Klustergruppsmöte Vatten i Landskapet 10/4 2018, SIWI/SWH, Stockholm

Tema: Lokal kunskap och lokalt deltagande

Deltagare: Lund Universitet/LUCSUS, Ecoloop, FOCALi/GU, WWF, SLU, GEWA Consulting, LRF, Naturvårdsverket och SIWI.

Greppa Näringen- Markus Hoffman, Lantbrukarnas Riksförbund (LRF)

Greppa näringen startade 2001 i och med miljökvalitetsmålen. Målet var att minska övergödningen, men det har nu utvecklats till att även inkludera minskning av utsläpp av klimatgaser och växtskyddsmedel. Hjärtat i Greppa Näringen är personlig rådgivning, där rådgivare åker ut till lantbrukarna för att ge råd genom personliga möten – råd som är anpassade efter kontexten. Detta finansieras genom jordbruksprogrammet.

Gården skall vara minst 50 ha och/eller ha minst 25 djurenheter för att vara aktuell för enskild rådgivning. Greppa Näringen har genomfört 53 000 besök. Länsstyrelserna är också med. Till exempel jorderosion kan spåras i Lantmäteriverkets högupplösta databas och syns som sår på fälten, och man arbetar därför med anpassade skyddszoner som fungerar som ”gräsplåster”. Ca 80 000 gräsplåster har hittills etablerats och man kan även få EU stöd för detta.

Det förebyggande arbetet är att undvika packningsskador. Den bestående åtgärden är anläggandet av våtmarken (ett 20-årigt avtal att det ska finnas kvar). Angående skyddzoner blir det en viss ryckighet, eftersom det inte alltid funnits pengar. Greppa Näringen försöker få tillit hos lantbrukarna, men det handlar också om politik (investeringar m.m.).

Vad gäller våtmarksrådgivning så är många trötta på byråkratin för anläggningen av våtmarker, även om man kan få ca 90% av kostnader i ersättning. Stora våtmarker är väldigt väderfulla, men många drar tillbaka sina ansökningar pga byråkratin. Just nu öser man pengar över landsbygden, men detta fungerar inte alltid i praktiken på grund av för krångliga regler.

Trendanalys av kvävehalter i jordbruksåar ihop med SLU visar att vattnet blivit renare, men mätningarna är ganska gamla (utfördes 2012). Vet man något om hur läget ser ut nu? Några uppdateringar? Ganska allvarligt om det inte har blivit några förbättringar, utan ligger på samma nivåer och har avstannat. Det är tydligt att vi behöver hitta nästa stora volymåtgärd.

Greppa arbetar mycket med digitalisering och precisionsodling (gödsling) med hjälp av satellitbilder (CropSAT), vilket kan minska kväveanvändningen. Motsvarande system för bevattning används inte i Sverige ännu, men att det skulle kunna gå. Detta system anvnänds också för besprutning och för att minska onödig besprutning.

CropSAT är inte subventionerat, men några länsstyreslser beviljar investeringsstöd. CropSAT är inte utvärderat, men är stabilt och uppskattas av lantbrukare. Det har fått större spridning i Danmark, men har utvecklats i Sverige med svenska investeringar. Det finns också ett alternativt system till CropSAT som mäter grödans reflektans med hjälp av kvävesensorer för att uppskatta kvävebehovet.

Minskade fosforförluster är också ett väldigt framgångsrikt projekt. Ett annat initiativ är Vattendragsgrupper och ett nytt omfattande arbete med ’catchment officers’ där man vill bättre utnyttja lokal kunskap i linjearbete med hjälp av pengar från HAV.

Skogsnäringen ligger lite före i miljöarbetet, med blå målklassning. Det finns en viss frustration över att det inte finns ett mera nära samarbete mellan sektorerna och de olika markägarna.

Lärdomar: One-to-One är effektivt, men det måste bygga på återkommande besök. Lantbrukare vill göra rätt. Vi har en snabb strukturomvandling med större och färre gårdar. Uthållighet och systematik är avgörande för framgång. Även rådgivarna har blivit bättre miljöutbildade

Gendered land rights in sub-Saharan Africa, Karin Steen, Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies (LUCSUS)

When discussing "Women in Africa" the focus is often on portraying the typical idea of women and the starting point is often the gendered division of labour, which is a static view of roles, and no men are present, but reality is more complex. The idea of women being closer to nature and as better caretakers of nature builds on ecofeminist ideas. Women are not necessarily closer to nature - they have often been forced into that gendered role. Studies of women in agriculture often focus on workload, tasks, allocation of time, access to land or credit, and rarely on women as owners, users of technology, and legal aspects. It is even more rare to focus on identity and power and control.

The last wave of feminism focused on voting, being represented and counted, and not so much on men and their role in gender. Focus has shifted from women in reproduction to production to generate economic value and participate in the market economy. This has led to poverty reduction strategies to invest in women to create economic value that are not primarily based on equity reasons. Issues to consider include:

- Efficiency/welfare reasons for investments in women – women are seen as instrumental, as a tool for developing the whole society, not for equity reasons and for their own reasons.
- If you invest in women for their own sake, it would challenge the power structure (which is more difficult).
- Women as instrument or end goal? Cannot force equality projects – intervention need to be context sensitive.

Gender is cutting through all aspects of society, and gender should be considered as relational and fluid and is more about the identify, not the biological body. We need to study how people do gender, both in relations and themselves. Feminism assumes power and that there are power relations.

Different methods: Methods range from counting women and men, to analysing gender as social relations, explaining identity and diversity beyond gender, and into intersectionality and reflexive questioning of knowledge production.

What type of right to resources do women have? There have been numerous women's land right campaigns. But what do we mean by land rights? Private property rights – you have the responsibility for the land and take care of the cost etc. It is based on certain assumptions about natural resource management and the use of property. It does not always help to have the legal right on paper, the question is whether it is it practiced. Other types of rights include customary or statutory law, access to, use and control over resources. Use for what? Water for household, cattle etc. There are thus many different rights that control access.

Gendering of resources also need to be considered. Take for example milk, when hand milking cows, it is considered female, while industrial farming is considered male. With respect to water, it is considered female when collecting for household needs, while male when water use in treatment

plants is the focus. This illustrates how gendered roles are expressed through responsibilities and that they are more about social norms.

Case study in Zimbabwe: Gender affects everyday farming in many ways. Rights to land- women's land is called garden, while men's land is the agriculture/productive land. A lot of time the right to land for women is a negotiation – they may not have official rights, but unofficial. An example includes the system of bridewealth that pays for the bride and for the woman's labour and her reproduction.

Conclusion: There is a difference between women's strategic interests and initiatives labelled as targeting women. Gender is not an add-on, but a higher order process. The gender regime has effects on identities, rights and responsibilities, and will affect strategies and interests.

Citizen and science interaction to co-generate actionable water knowledge- Timo Karpouzoglou, Independent Consultant

What is Citizens Science (CS)? It is an approach where non-scientists are actively involved in generating new scientific knowledge. In the beginning citizens were part of monitoring resources, which was also a way of gaining power. CS is about co-generation of knowledge and interactive learning exchange. It brings citizens into the democratic dialogue. How can you better capture and understand local experience about water? Better achieve specific targets and local implementation. How do you link these actions to governance structures and adaptive governance?

CS methods is not the standard way data is collected in the field of water. Many times, expensive instruments are used to collect data, with no accessibility for local citizens. Different variables are included in collecting data: for example, precipitation, streamflow, water quality, and water use. All variables offer both opportunities and challenges as to where CS can contribute with certain tools/methods to develop new ways of collecting data. CS does not yet include management variables and some of the methods fits better at the local level.

Case study: Mountain Water Resources and Citizens science. A study was carried out in Nepal, Ethiopia, Peru and Kyrgyzstan. Fragile and poorly known mountain ecosystems services were mapped. This was linked with CS and interactive models of information exchange, knowledge generation and learning (EVOs). A case study was presented from Mustang area in Nepal with a focus on what is happening at village level in water management, for example storage ponds. People were concerned about lower levels of water, which is also affecting which crops farmer choose to grow and how they can diversify. In the process different ties need to be forged with local governments and science institutions in order to carry out CS methods. CS experiments in Mustang showed that these approaches can complement other development interventions, but that that one needs to be careful not to replace existing responsibilities of local state/government, but use both methods.

CS 2.0 and new knowledge co-generation tool: How can we visualize information so that local communities understand? Sometimes something as simple as a video could be used, but we need combination of visualizing tools to communicate to a larger crowd. Many websites and applications are design and developed very top-down, not taking into account the needs from the ground. We should co-develop them with local stakeholders. Visualization design sessions could be used, as some things are very culturally sensitive.

How to use CS with governance? Link adaptive governance capabilities and CS 2.0, which is based on

reflectivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalisation, and rescaling. There is a need to also build trust in order for the tools to have impact.

Conclusion: Allow more actors to engage in the monitoring of water.
- Decentralised and diverse methods.
- Need to redefine and constantly develop participatory processes.
- Need to be careful about power relations between research and stakeholders.

Local participation and tools – there can be a problem with integrity. Some might not want to share data.

Discussions

- In Sweden there is portal where cities can report different animal species and contribute to collection of data, it is called Artportalen: https://emea01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=www.artportalen.se&data=02%7C01%7C%7C8e7b5682af9941ba0a8c08d59ed5658a%7C52c09282682a444e87eff79f53826cb5%7C0%7C0%7C636589561747101673&sdata=V%2FqPEQK5aVVoJjBP2f79xsNqSLz3Fc8ilB3etuf%2BO1Q%3D&reserved=0
- There is another portal for Sweden's new national platform for citizen: https://emea01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=www.medborgarforskning.se&data=02%7C01%7C%7C8e7b5682af9941ba0a8c08d59ed5658a%7C52c09282682a444e87eff79f53826cb5%7C0%7C0%7C636589561747101673&sdata=ayjJzwIrjXYRGEFVXGXIMMZyykCg85UujJJBwHPLTlk%3D&reserved=0
- There must be something to gain for the participants to engage in CS - do they perceive they get help or improvement? Local governments are usually quicker to see the benefits with this approach than the local stakeholders. But it cannot replace other development projects, as there is a need for that as well.
- How do you secure credibility of information/data? Need to make data available to those who needs it. Can use different methods to complement CS to make it more scientific. Important to design a relevant process, also in raising capacity.
- Can we claim we have landscape approach unless we have CS and gender included in the approach?
- Many times, there is a big pot where all aspects are supposed to be included. Need to move beyond IWRM, as that has not worked that well. Need to develop something new. Should pick a specific problem and gather around that in order for people to feel relevance of the process. The landscape approach can be seen as a development of IWRM and other methods. There is always a need to improve and learn.
- The issues of scale - which scale do we want to work at? How and at which scale also depends on data available.
- How do we use the landscape approach? Not currently a priority, more of an academic approach. How do we use it for implementation? The concept is used and discussed but need concrete good examples. The approach has also been used in Sweden.