



ONE WORLD CAFÉ

What creates sustainability?

**Visions and ideas for long term cooperation -
SWOT**

SUSTAINABILITY → SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- Sustainable for whom and for what?
 - S pace
 - U s
 - S takeholder
 - T arget
 - A daptive
 - I nnovation
 - N eeds
 - A sssessment
 - B alance
 - I ntegrated
 - L ong term
 - I ntergenerational
 - T echnology
 - Y ield



SWOT

○ Strengths

- Good for funds
- Recognized term by public (integrative term)
- Top down → framework → vision
- = basic attitude to life (brings people and issues together)
- Starts discussion

○ Weaknesses

- Fuzzy
- Hard to operationalize

○ Opportunities

- Process oriented
- Generates knowledge
- Bottom up / participation
- Consensus, society agreement
- Reduction of negative trade-offs

○ Threats

- Misused (meaning too stretched)



SUSTAINABILITY- THE RIGHT TERM?

- EU: Resource efficiency instead of sustainability?
 - Leaves out social aspects
 - More the economic aspect
- ES-discussion → basis = sustainability
 - (no value of nature without sustainability)
 - ES makes clear that there is more than just sectoral profit
- Why new concepts? Sustainability was adequate (as fuzzy as it is)



FUTURE OF SUSTAINABILITY

- Future is not to invent new terms.
- What is the next word to be exploited?
- Scientists:
 - Do scientists create new words for the market?
 - EWS?
 - Should be more! → Operationalizing, finding new ways of treating issues
- Sustainability already transports the basic message.
 - Sustainability = “Take care or die.”



SWOT

- S + O dominates → there is a future of „sustainability“
- „resource efficiency“
 - a loss, as social topics are missing (too technical)
 - = step backward, reduction
 - Has no future.
- “ES”
 - same as RE
- Comparison: “Governance” few years ago
→ same



FAILURE OF SCIENCE THAT NEW TERMS ARE INVENTED?

- Sciences are playing a too small role.
 - e.g. floods → nobody listens to scientists, but a flood is “effective”
 - Responsibility is transferred to scientists (energy)
 - it’s a question of communication (other channels needed...media... journalists)
- Take care of the channeling!



SCIENCE AND POLICY

- Government only likes science for economy.
- Special group in science needed for communication.
 - The right language is necessary.



DRAWBACKS FOR SCIENTISTS (US)

- Resources efficiency means enhance a part of sustainability.
- ES also isn't holistic.
- Ecologists = Losers of sustainability discussion, economists = winners (Stieglitz report)

- Our message:
 1. Resource efficiency is not enough.
 2. We need to communicate results in a more clear way.(Who reads journals? RE also comes from science → Lobbying? Competition between scientists!)



ELI- A LOBBY GROUP?

- ELI should be working groups (like IALE)
- For focusing on landscape research
- Linkage of institutions
- Cooperation with other institutions: IALE, IUFRO (Sandra Luque)
- A lobby costs: How much money do we want to invest? Is that science? A job for Green Peace?
- ELI- land **use** (management) or **landscape** (IALE)?
- Institutions for lobbying: ZALF, UFZ (funding for landscape science)



(S)

- good for funds
- recognized
- integrative
- flexible
- topdown → framework
→ vision

(W)

- fuzzy
- hard to operationalize
- scale dependent

(O)

- process oriented
generates knowledge
- bottom up
participation
- consensus
society agreement
- reduce negative
trade off

(T)

- misused



Sustainable for whom?

Space

us → you, me etc

Stakeholder

Targets

Adaptive

Innovation

Needs

Assessment

Balance

Integrated

Long term

Intergenerational

Technology / Transition

Yield



GROUP PARTICIPANTS

- Claudia Neumann
- Claudia Franz
- Felix Müller
- Peter Verburg
- ...(Kassel?)
- Jochen König
- ...(Croatia)
- Sandra Luque
- Carsten Lorz
- Katharina Heling
- Susanne Frank

