



Living Laboratories

Integrated Landscape Science & Management Workshop

National Wine Centre, 14 March 2008

Notes from Landscape Science Cluster (LSC) workshop sessions

Innovation Model – Thanks to David Pannell and Anna Ridley

	What	Who	How	
Champions	Define the task/problem	Decision makers, research providers, implementers	Iterative process	Interface Nationally
	Understand the Complexity	Research providers, project leader	Involve integrators and agencies	
	Simplify the messages (rules of thumb), trial and testing	Whoever is good at it (translator, synthesizer, project leader or sub-group)	Always needs practice and refinement	
	Build trust around the process, quality assurance, capacity building	Networkers, trainers, communicators (Agency, local government, consultants)	Links to existing requirements	
	Helpdesk	Networkers, trainers, communicators (Agency, local government, consultants)	Ongoing support and quality assurance	

- There is demand (AMLR, EP, GRDC) which can be encouraged
- More focused analysis of market demand is needed
- Opportunity to connect, interact and influence land use planning processes needs to be explored



What is the compelling Case?

Group 1:

- Evidence-based support for NRM planning
 - Nexus between NRM and planning

↓ ↓

State and Planning SA

Regions Councils
- Outcomes
 - Efficiencies and targeting
 - Avoiding perverse outcomes
 - Better outcomes
 - Systematic and strategic
- Strong need – ongoing rapid decline in environmental condition
- Needs clarity in scope and terms: agriculture, water, carbon, land and soils, people and communities, development, ecosystems.

Group 2:

Need:

- Integration of disciplines – develop conceptual tools
- Niche – SA focus on existing and new data
- Clean outcome-focus to science
- Connecting science to policy cost effectiveness
- Value for \$ for investors

Group 3

- Demonstrate improved outcomes are possible
- There is user pull
- We need new models to fund and promote adoption?
 - Repeating what we know is important “Turning the handle”
- This offers a mode to bring good science to policy development
- ‘Planning’ SA should adopt these types of information and projection analysis

Group 4

- Looks at all problems rather than bits – more holistic approach is needed
- Fragmented approach(es) have not ‘fixed’ the problems
- Systems approach promises more progress than individual
- Planning is not connected currently to NRM – this seems logically and consequentially dopey!
- Get planning and regional NRM to form partnerships for:
 - Problem definition – problem framing
 - Knowledge integration to address problem
 - Building relationship for uptake and adoption



What would it take to get involved and do it?

Group 1

- Real commitment
- Accountability of LSC for transfer and adoption of science in policy and on-ground outcomes (pathways to adoption)
- Impact of science can be enhanced with simple straight forward communication
- Alignment with existing state strategic directions (strategic plan, state NRM plan, NRM RA etc) and commonwealth
- Commercial and industry relevance
 - Grains
 - Carbon etc
- Return on investment for partners will need to be demonstrated
- World-class innovation and science
- Real projects to get going on

Group 2

- Need \$ for science (particularly trans-disciplinary science)
- Clearly informing policy with science
- Uptake – outcomes ‘on the ground’
- Strong/innovative leadership
- Role for social sciences
- Resources to facilitate partnerships (external view)
- Streamlined administrative process for collaborations
- Needs own identity – not university, government, or commercial.

Current gap:

- Process (formal mechanism) linking science to outcomes and policy
- Linking with community and other end users

Group 3

How can we do this?

- Define the task/problem
- Understand the complexity (bio, social, physical, economical etc)
- Adopt an iterative approach decision makers and research providers and implementers.
- Show me the \$\$
- Need research providers with project leaders (integrators and agencies)
- Need trial and testing
- Whoever is good at it – translator, synthesizer, project leader, sub-group of above
- Capability building
- Build trust around the process
- Define and implement an efficient roll out
- Link to existing requirements
- Identify networkers, trainers, communicators, agency, local government, consultants
- Helpdesk need is vital component of adaptive management
- Interface nationally
- Identify champions and engage in more listening



Group 4

- Connecting planning and NRM systems planning (Planning SA and PIRSA)
- Redesign landscape course
- Influence policy development
- Need flagship projects – take an economic development perspective

Next Steps

- Develop flagship projects
 - Brainstorming
 - Include stakeholders
 - Other project leaders
 - Background paper
 - Identify project champions
- National linkages
 - Include national players on board
 - Project linkages
 - Piggyback on existing conferences
 - Website > LWA?
 - Formal linkages to CERF's?
- Training and Education
 - Wait until 1 and 2 have started
 - CSIRO are happy to co-supervise
 - Tony Jakeman interested in this

How:

- Work with stakeholders and partners from the beginning
- Focus on target projects – tackle real issues
- No one tool – encourage innovation, defined by nature of the problem
- Identify immediate and long-term drivers
- Project leader role is critical to success
- Adopt a YES WE CAN! Position and attitude
- Fund the whole model from the beginning from task formation through to help desk
- Maintain commitment to the end
- Challenge the system
- Training and education – can we make this national?
 - Co-teaching
 - Curriculum development
 - Training/TAFE?
 - Post-grads

- High level advocacy – build the case around the Flagships
- Another meeting of core group in next month