

*Preprint of:* J.K. Vanclay, R. Muetzelfeldt, M. Haggith and F. Bousquet, 2000. FLORES: Helping people to realize sustainable futures. In: B. Krishnapillay, E. Soepadmo, N.L. Arshad, A.Wong, S. Appanah, S.W. Chick, N. Manokaran, H.L. Tong and K.K. Choon (eds) *Forests and Society: The role of research*. XXI IUFRO World Congress 2000 Sub-plenary Sessions 1:723-729

## **FLORES: Helping people to realize sustainable futures...**

*Jerome K Vanclay<sup>1</sup>, Robert Muetzelfeldt<sup>2</sup>, Mandy Haggith<sup>3</sup> and Francois Bousquet<sup>4</sup>*

1. Southern Cross University, PO Box 157, Lismore NSW 2480, Australia. [JVanclay@scu.edu.au](mailto:JVanclay@scu.edu.au)
2. University of Edinburgh, Mayfield Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JU, UK. [R.Muetzelfeldt@ed.ac.uk](mailto:R.Muetzelfeldt@ed.ac.uk)
3. WorldForests, 3 Inchmore, Struy, Beaulieu, Inverness IV4 7JX, UK. [Hag@worldforests.org](mailto:Hag@worldforests.org)
4. CIRAD, BP 5035, 34032 Montpellier Cedex, France. [Bousquet@cirad.fr](mailto:Bousquet@cirad.fr)

### **Abstract**

People usually know *how they want their situation to change* to secure a better future – but they do not always know *how to change their situation*. Initiatives intended to secure a better future do not always work as intended, and may have unintended side effects. Computer models can help advocates explore consequences of proposed initiatives, so they can make informed selections of alternatives, secure in the knowledge that consequences have been thoroughly investigated. By encouraging people to explore scenarios, models empower people to be more innovative and less dependent on technocrats. New software solves technical limitations, but the real issue is not software, but rather the provision of a supportive framework within which people can express and experiment with ideas. FLORES, the Forest Land Oriented Resource Envisioning System, provides such a framework to stimulate interdisciplinary collaboration between researchers, practitioners and clients. A recent prototype demonstrated the feasibility of FLORES. However, FLORES is not about software; it is about providing the means to explore the consequences of alternative scenarios. Ultimately, FLORES is not a physical package, but a user group and the interactions they have amongst themselves, and with the people involved in policy-making. Fostering this emerging network through workshops and technical support will enhance FLORES by offering a better understanding of the concept, and by allowing more people, especially those from developing countries, to influence the development of FLORES and the issues that can be explored within it.

Key words: Decision support system, adaptive modelling, land use alternatives, policy analysis

### **Introduction**

Policies and incentives to promote sustainable forestry and better land use do not always achieve the desired effect. Proponents rarely foresee all the consequences, and that those best able to offer alternative views may be unable to contribute to the decision-making process. This leads to inefficient, and sometimes counter-effective initiatives. How can we better equip policy makers and their advisors to envisage fully the efficacy and consequences of initiatives? One way is to provide a simulator that helps people to visualize possible outcomes of proposed initiatives. FLORES is an attempt to build such a simulator. Work on FLORES is still in progress, so a traditional methods-results format is inappropriate, and we offer a narrative highlighting trials, tribulations and insights gained.

### **What is FLORES, and where did the idea come from?**

FLORES, the Forest Land Oriented Resource Envisioning System, aims to improve our understanding of land use patterns in time and space, especially in forested landscapes, and to facilitate rigorous analyses of policy options intended to manipulate these patterns.

The idea for FLORES arose from several initiatives, among which were the desires to create a platform that would allow researchers to integrate their research, to make it possible for them to work together to reveal the bigger picture, and to provide the ability to test propositions rigorously within a realistic framework. These

remain important influences in the development of FLORES. Accordingly, FLORES is spatially explicit, and operates at the landscape scale, spanning both forest and agricultural lands. Agricultural lands and villages form a critical component of the landscape, and must be modelled to fully understand the processes at work in and near the forest.

The basic concepts of this work are not new; what is new is the way concepts are integrated and applied. FLORES seems most closely related to work by Bousquet *et al.* (1993, 1994), who constructed a multi-agent simulation (MAS) model of an inland fishery in the Central Niger Delta as basis for focusing discussion, evaluating options and formulating recommendations. There is an interesting contrast between FLORES and MAS: both are concerned with *agents* that can modify and respond to their environment, but the emphasis differs. Generally, MAS attempts to find the simplest set of rules that can reproduce a particular pattern from a defined scenario. In essence, the usual question for MAS is: What are the rules that might explain this pattern that we have observed? FLORES considers the converse: Given what we know about human behaviour, can we predict future outcomes for a range of scenarios? Generally we do not know what future outcomes should look like, except in a few specific cases that may be used to test the model. FLORES also recognises that people may have complex reasons for their behaviour, and attempts to represent our present understanding of those reasons, rather than seeking the simplest rules that may reproduce a given pattern.

## Why do we need FLORES?

We offer some analogies to illustrate why FLORES is important. Anyone who has played Fish Banks<sup>1</sup>, the Beer Game<sup>2</sup> or a similar management game should appreciate the need for up-to-date information. With Fish Banks, a game about sustainable resource utilization, players often destroy a fishery because they rely on information from a previous game cycle. It is only when players learn to predict current and future fish stocks that they can achieve a sustainable outcome. Using old information for resource management is like driving a car without forward vision, and relying on rear-view mirrors for information. Up-to-date information (cf. looking out of the side mirrors to see the side of the road) helps, but we can only drive safely when we can see forwards (cf. predicting future outcomes).

We can also draw a useful contrast with air travel. What makes air transport so safe and pilot error so rare? Good design, careful planning, diligent maintenance and competent supervision are factors, but pilot training is crucial. Before crew members take the controls of a commercial airliner, they will have studied the theory of flight, trained in light aircraft, spent hours in a flight simulator, and flown with more experienced colleagues. They know how to read the indicators, what every button and every lever does, and when and how these controls should be used. They know instinctively how to respond when something goes wrong, and what to do if the plane deviates from its planned course. And they rarely need to use their training, because our knowledge of flight has been synthesised into an autopilot that takes care of most situations.

Now contrast this with our management of forests:

- Do we know what to do when things go wrong?
- Can we tell when things are beginning to go wrong?
- Do we know which controls we can use to change things?
- Do we know what the controls are, where to find them, and how to activate them?
- Can we recognise and interpret the indicators?
- Why don't we have an "autopilot" to give advice?

Why is it that so many amongst those who make important decisions about the world's forests have never raised a tree, tended a garden, gathered food from the forest, or used a simulator to explore the implications of an impending decision? Would a forest landscape simulator make a difference?

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.unh.edu/ipssr/Lab/FishBank.html>

<sup>2</sup> <http://learning.mit.edu/pratool/beer.html>

The computer game SimCity<sup>3</sup> provides an interesting analogy for user interface that we would like to develop for FLORES. The Maxis Corporation provides a simulator in the form of a game. The game offers the player an “aerial view” of a city, a menu of policies and incentives (e.g., expenditure on education, transport, sanitation, etc.), and indicators of performance (e.g., unemployment, GNP, pollution, etc.). Scenarios are available freely on the Internet<sup>4</sup>, and range from real cities to fantasies.

In FLORES, we replace the cityscape with a landscape of forest and non-forest land. Its menu includes a range of options to manipulate the forest and land use patterns, and performance indicators could include biodiversity and rural poverty. It must have a strong factual basis, and must be able to be customised to suit different situations. It will

- synthesise existing knowledge and identify gaps and other deficiencies;
- express present knowledge concisely, completely, explicitly and unambiguously as a model;
- create a framework to promote collaborative interdisciplinary research;
- provide a basis for strong empirical tests of hypotheses relating to land use policy;
- create a planning tool to allow planners and policy makers to explore future scenarios; and
- provide an educational game to improve general knowledge of tropical forest environments.

## What has been achieved?

The FLORES concept was developed during 1995 (Vanclay 1995), but it was not until 1997 that work began in earnest and a prototype<sup>5</sup> was produced (Muetzelfeldt *et al.*, 1997). Significant progress<sup>6</sup> was made during 1999, and at the time of writing, the FLORES team are about to embark on another workshop to test the applicability and ability to adapt the Rantau Pandan version to a Zimbabwe situation. Progress to date is the outcome of collaboration between the Institute of Ecology and Resource Management at the University of Edinburgh and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), and a group of fifty people<sup>7</sup> who contributed to a model design workshop held in Sumatra in 1999 with support from the UK Department for International Development.

The present version of FLORES is still rather simplistic, but provides the basis for on-going work over a long period. This platform is not, and must not be, a “black box”, opaque to participants. It is not enough that it should be transparent; it should be enlightening, and should empower participants to make better analyses and draw more revealing insights than they could working in isolation. We have tried to provide this, and hope that it will be used as a basis for testing a wide range of propositions, and will be modified as necessary to make these tests and incorporate findings into the model. We must begin with simple models, and should progressively enrich these as we refute inappropriate simplifications. Models excel at exposing counter-intuitive consequences of simple assumptions. Even if initial prototypes of the model are of little practical relevance, they may offer valuable insights, and their main purpose may be to focus questions rather than to provide answers. The challenge is to construct a framework that is broad enough to accommodate a wide variety of propositions, and sufficiently accessible that researchers from a range of disciplines are stimulated to collaborate and test their propositions in this integrated way.

## How does it work, and will it give the right answers?

FLORES relies on four basic assumptions, namely that:

1. Land use patterns are created by *actors*, individuals or groups of individuals who collaborate as families, clans, associations and corporations.

---

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.maxis.com>

<sup>4</sup> For example, <http://www.simcity.com/exchange/exchange.html> and <http://www.sc3000.com/cities>

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.ed.ac.uk/~ebfr28/flores/version1/index.htm>

<sup>6</sup> See <http://helios.bto.ed.ac.uk/ierm/flores/RantauPandan/index.html>

<sup>7</sup> See [http://www.cgiar.org/cifor/research/flores/flores\\_participants.html](http://www.cgiar.org/cifor/research/flores/flores_participants.html)

2. These actors make *rational* decisions based on available information, obligations and expectations, social as well as economic. Note that an actor's *perception* is what influences decision-making.
3. When choosing an *activity*, actors explore all options available to them, within the constraints imposed by resources (land, time, capital, etc.), knowledge, and their comfort zone (cultural attachments, willingness to attempt novel activities, etc.).
4. Actors tend to undertake activities that maximise expected benefits or minimise anticipated risks to themselves and their beneficiaries (families, clans, shareholders, etc.). It may be possible to model both benefit-seeking and risk-avoiding behaviour by considering risk-adjusted benefits.

The constraints implied by an actor's comfort zone and previous experience mean that many actors consider a rather small number of activities, often only those done in the past, plus a few new activities pursued profitably by neighbours. However, there are usually a few innovators who consider an extended list of activities and may attempt a diverse range of enterprises. Typically, innovators are more willing to attempt risky enterprises than are their more conservative fellows. Disposition is only one determinant of willingness to accept risk, and age, assets and income also feature prominently in many explanations.

Decision-making by actors is just one component of FLORES, and several other sub-models are needed to predict the growth of trees and crops, changes in the soil and water balance, interactions between key plant and animal species, and other ecosystem processes. Fortunately, many such models already exist (e.g., Vanclay 1994, Anon 1997), and some are amenable to calibration and integration within the FLORES framework.

We have implemented FLORES in AME to minimize the amount of computer code, in the hope that we can engage potential participants who are not conversant with computer languages. AME<sup>8</sup>, the Agroforestry Modelling Environment (Muetzeldelft and Taylor 1997), has a graphical interface that makes the model accessible to researchers who are not fluent in computer programming, while allowing access to the underlying code. Thus it offers a powerful and flexible platform that does not exclude less computer-literate participants in the project. There are other advantages in using AME, some of which include the ability to

- represent relationships as simple sketches, mathematical equations, or as sets of rules, to
- substitute alternative models easily via the Windows click-and-drag facility, and to
- create customised user interfaces with software "helpers" that can be developed independently and "plugged in" later.

## **So what does it mean for resource managers and planners?**

Too many models languish, under-utilised, because they do not satisfy the needs of potential users and because system developers did not explicitly contact clients, ascertain their needs, and stimulate their interest. To encourage uptake, potential users must be involved in the development of the model. Obviously, users may not be interested in all aspects of model design and construction, but they should have the opportunity to participate in specification and design of the user interface. It is not enough to ask them what they want and how they want it. Team members have to engender enthusiasm and involvement through mutual understanding and collaboration. This means that the model has to be explained in an accessible way, and that simple prototypes and mock-ups need to be built so that ideas can be demonstrated, tested and modified.

FLORES will provide a range of outputs to suit different user requirements. One output will be the forested landscape of a SimForest implementation. One great contribution that information science could make for conservation and wise use of forests would be to provide a virtual reality interface for forest management planning (Vanclay 1993). This could allow a minister and his advisors to put on a virtual reality headset and take a "magic carpet" ride over a forest estate. They could observe the spatial pattern of their forest and watch how it changes over time, and under different scenarios. They could "zoom in" to examine particular issues, and stand back to get an overall perspective. The technology to do this exists, and it is possible to link forest inventory

---

<sup>8</sup> See <http://www.simile.co.uk>

systems, growth models, geographic information systems and virtual reality systems in this way. However, it has not been done at this time, and awaits further software and hardware development to make it more affordable. In developing FLORES, we have been mindful that the eventual user interface may well be a virtual reality system, and we should deliberately design an open and flexible system that does not foreclose this possibility. However, the SimCity-style interface is adequate for many applications, and would be particularly useful for educational applications and general information dissemination.

## **What's next? When will it be useful to others?**

There are several specific problems that need to be addressed before this model can be realised as anything more than a simple prototype. Many of these challenges can be addressed as separate tasks, and are amenable to research by others, including students. Some of the more obvious issues are listed below.

In the proposed model formulation, the underlying functional relationships may be relatively simple, but the data requirements are rather demanding. Most utility functions appear innocent enough, but they require a lot of data: anticipated yields and prices of all possible crops under a range of situations, detailed tenure and demographic data, and a good understanding of the socio-economic culture of the community. This is a major undertaking, and may be one limitation of the model. We envisage that initial prototypes will be restricted to a limited geographic area, allowing a complete census of all inhabitants for thorough model testing. However, subsequent operational implementations may sample only selected actors to reduce the burden of data acquisition. Crop yields may be inferred from models, but prices and elasticities must be gleaned from field survey work. This task may be particularly onerous for non-timber forest products such as medicinal plants.

Superficially, the model appears tractable, but it involves many challenges. Is it really possible to quantify the social profile of all actors in a community in sufficient detail to provide meaningful predictions from a simple utility function? There is no clear answer, and only an empirical test can elucidate if numerical approximations of complex social structures provide an adequate basis for planning. Two further issues for methodological research are evident at this stage: whether to model individual actors or classes of actors, and how to quantify risk and willingness of actors to accept risk. Both are central to the FLORES approach, and in both cases, the issue is whether the preliminary approach is a necessary and sufficient representation of reality. There are some advantages in modelling individual actors: it is conceptually elegant and facilitates empirical testing, but it imposes a substantial computational load. Simulation based on a few classes of actors (e.g., classified by age and gender) would speed up simulations, and may ease data input requirements, but it is not clear if this would lead to the same result as individual-based modelling. The issue may be best resolved through empirical trials and sensitivity tests.

It is presently assumed that an actor's willingness to accept risk can be quantified, in part through the historic variation in benefits accruing from a particular activity, and from the actor's age, tangible assets and income. However, this assumption warrants closer scrutiny since attitudes to risk have a major influence on land use decisions. Our ability to quantify risks and attitudes to risk will have a major influence on the accuracy of FLORES predictions.

Satisfactory ways to value the intangibles involved with land use decisions pose a major challenge. One particular aspect that needs to be addressed is how to value prestige. Prestige may take many forms, and may explain land purchases at prices inconsistent with production (e.g., prestige of owning a bigger estate), herd sizes (e.g., prestige of large flocks leads to overstocking, even though smaller flocks may offer equivalent returns and lower risks), and possession or production of certain items.

A further challenge for later versions will be to model selected species interactions in both plant and animal species, especially for apparently pivotal or keystone species. It is not sufficient to model the food web, because energy flows are only one of the aspects. It is also important to consider relationships such as mycorrhizal and other symbiotic relationships, pollination and transport of seeds, microclimate and other modifications of the environment that may facilitate the establishment of plant and animal species. It is probably impossible to model

all of these relationships in a tropical forest, but it is important to recognise and include the pivotal relationships in our model.

A FLORES-type model is easy to conceive for a small village, where we can simulate every individual actor. However, when we scale up our efforts to model larger landscapes, it may become impractical to examine decision-making by all actors, and it may be necessary to extrapolate from a sample of actors. The choice of sample may be critical to the outcome, and suitable sampling strategies must be investigated before the approach can be scaled-up to the provincial or national level. A crucial part of this investigation will be to identify the minimum essential set of prime determinants.

FLORES seeks to provide a framework for testing and refining ideas. This means that the basic framework of FLORES must be carefully tested, and that baseline data should be acquired for detailed empirical testing. Two components of these tests warrant special attention and preparation: sensitivity tests and benchmark tests (Vanclay and Skovsgaard 1997). Ideally, a thorough program of sensitivity testing should examine each input, every parameter, and all assumptions to see how much influence they have on predicted outputs. This is useful information that can be used to direct further development of a model, with a lower priority assigned to parameters and assumptions that have little influence on predicted outputs.

Thorough benchmark testing is another big job that requires planning and preparation. It requires comprehensive data about a series of sites for at least two points in time, preferably over a reasonable interval. Ideally, the situation at some sites should remain more-or-less unchanged, while substantial changes should be evident at other sites. There are always difficult issues to be addressed if these sites involve only passive monitoring, and empirical tests are strengthened if experimental data are available. In agricultural situations, it is customary to use paired and replicated experiments to compare treatments against control plots. Such data are more difficult to obtain at the landscape scale and when people are involved, so greater ingenuity is required. Survey data pose special problems, since many factors may vary and it can be difficult to make reliable inferences. In theory, it is possible to conduct experiments to gather rigorous data to test FLORES, but there are ethical questions that would need to be considered carefully. For example, it is feasible to go to a village and buy locally produced goods at prices higher than the prevailing market rate, and watch how the community responds. Fortunately, this experiment is not necessary, because in many developing countries, governments conduct such “experiments” all the time. For instance, new bridges and roads can markedly change transport costs. Thus the data required for model testing may be obtained by strategically choosing and monitoring selected communities over an extended period.

Perhaps the best test of a model is how well can the modeller answer the questions ‘What do you know now that you did not know before?’ and ‘How can you find out if it is true?’. FLORES has many limitations, but it provides a fertile test-bed for ideas, and offers ample scope for furthering our knowledge of policies, incentives and land use patterns in forested landscapes. We need the product, and we need the process. We need to bring together scientists from diverse disciplines to work towards a common goal. We also need to add more rigour to forest policy research. FLORES can help realise it.

## **Where can I get it and how can I use it?**

FLORES, its documentation, and the AME software are available freely via the internet from <http://helios.bto.ed.ac.uk/ierm/flores/>. You will need a PC running Linux or Windows 95, 98 or NT.

## **How can I help to make it better?**

FLORES is a continuing research project, the product of close collaboration by many individuals, and we invite others to participate. For more information on the current status of FLORES or on how to become involved, contact one of the authors.

## Acknowledgements

FLORES is the result of collaboration between many (50+) individuals and several institutions. Special thanks are due to John Palmer and the UK Department for International Development for their support. This publication is an output from a research project funded by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom. However, the Department for International Development can accept no responsibility for any information provided or views expressed [R7315 FLORES Model Design Workshop].

## References

- Anonymous, 1997. *Crop Yield Forecasting Methods*. Proceedings of the seminar, Villefranche-sur-Mer, 24-27 Oct 1994. Eurostat, JRC-ISPRA, DG VI and FAO. ECSC-EC-EAEC, Luxembourg.
- Bousquet, F., C. Cambier, C. Mullon, P. Morand, J. Quensiere and A. Pavé, 1993. Simulating the interaction between a society and a renewable resource. *Journal of Biological Systems* 1:199-214.
- Bousquet, F., C. Cambier and P. Morand, 1994. Distributed artificial intelligence and object-oriented modelling of a fishery. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 20:97-107.
- Muetzelfeldt, R.I. and J. Taylor, 1997. The suitability of AME for agroforestry modeling. *Agroforestry Forum* 8(2): 7-9.
- Muetzelfeldt, R.I., J. Taylor and M. Haggith, 1997. Development of pFLORES, a Prototype FLORES Model: Progress Report, December 1997. Institute of Ecology and Resource Management, University of Edinburgh. <http://www.ed.ac.uk/~ebfr28/flores/rep9712/rep9712.htm>
- Vanclay, J.K., 1993. Inventory and yield prediction for natural forest management. In: R.N. Thwaites and B.J. Schaumberg (eds) *Australasian Forestry and the Global Environment*. Institute of Foresters of Australia, Brisbane, pp. 163-169.
- Vanclay, J.K., 1994. *Modelling Forest Growth and Yield: Applications to Mixed Tropical Forests*. CAB International, Wallingford, U.K. xvii+312 p.
- Vanclay, J.K., 1995. Modelling to explore land use patterns at the forest edge: objectives and model design. In: P. Binning, H. Bridgman and B. Williams (eds) Proceedings, International Congress on Modelling and Simulation (MODSIM'95), 27-30 November, University of Newcastle, NSW, pp. 1:113-116.
- Vanclay, J.K. and J.P. Skovsgaard, 1997. Evaluating forest growth models. *Ecological Modeling* 98: 1-12.