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(James Reed)

So I'd like to start first by acknowledging really the integrated landscape approaches to land management is not a new concept. It's actually been widely documented within the literatures since at least the early 1980s on the various guides and the past three decades have seen a real growing recognition there, the traditional approaches, the historical approaches to global challenges such as biodiversity, conservation, poverty alleviation, deforestation are no longer working, and we need to find a more holistic integrated solutions to these problems. Now previous approaches, like I said they fell on various guides but they've been developed over the past three decades, and despite an initial promise, they failed to achieve a lot of key objectives and principles among thesis combining sectors, so reconciling conservation and development targets. To give some examples, initiatives such as ecosystem based approaches or ICDPs have been heavily criticized for being too heavily focused on conservation issues, and therefore the deterioration of the local livelihoods. Conversely you have integrated rule development approaches, which have come up to screen for being too anthropocentric and therefore not addressing conservation issues sufficiently. The integrated landscape approach can be viewed as a refinement of these prior approaches, and can broadly defined as a framework to address the increasingly widespreading complex, environmental, social, and political challenges, and typically transition to traditional management boundaries. Then to do this through the equitable and sustainable use of land and also help strengthen measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change. So they really are multifaceted approaches to land management, then to bring together multiple stakeholders across multiple sectors and work at various multiple scales. Now when you consider these approaches in this context, it's really quite difficult to argue against the merits of a landscape approaches framework. You know what we have heard is a mechanism that could potentially help to alleviate poverty, and do so in an equitable manner, conserve biodiversity, save forests, and also contribute to food production while also mitigating climate change. We can also throw into that mix, with the force of coming sustainable development goals, if you look at the current working draft, they've outlined several targets, key targets, and if you look at the terrestrial targets, at least a majority of them displace significant overlap with the objectives of a landscape approach. So at this point, we really have to question why is the landscape approach been relatively slow to gain policy attraction? And this is inevitably a lot to be taken on the ground. So what I'd like to do is to address a few key issues that we've identified that have become primary barriers to implementation of the approach. So the first one is this issue of terminology. As I mentioned, it has been an exponential rise in the last three decades of literatures related to landscape approach, one for more others. And this has led to a real significant institutional overlap in terms of the terminology use. So research groups in different corner of the globe and they are using different definitions and even applying different terms that all mean the same thing. A recent study identified 78 different terms all related to landscape approaches. And perhaps what we have done is just creating a sea of terminology, it's not actually helping progress, actually hindering engagement with policy makers, because the scientists will fail to deliver a coherent message. The second issue is really related to the first one, how do we define a landscape approach? This is becoming increasingly problematic. We are dealing with the complex and dynamic system, and we acknowledge, perhaps what we don't need is a universal agreed definition because a landscape approach is a framework, perhaps it has to be as dynamic as a landscape which we are trying to apply it. Having said that, what we do need is a coordinated effort, at least within the research community, so built on the terminology we have, and try to provide at least a widely accepted definition of what we think is a landscape approach, and how we can deliver that message to policy makers. The third point is the issue of impact assessment. We seem to build this real wealth of knowledge related to integrated landscape approaches to land management. But a lot of it is theory and conceptual frameworks. Do we really have a strong evidence base? Do we have the case studies on the ground that have shown these objectives are being met and these global challenges are being addressed? Related to this, do we currently have a tool that can assess landscape approach, how it has been implemented? Again we acknowledged the landscape approach does not need to have a specific angle, it's more about the journey rather than the destination. But the points along this journey, we need to be having some metrics some measure of meeting objectives in a short term at various stages along the journey. The final issue is the issue of governance. Again it's a problematic area, it's quite easy to sit here and say, we demand what amount of approach, we need to engage rural communities, but we all know from experience, within forest governance, when you try to implement something in the field, having this bottom of approach is very difficult to get all the stakeholders together and get them involved in the decision making process. in order to bridge national policies with local practices that needs to be engaged with rural communities, and we need to somehow work out how to empower these rural communities, they do have an active voice within the decision-making processes, and also direct the management going forward the approach. So in order to seek solutions to some issues that we have raised, CIFOR is currently undertaking this systematic mapping process. We are following the standard, systematic review, methodology, we've catch this broad range of literatures possible from a number of specialized databases, and great literature sources, individuals and organizations, and we collect the literatures and apply inclusion and exclusion criteria, and then filter these literatures at various stages, so title screening, abstract screening and finally full texts, that will give us a final set of studies that we plan to map. The two key objectives that we hope to meet in this process are, we first want to map the development of the theory of landscape approaches, so how the previous approaches are fed into the current integrated landscape approaches, and try to somehow decide for the existing terminology and provide that more coherent message. And then we can use this in the formal policy brief to deliver a better message to policy makers. The second objective is to identify a map geographically, where and how these initiatives have be implemented in the field. So we would ideally like to identify what stakeholders' involvement has been, what sectors' involvement has been, how governance has been applied. And by doing this process, we hope that we can then contribute to future research efforts to gain a great understanding and display how landscape approaches can be implemented. On current process with the map, we work on a very short timeframe, but we manage to complete our title and abstract screening. We started with approximately 13,000 studies, after title screening, we filter that number down to 3,500, and as I said, we recently completed the abstract screening, we left 382 studies but we will read full texts and extract our data from, and we will be transferring that data directly into an interactive map. And we hope to reveal some results, some preliminary results at the global landscapes forum in Peru in December, and we'll hope to unveil the map at this point as well. Thank you very much.

(Audience)

I think this is a nice overview and I'm happy that you are undertaking this study for the CIFOR, undertaking this study and I'm happy that you noted that this is a long history of landscape approaches, and we should be tapping into that. I'm also happy that you mentioned the empowerment or something that came up last week when we have this event in New York and we were just discussing about landscape approach, and there were points very strongly made also by several people that somehow we have to figure out a way of finding what could look like a top-down approach, putting a landscape perspective on development problem, but we have the approach, we have people coming from the regions and the villages and say, state that point of view. So I think that's one of the challenges we have there. Another point I'd like to make and I made also before is that we need to find a way of making this operational and that means finding a way of getting from the integration of the complexity to an output of simplicity, because we live in a sectors world, we live in a levels world. People at the village level are not in the ministries, that's simply not the case so they will have different challenges than those up there, and we need to find a way of bringing those outputs and breaking them down again and bringing them out to where they matter and how they matter in those different sectors and levels. Ministries are separate, there is no ministry of landscapes, you don't have that. But there is ministry of forestry, ministry of agriculture, ministry of finances, of economies and so on, which need to do their contribution to the solution and we need to find a way of breaking what we find in the integrated approach down into sector solutions again, which then somehow reflect this integrated analysis and respond to it and contribute to an integrated outcome, but they're working basically separately and at levels, I think that's another challenge we have.

(James Reed)

Top-down and bottom-up approaches has been mentioned in a few meetings, would the approach work without either or. I think a landscape approach does require both, so I agree with that. And in terms of operationalizing the landscape approach, at the administratory level, it's quite convenient for them to say in the box. But I think as a research community, what we can do is at least deliver the research and show there is a feasible approach. I'm not entirely sure that we are doing that at the moment in terms of delivering case studies and research on the ground, but it's gonna take a lot of people, basically being very brave, the donor community, the research community, working together, and making this large scale long-term project happen.

(James Reed)

So we did the skyping study to identify a set of search terms, and we have a set of search terms that we then apply to various databases. We've contacted research institutions directly, spoken to individual experts, and basically trying to find as broader range of materials as we can possibly find, including great literature materials as well. And then we screen at various levels for literatures we were left with and we start with 13,000 but a lot among them aren’t relevant to landscape approach but that's a fact of doing systematic review, have to start at a very broad set of search and make sure you are capturing all of materials you do want to capture, and then you go through this quite time-consuming processive screening that tie to abstract, full-text, and we'll then be left with, we have 328 full text that we have to rate, take the data from and then we will meet that data accordingly How many fun of studies we have in the map, I could not say at the moment. From my experience, it is generally 1% from the original search, the 13,000, will be left with 130. But sometimes you're left with nothing of saying, another systematic review, but that's not gonna be the case for us.

(Audience)

I would recommend not to be too widely so the interpretation of the approaches, or the concept, I would incorporate into your review, the whole issues of governance. Governance of landscape is a completely different issue, I think, has to be more into the literatures where you might have this one. You might reach your review by looking at theory of complexity because I think in a lot of landscape approaches are missing there is a whole theoretical framework, that's the problem when UNDP, its ecosystem-based adaptational approach that they are doing, the theory is not there. I think the cultivation could be very good if you look at the theory of complexity and provides some common theoretical framework of landscape approaches. Governance, again, it is probably more into the legal aspect, literature, or some other social, political signs as part to the literature. It might be too wide to try to incorporate everything in one review.

(James Reed)

Yeah, obviously we have to draw boundaries somewhere and when you do a systematic approach, you have to follow a quite rich methodology. But at the stage, we are at the moment which is screening the full text, we can choose what data we want to take from the text, so we have a pretty large spreadsheet and various different variables that we hope to identify, but we can actually be flexible at this stage, so we can add or remove depending on what we find in the text. The governance issue is not a specific key objective that we have, it's more about mapping, where and how they could implement and how to decide for the terminology.

(Audience)

Just a quick easy one I think. But just from the studies you've waisted down, is that they actually work, the landscape approach is being applied, or do you mean, are they conceptual papers as well working and defining it?

(James Reed)

There are mix of the two. So when we are going through the screening of full text, we will basically apply into different folders, one would be theoretical frameworks, one would be case studies. It's probably not a good idea to say right now, but I'm gonna to say it anyway. We are emerging theme, we are emerging panels. We start to see there are very little examples of case studies within the tropics. We are finding much more theoretical work, but we haven't read the full text so that might come back finally.