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Landscape approaches are **HOT**

- Complexity of global problems
- Require integrated solutions
- No blue-prints available
- Place-specific or area-based approach
Landscape approaches

Landscape as ‘boundary’ concept (adapted from Oskam, 2009)
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Multiple restoration options

Global commitment to restore 150,000,000 of degraded land by 2020
Sectoral boundaries
Jurisdictional boundaries
How to integrate?

From jurisdictional to functional space
Four strands of literature

- **Environmental policy integration (EPI):** integration of environmental goals in sectoral policies

- **Landscape governance:** spatial integration *from below*, through landscape’s spatial characteristics and people’s agency

- **(Critical) institutionalism:** landscapes as institutional void; need for new spatiality; productive and institutional *bricolage*

- **Innovation literature:** institutional entrepreneurship, policy entrepreneurs; *fit & conform*, or *stretch & transform*
Rwanda: landscapes not a new concept

- *Ibisiza n’imisozi*:
The valleys and the hills
Hills as home of people

- *Abahinzi-boroze beza*
Good farmers
having crops, cows, trees
Rwanda: commitment to restore

- High level of degradation
- First African pledge to Bonn Challenge
- Pledging 2,000,000 ha
- Trees-on-farm approach
Rwanda: strong, strict, and sticky

- Strong political leadership
- Strong sectoral policies
- Strict system of performance contracts (Imihigo)
- No room to play…
Rwanda: policy conflicts

- **Forest law**
  - Restoration
  - Trees-on-farm

- **Land law**
  - Everybody to register land
  - Small plots to be collectivised

- **Agricultural law**
  - Specialisation/intensification
  - Commercialisation
Policy conflicts

- Substantive conflicts (conflicting policy goals)
- Procedural conflicts (participatory decision making)

The question:

What strategies do landscape actors employ to overcome these?
Rulindo: district and landscape
Policy conflicts

- Substantive conflict
  - Mono-functional versus multi-functional
  - Cash crops versus food crops
  - Risk taking versus risk avoiding

- Procedural conflict
  - No consultation
  - Sticky institutions
  - Sectoral/individual performance contracts
Strategies that landscape actors employ

- Productive bricolage
- Institutional bricolage
- Institutional entrepreneurship

- Fit & conform
- Stretch & transform
Farmers: fit and conform
Companies: conform and stretch
Local government: conform, stretch, transform
National government: stretch and transform
From district to landscape: transform
Conclusions

1. Policy integration happens
2. Through landscape actors practicing productive and institutional bricolage; institutional entrepreneurship
3. Fit & conform, stretch & transform
4. Spatial shift: Landscapes as functional space
5. Spatialisation of policies: across jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries
6. For landscape governance arrangements to emerge
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