



## Living Laboratories

### Integrated Landscape Science & Management Forum

Australia Asia Water Centre, 13 March 2008

#### Notes from audience workshop sessions

##### 1<sup>st</sup> workshop session

##### **What did we learn from the speakers that we can implement in SA?**

###### Group 1:

- Need for integration was reinforced
- Partnerships can be an effective strategy to harness increased \$ and decreased transaction costs
- Strong leadership is important and can be aided by “horizontal” organizational structure
- Need for an objective framework to assist in developing ‘right’ questions
- Need for state and regional agency champions to communicate and promote
- Challenge is to develop a united voice in state agencies
- Partners need ownership as a shareholder to encourage commitment of \$ and resources (joint appointments, internships, sharing resources)
- Decision-making tools can help influence legislative framework and enable move beyond compliance especially using incentives
- Integrative research will need new rewards and funding structures to encourage people to get involved
- Developing Trust among and between groups is only way multi-disciplinary efforts can succeed.

###### Group 2:

- Plenty of tools and products available but need someone to sort tools and build capacity (what tools and how to apply them).
- Need tools to rigorously make choices about investment across assets.
- Researchers need better understanding of requirements of NRM regions (framework and brief) not just focus on breaking down discipline based silos.
- Resources needed to achieve integration and match aims and aspirations
- Why do we need a landscape cluster in SA? Are our issues sufficiently different?



### Group 3:

#### *Attractive aspects*

- Multidisciplinary – including social sciences
- NRM community needs better skills/ tools / techniques
  - deliver these in an uncomplicated manner
  - technical champion from within CMA/ NRM board
- Adaptive management approach needed
  - Connectivity – evaluation/monitoring/ feedback / adapting.

#### *Issues*

- Incentives needed for good collegiate behaviour
- Cluster actually drives focus (also what not to do)
- Community/ industry engagement models not well defined or understood
- What are the indicators of success? – adoption by CMA/NRM?
- What is the pathway to market? – plan to deliver
- Need to achieve trust, respect and perceived relevance through relationships and time

### Group 4

#### *What does this cluster want to be?*

- Problem focused (specific) eg Landscape Logic?
- Important concepts that are important for a range of environmental issues eg AEDA?
- Something in between eg hybrid?

### Group 5

- What potential for this decision network to do its business?
  - Provide support for Program Logic by adding values, rigor, transparency
  - Accrue knowledge for regions
  - To build capacity, be independent
  - Inform business and identify gaps
- Two-way process important: scientists engaging with regions more as well as regions seeing the value of science
- Negatives and considerations
  - Competing demands for time in regions
  - Assessing what different skills people have to offer
  - Different capacities among regions
  - Decision theory development can have relevance / use in a broader political context.



## Group 6

### *What did we learn?*

- Tools are important but need to be implemented through improved capacity
- Minimise bureaucracy?
  - Can we? Should we?
  - Management / administration / research / communication structure
- Integration of disparate researchers
  - Communication and brokering
  - Differing view but need ways forwards
- Partnership approach with 'do-ers' and researchers and landholders is a good way to go
- Need to reduce transaction costs of multidisciplinary research
- SA Landscape Science Cluster needs to decide on a model to organize itself
  - Purpose
  - Measure impact
  - Politics and pragmatics

## Group 7

- There is difficulty in linking researchers to the many NRM stakeholders (and vice versa)
  - Is there enough incentive and motivation to engage?
  - Time required is large and takes researchers away from activity that leads to rewards and recognition
  - NRM stakeholders not knowing what to ask – Don't know what we don't know!
  - Available info/tools often too specialized, not relevant
  - Often we do not understand each others language
  - Important to understand institutional structure you are trying to engage with
- Don't try to do everything
  - Choose partners carefully
  - Diffusion?
  - Serial monogamy?
- It is possible
  - Just do it
  - It's iterative
  - Be prepared for things to evolve
  - Find a GREAT leader
  - Plenty of resources to grease the wheels of collaboration and motivate people



- Lots of different frameworks
  - Could be confusing
  - How to choose which one(s)?
- Importance of institutional structure eg. Face to face meetings
- Lots of experience out there
  - Don't reinvent wheels
  - Have specialists in extension
- Expect change
  - Be adaptable
  - Have a supportive environment

## **Workshop 2**

**What do we need to do next in SA to generate knowledge, tools and/or information that could be used by decision makers to integrate NRM more effectively?**

### **Group 1:**

- Develop an NRM tool bar that would also be a Web repository
- Develop linkages with existing CERF's / institutions
- Explore opportunities to generalize learnings from CERF/ other case studies
- Start using a (any) systematic prioritization strategy (DON'T WAIT)
- Do we need tools OR ways of thinking

### **Group 2:**

- Journals: who has the time and access?
- Publications: Landcare journal, regional newsletters – do these work?
- Is it more about relationships that build trust and communication
- Need mechanisms to follow up information
- Warehouse of integrated material that includes websites, newsletters and existing conferences
- Are there more David Pannell's that can provide the 'easy' user interface?
- User interfaces need to have 'the goods under the hood' – be careful not to promote the notion that one size fits all
- The process you go through in developing "tools" is just as important as the tool and user interface balance is important
- Continue to build on two-way communication between regions and researchers, existing networks, NRM Alliance
- Need to employ social scientists to assist with defining the next steps and how to go about them
- Need to develop co-ownership



- Need policy staff, ecologists, sociologist etc to develop a co-project
  - Where would 'this' exist
  - What bureaucracy system do we need?
- Collective decision making
  - All opinions valued
  - Everyone listened to
- Build capacity within regions
- Tap into tools that already exist

### Group 3:

- Need Website to explain capabilities and limitations of different ILS tools
  - I have a problem, which models could I use?
- Think about how to get from tools with potential to tools that are being used – need for co-operative prototype development and testing
- Address balance between roll-out and new development of tools ( and the feedback process)
- Think in advance about funding for long-term maintenance and support for tools you develop
- Keep talking in a range of ways
- Start working together
  - Collaborate with established ILS groups

### Group 4:

#### *What next?*

- Define which modelling approach and propose how to bring it together?
- Make sure research is feeding various agenda's eg Aust., state, NRM region
- Opportunity to run scenarios to help inform policy is important
- Researchers can help Boards formulate research questions
- Need to quantify the value proposition
- Scenarios to include climate change (averages of variability)
- Include indigenous issues – land management, people
- Inclusion of 'social scientists' appropriate to project
- Understand stakeholder value sets – who and what influences decision making?
- Focus on 1-2 demo/flagship projects to show what Landscape Science means in SA context
- Refine the business case