

Group 1 report, 1

- GLP comments
 - No explicit actors
 - Not scale specific
 - Reductionistic
- GLP suggestions
 - Problem oriented approach
 - Poverty & extreme events
 - Clearer foci & questions

1

Group 1 report, 2

- DK needs
 - Mesoscale structures – conceptual & structural
 - Less description – more theory
 - More modelling

2

Group 2 report, 1

- There is an apparent lack of danish involvement in modelling activities. Unfortunate, because
 - Interaction between empirical work and modelling is useful
 - Models add to our understanding
 - Models are useful for producing policy-relevant output

3

Group 2 report, 2

- Danish research on land system science seems to have a comparative strength/advantage on the social side. This would be a very useful contribution to GLP

4

Group 2 report, 3

- In relation to LaSyS
 - Suggestion: next workshop should have 'scale' (spatial, temporal) as the main theme
 - It is useful to have researchers working in Denmark and in 3rd world countries working jointly in a LaSyS context
 - LaSyS may be used as a means of synthesizing research results and making them accessible and useful to policy-makers and other stakeholders

5

Group 3 report

6

I: complementary actions

- Process of discussion:
 - We have too few people from natural sciences – or yet, the same can be said about anthropology, political science...
 - Or, is it a question about some land change experts 'collecting the relevant information from those who know'
 - Having a common perception of how individual components fit into a larger picture will add value even if complete holism is not achieved

7

I: complementary actions cont.

- Crucially important to align scales (matching ecological and social spatial scales) – both temporal and spatial => the relevant scale is defined by the land use management system
- The ecological system research may need to develop methods to provide input at the appropriate level of scale
- Discussion of possible ways of stimulating the process of integrating cross-discipline interaction in future workshops. Scale? Case-studies?

8

GLP – critical reflections

- 'Decisions making' does not capture the origin of decisions and what drives the decisions
- The presentation of 'land use and management' as an equally valid circle (parallel to Social systems and Ecological system) does not seem very logical
- The figure does not point to the importance of the internal dynamics of neither the social system (those not related to the ecological system) nor the ecosystem
- It seems confusing that the apparent aims of the analytical exercise (i.e. T3.1...Critical pathways of change , T3.2 ..etc) are integrated in the GLP conceptual framework

9

GLP – critical reflections, cont.

- Historical aspects are poorly mirrored in figure (3D?)
- The characterization parameters for the ecological system seem to be inspired only by the ecological services which the system will provide – may be replaced or supplemented with e.g. topography, vegetation, fauna
- There may be a basic mismatch between the relevant scale/resolution for ecological system and the social system

10

Positive aspects

- Relevant to have land use as a focal point of interest/observation and hence define the scale (extent and grain size)

11

Conclusions 1/2

- Focus on questions/problems
- Last workshop at Christiansborg
- Summing up empirical case studies in meta-studies
- Meta-studies of conceptual frameworks
- Links to urbanization

12

Conclusions 2/2

- Approaches to research in landscape flow, decision making -> strengths/weaknesses
- Summing up experience from former MD programmes -> more frameworks
- Case development to specify complementary skills
- Publishing & money
- Excursion

13