

Editors: Claudia Pahl-Wostl, Sonja Schmidt,  
Andrea E. Rizzoli, Anthony J. Jakeman

University of Osnabrück, Germany



*Complexity and Integrated*

*Resources Management*

*Transactions*

*of the 2nd Biennial*

*Meeting of the International*

*Environmental Modelling*

*and Software Society*

**Vol. 2**

14-17 June 2004



# Complexity and Integrated Resources Management

*Transactions  
of the 2nd Biennial Meeting of the  
International Environmental Modelling  
and Software Society*



INTERNATIONAL  
**Environmental  
Modelling  
and Software**  
SOCIETY

***Editors***

Claudia Pahl-Wostl  
Sonja Schmidt  
Andrea E. Rizzoli  
Anthony J. Jakeman

**IEMSS 2004 – 14-17 June 2004,  
University of Osnabrück, Germany**

**Complexity and Integrated Resources Management - Transactions of the 2nd Biennial Meeting of the International Environmental Modelling and Software Society**

**Volume Editors**

**Claudia Pahl-Wostl**  
**Sonja Schmidt**  
*Institut für Umweltsystemforschung*  
*Universität Osnabrück*  
*Artilleriestr. 34*  
*D 49076 Osnabrück, Germany*

**Andrea E. Rizzoli**  
*IDSIA Istituto Dalle Molle di studi sull'intelligenza artificiale*  
*Galleria 2*  
*CH 6928 Manno, Switzerland*

**Anthony J. Jakeman**  
*The Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies (Bldg 43)*  
*The Australian National University*  
*ACT 0200, Canberra, Australia*

*Each paper in this volume was refereed by an Editor, a member of the Editorial Board and two anonymous referees.*

*The copyright of all papers is an exclusive right of the authors. No work can be reproduced without written permission of the authors.*

*Responsibility for the contents of these papers rests upon the authors and not on the International Environmental Modelling and Software Society.*

ISBN 88-900787-1-5

**iEMSs 2004**

*Published by the International Environmental Modelling and Software Society (iEMSs)*  
*President: Anthony J. Jakeman.*  
*Address: iEMSs, c/- IDSIA, Galleria 2, 6928 Manno, Switzerland*  
*Email: [secretary@iemss.org](mailto:secretary@iemss.org)*  
*Website: <http://www.iemss.org>*

**IEMSSs 2004 – 14-17 June 2004,  
University of Osnabrück, Germany**



**Complexity and Integrated Resources  
Management Transactions of the 2nd Biennial  
Meeting of the International Environmental  
Modelling and Software Society**

**Claudia Pahl-Wostl, Sonja Schmidt, Andrea  
E. Rizzoli, Anthony J. Jakeman** (*Editors*)

*Co-editors*

David Batten	Keith Jeffery	Dale S. Rothman
Michel Blind	Kostas Karatzas	Miquel Sànchez-Marrè
Felix Chan	Markus Knoflacher	Dragan Savic
Barry Croke	Peter Krause	Huub Scholten
Wolfgang-Albert Flügel	Christine Lim	Boris Schröder
Carlo Giupponi	Ian Littlewood	Jan Sendzimir
Romy Greiner	Michael Matthies	Ralf Seppelt
Carlo Gualtieri	Michael McAleer	Achim Sydow
Nigel Hall	Dragutin T. Mihailovic	Hilde Passier
Matt Hare	Les Oxley	David Post
Reinout Heijungs	Jens C. Refsgaard	Peter Vanrolleghem
Stefanie Hellweg	Otto Richter	
Suhejla Hoti	Michela Robba	

*Organizers*

The conference has been organized by iEMSS  
(the International Environmental Modelling and Software Society) in cooperation with:

**Harmoni-CA** (Concerted Action on Harmonizing Modelling Tools for River Basin Management)

**TIAS** (Integrated Assessment Society)

**IAHS** (International Association of Hydrological Sciences)

**BESAI** (Binding Environmental Sciences and Artificial Intelligence)

**MODSS** International Conference on Multi-objective Decision Support Systems for Land,  
Water and Environmental Management

**ISESS** International Symposium on Environmental Software Systems

**ERCIM** the European Research Consortium for Informatics and Mathematics

*Local Organizers*

The local organization of the conference has been managed by:

**DBU** (German Environmental Foundation)

**USF** (Institute of Environmental Systems Research, University of Osnabrück)

## ***Editorial***

Dear Reader,

The 2nd Biennial Meeting of the International Environmental Modelling and Software Society (iEMSS 2004) was dedicated to the theme: "Complexity and Integrated Resources Management", a very topical theme given the increasing complexity of contemporary resource management problems and the increasing uncertainties from global change. The meeting assembled nearly 300 researchers from all over the globe and from a wide range of disciplines. Presentations discussed latest developments in modelling methodologies and software tools applied to different areas of resources management. Contributions provided evidence of the important role of models to improve our understanding of the complexity of socio-ecological systems and to develop appropriate management strategies. Increasing attention was paid to the role of stakeholders in model development and application and to a new role for models in processes of social learning in participatory resources management.

The conference took place in the facilities of the German Environmental Foundation in Osnabrück. The ambience of these low-energy buildings, designed to minimise their impact on the environment, was well suited to the conference theme and their open and flexible structure facilitated intense discussions and exchange not only during but also between sessions.

I hope that readers will share the excitement of conference participants when browsing through the conference proceedings and reading some of the papers in more detail. Interested readers are advised to consult the journals *Environmental Modelling and Software* and *Ecological Modelling and Advances in Geosciences* where special issues emanating from this conference will be published. We also look forward to the third biennial meeting, iEMSs 2006, which will be held in Burlington, Vermont, USA (see <http://www.iemss.org/iemss2006>).

*Claudia Pahl-Wostl*

October 2004

**The International Environmental Modelling and Software Society acknowledges gratefully the assistance of the following people in realizing the iEMSs 2004 conference:**

- Claudia Pahl-Wostl for convening the conference
- Sonja Schmidt for organising the conference
- Andrea Rizzoli for the web-based conference management tool, creating and updating the conference website and for expert and technical advice
- all session organizers and reviewers
- Antje Braeuer and Georg Johann for supporting the organisation whenever and wherever necessary
- all members of the Institute of Environmental Systems Research and the department of resource flow management for supporting iEMSs 2004, especially Ilke Borowski, Frank Hilker, Maja Schlüter and Dominik Reusser
- all members of ZUK "Zentrum für Umweltkommunikation" of the German Environmental Foundation

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## ***iEMSs 2004 sessions (part two)***

---

### **Environmental Informatics Towards Citizen-centred Electronic Information Services: the Urban Environment Example**

- Using FLOSS towards Building Environmental Information  
*K. Karatzas, A. Masouras* .....p. 525
- Applying agent technology in Environmental Management Systems under real-time constraints  
*I.N. Athanasiadis, P.A. Mitkas* .....p. 531
- Supporting the Strategic Objectives of Participative Water Resources Management;  
an Evaluation of the Performance of Four ICT Tools  
*A. Swinford, B. McIntosh, P. Jeffrey* .....p. 537
- Web Services for Environmental Informatics  
*E. Arauco, L. Sommaruga* .....p. 543

---

### **Environmental Decision Support Systems**

- Concepts of Decision Support for River Rehabilitation P. Reichert, M. Borsuk, M. Hostmann,  
S. Schweizer, C. Spörri, K. Tockner, B. Truffer .....p. 550
- Decision Making under Uncertainty in a Decision Support System for the Red River Inge  
*A.T. de Kort, M.J. Booij* .....p. 556
- Development of a GIS-based Decision Support Tool for Integrated Water Resources Management in  
Southern Africa  
*M. Märker, K. Bongartz, W.A. Flügel* .....p. 562
- Possible Courses: Multi-Objective Modelling and Decision Support Using a Bayesian Network  
Approximation to a Nonpoint Source Pollution Model  
*D. Swayne, J. Shi* .....p. 568

A Spatial DSS for South Australia's Prawn Fisheries. Using Historic Knowledge Towards Environmental and Economical Sustainability <i>B. Ostendorf, N. Carrick</i> .....	p. 574
Optimum Sustainable Water Management in an Urbanizing River Basin in Japan, Based on Integrated Modelling Techniques <i>E. Kudo, M. Ostrowski</i> .....	p. 580
Application of a GIS-based Simulation Tool to Analyze and Communicate Uncertainties in Future Water Availability in the Amudarya River Delta <i>M. Schlüter, N. Rüger</i> .....	p. 586
Integration of MONERIS and GREAT-ER in the Decision Support System for the German Elbe River Basin <i>J. Berlekamp, N. Graf, O. Hess, S. Lautenbach, S. Reimer, M. Matthies</i> .....	p. 593
An integrated tool for water policy in agriculture <i>G.M. Bazzana</i> .....	p. 599
Towards a Decision Support System for Real Time Risk Assessment of Hazardous Material Transport on Road <i>D. Giglio, R. Minciardi, D. Pizzorni, R. Rudari, R. Sacile, A. Tomasoni, E. Trasforini</i> .....	p. 605
Appropriate Modelling in DSSs for River Basin Management <i>Y. Xu, M.J. Booij</i> .....	p. 611
Water Management, Public Participation and Decision Support Systems: the MULINO Approach <i>J. Feás, C. Giupponi, P. Rosato</i> .....	p. 617
A Dual-scale Modelling approach to Integrated Resource Management in East and South-east Asia: Challenges and Potential solutions <i>R. Rötter, M. van den Berg, H. Hengsdijk, J. Wolf, M. van Ittersum, H. van Keulen, E.O. Agustin, T.T. Son, N.X. Lai, W. Guanghuo, A.G. Laborte</i> .....	p. 623
The role of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis in a DEcision Support sYstem for REhabilitation of contaminated sites (the DESYRE software) <i>C. Carlon, S. Giove, P. Agostini, A. Critto, A. Marcomini</i> .....	p. 629
ICT Requirements for an 'evolutionary' development of WFD compliant River Basin Management Plans <i>M. Blind</i> .....	p. 635
DAWN:A platform for evaluating water-pricing policies using a software agent society <i>I.N. Athanasiadis, P. Vartalas, P.A. Mitkasa</i> .....	p. 643
Empirical Evaluation of Decision Support Systems: Concepts and an Example for Trumpeter Swan Management <i>R.S. Sojda</i> .....	p. 649
An integrated modelling approach to conduct multi-factorial analyses on the impacts of climate change on whole-farm systems <i>M. Rivington, G. Bellocchi, K.B. Matthews, K. Buchan, M. Donatelli</i> .....	p. 656

Some Methodological Concepts to Analyse the Role of IC-tools in Social Learning Processes <i>P. Maurel, F. Cernesson, N. Ferrand, M. Craps, P. Valkering</i> .....	p. 662
Tools to Think With? Towards Understanding the Use and Impact of Model-Based Support Tools <i>B.S. McIntosh, R.A.F. Seaton, P. Jeffrey</i> .....	p. 668
Uncertainty in the Water Framework Directive: Implications for Economic Analysis <i>J. Mysiak, K. Sigel</i> .....	p. 674
<i>An Interactive Spatial Optimisation Tool for Systematic Landscape Restoration</i> <i>B.A. Bryana, L.M. Perryb, D. Gerner, B. Ostendorf, N.D. Crossman</i> .....	p. 680
Assessing the Feasibility of Using Radar Satellite Data to Detect Flood Extent and Floodplain Structures <i>Edith Stabel</i> .....	p. 686
Optimal Groundwater Exploitation and Pollution Control <i>A. Bagnera, M. Massabò, R. Minciardi, L. Molini, M. Robba, R. Sacile</i> .....	p. 693
Towards an Environmental DSS based on Spatio-Temporal Markov Chain Approximation <i>G. Balent, M. Deconchat, S. Ladet, R. Martin-Clouaire, R. Sabbadin</i> .....	p. 699

---

### Regional Dynamic Modelling

Land Use and Hydrological Management: ICHAM, an Integrated Model at a Regional Scale in Northeastern Thailand <i>N. Hall, R. Lertsirivorakul, R. Greiner, S. Yongvanit, A. Yuvaniyama, R. Lastf, W. Milne-Homef</i> .....	p. 705
Forecasting Municipal Solid Waste Generation in Major European Cities <i>P. Beigl, G. Wassermann, F. Schneider, S. Salhofer</i> .....	p. 711
Real Time Optimal Resource Allocation in Natural Hazard Management <i>P. Fiorucci, F. Gaetani, R. Minciardi, R. Sacile, E. Trasforini</i> .....	p. 717
Combining Dynamic Economic Analysis and Environmental Impact Modelling: Addressing Uncertainty and Complexity of Agricultural Development <i>H. Lehtonen, I. Bärlund, S. Tattari, M. Hilden</i> .....	p. 723
Simulation of Water and Carbon Fluxes in Agro- and forest Ecosystems at the Regional Scale <i>J. Post, V. Krysanova, F. Suckow</i> .....	p. 730
An Integrated Geomorphological and Hydrogeological MMS Modelling Framework for a Semi-Arid Mountain Basin in the High Atlas, Southern Morocco <i>C. de Jong, R. Machauer, B. Reichert, S. Cappy, R. Viger, G. Leavesley</i> .....	p. 736
Anticipated Effects of Re-Allocation of Intensive Livestock in Sandy Areas in the Netherlands <i>A. van Wezel, J.D. van Dam, P. Cleij</i> .....	p. 742
An Integrated System for the Forest Fires Dynamic Hazard Assessment Over a Wide Area <i>P. Fiorucci, F. Gaetani, R. Minciardi</i> .....	p. 748

---

## Scenario Development and Integrated Scenario Modelling

- Linking Narrative Storylines and Quantitative Models to Combat Desertification in the Guadalentín, Spain  
*K. Kok, H. Van Delden* .....p. 754
- Integrated Assessment of Water Stress in Ceara, Brazil, under Climate Change Forcing  
*M.S. Krol, P. van Oel* .....p. 760
- From Narrative to Number: A Role for Quantitative Models in Scenario Analysis  
*E. Kemp-Benedict* .....p. 765
- Scenario Reoptimization under Data Uncertainty  
*P. Zuddas, G.M. Sechi, A. Manca* .....p. 771
- Reliable and Valid Identification of a Small Number of Global Emission Scenarios  
*O. Tietje* .....p. 777
- Simulating Global Feedbacks Between Sea Level Rise, Water for Agriculture and the Complex Socio-Economic Development of the IPCC Scenarios  
*S. Werners, R. Boumans, L. Bouwer* .....p. 783

---

## Biocomplexity and Adaptive Ecosystem Management

- Principles of Human-Environment Systems (HES) Research  
*R. Scholz, C. Binder* .....p. 791
- Addressing Sustainability, HIV-AIDS, and Water Resource Questions in Botswana  
*M. Hellmuth, J. Sendzimir, D. Yates, K. Strzepek, W. Sanderson* .....p. 797
- Modelling Biocomplexity in the Tisza River Basin within a Participatory Adaptive Framework  
*J. Sendzimir, P. Balogh, A. Vári* .....p. 803
- Linking Hydrologic Modeling and Ecologic Modeling: An Application of Adaptive Ecosystem Management in the Everglades Mangrove Zone of Florida Bay  
*J.C. Cline, J. Lorenz, E. Swain* .....p. 810
- On the Local Coexistence of Species in Plant Communities  
*J. Yoshimura, K. Tainaka, T. Suzuki, M. Shiyomi* .....p. 816
- Ecosystems as Evolutionary Complex Systems: A Synthesis of Two System-Theoretic Approaches Based on Boolean Network  
*B. Fath, W. Grant* .....p. 822
- Benthic Macroinvertebrates Modelling Using Artificial Neural Networks (ANN):  
Case Study of a Subtropical Brazilian River  
*D. Pereira, M. de A. Vitola, O.C. Pedrollo, I.C. Junqueira, S.J. de Luca* .....p. 828
- Interspecific Segregation and Phase Transition in a Lattice Ecosystem with Intraspecific Competition  
*K. Tainaka, M. Kushida, Y. Itoh, J. Yoshimura* .....p. 834

A Model of the Biocomplexity of Deforestation in Tropical Forest: Caparo Case Study  
*R. Quintero, R. Barros, J. Dávila, N. Moreno, G. Tonella, M. Ablan* .....p. 840

Developing Tools for Adaptive Integrated Water Resource Management in a Semi-Arid Region:  
Possibilities, Probabilities and Uncertainties  
*D. Eisenhuth, J.B. Abad, A. Bonnet* .....p. 846

---

### **Ecological Modelling**

Stability Analyses of the 50/50 Sex Ratio Using Lattice Simulation  
*Y. Itoh, J. Yoshimura, K. Tainaka* .....p. 852

Reproductive Strategies of Marine Green Algae: the Evolution of Slight Anisogamy and Environmental  
Conditions of Habitat  
*T. Togashi, T. Miyazaki, J. Yoshimura, J.L. Bartelt, P.A. Cox* .....p. 858

Predicting Predation Efficiency of Biocontrol Agents: Linking Behavior of Individuals and Population  
Dynamics  
*B. Tenhumberg* .....p. 864

The Coexistence of Plankton Species with Various Nutrient Conditions: nutrient conditions: A Lattice  
Simulation Model  
*T. Miyazaki, T. Togashi, T. Suzuki, T. Hashimoto, K. Tainaka, J. Yoshimura* .....p. 870

Mathematical Modelling of Harmful Algal Blooms  
*R.R. Sarkar* .....p. 876

---

### **Landscape Patterns: Simulating Changes, Identifying Driving Forces and Calibrating Models**

Implications of Processing Spatial Data from a Forested Catchment for a Hillslope Hydrological Model  
*T. Kokkonen, H. Koivusalo, A. Laurén, S. Penttinen, S. Piirainen, M. Starr, L. Finér* .....p. 783

Generic Process-Based Plant Models for the Analysis of Landscape Change  
*B. Reineking, A. Huth, C. Wissel* .....p. 889

The Role of Local Spatial Heterogeneity in the Maintenance of Parapatric Boundaries: Agent Based  
Models of Competition Between two Parasitic Ticks  
*A. Tyre, B. Tenhumberg, C.M. Bull* .....p. 895

How to Compare Different Conceptual Approaches to Metapopulation Modelling  
*F.M. Hilker, M. Hinsch, H.J. Poethke* .....p. 902

Simulation of Dynamic Tree Species Patterns in the Alpine region of Valais (Switzerland) during the Holocene  
*H. Lischke* .....p. 908

Aphid Population Dynamics in Agricultural Landscapes: An Agent-based Simulation Model  
*H. Parry, A.J. Evans, D. Morgan* .....p. 914

Integrating Wetlands and Riparian Zones in Regional Hydrological Modeling  
*F.F. Hattermann, V. Krysanova, A. Habeck* .....p. 920

Ecoregion Classification Using a Bayesian Approach and Centre-Focused Clusters  
*D. Pullar, S. Low Choy, W. Rochester* .....p. 927

Assessing Management Systems for the Conservation of Open Landscapes Using an Integrated Landscape Model Approach  
*M. Rudner, R. Biedermann, B. Schröder, M. Kleyer* .....p. 933

---

### **Physics and Modelling of Transport and Transformation Processes at Environmental Interfaces**

Forecasting UV Index by NEOPLANTA Model: Methodology and Validation  
*S. Malinovic, D. Mihailovic, D. Kapor, Z. Mijatovic, I. Arsenic* .....p. 939

Mathematical Models for Gene Flow from GM Crops in the Environment  
*O. Richter, K. Foit, R. Seppelt* .....p. 945

Simulation of Herbicide Transport in an Alluvial Plain  
*K. Meiwirth, A. Mermoud* .....p. 951

The Influence of the Averaging Period on Calculation of Air Pollution Using a Puff Model  
*B. Rajkovic, G. Zoran, P. Zlatica, D. Vladimir* .....p. 956

Interaction Between Hydrodynamics and Mass-Transfer at the Sediment-Water Interface  
*C. Gualtieri* .....p. 962

A Spatially-Distributed Conceptual Model for Reactive Transport of Phosphorus from Diffuse Sources: an Object-Oriented Approach  
*B. Koo, S. Dunn, R. Ferrier* .....p. 970

A Probabilistic Modelling Concept for the Quantification of Flood Risks and Associated Uncertainties  
*H. Apel, A. Thieken, B. Merz, G. Blöschl* .....p. 977

Parameters Estimation Using Some Analytical Solutions of the Anisotropic Advection-Dispersion Model  
*F. Catania, M. Massabo, O. Paladino* .....p. 984

Soil Hydraulics Properties Estimation by using Pedotransfer Functions in a Northeastern Semiarid Zone Catchment, Brazil  
*L. Moreira, A. Marozzi Righetto, V. Medeiros* .....p. 990

An Approach for Calculating the Turbulent Transfer Coefficient Inside the Sparse Tall Vegetation  
*D. Mihailovic, M. Budincevic, B. Lalic, D. Kapor* .....p. 996

---

## River Basin Management

- The Utility of GIS Delivered Environmental Models in the Characterisation of Surface Water Bodies under the Water Framework Directive: Low Flows 2000 - a Case Study  
*T. Goodwin, M. Fry, M. Holmes, A. Young* .....p.1002
- A Tool for Evaluating Risk to Surface Water Quality Status  
*N. McIntyre* .....p.1008
- Spatially Distributed Investment Prioritization for Sediment Control over the Murray Darling Basin, Australia  
*H. Lu, C. Moran, I. Prosser, R. DeRose* .....p.1014
- Appropriate Accuracy of Models for Decision-Support Systems: Case Example for the Elbe River Basin  
*J.L. de Kok, K.U. van der Wal, M.J. Booij* .....p.1021
- River Basin Management Plans and Decision Support  
*C. Giupponi, R. Camera, V. Cogan, F. Anita* .....p.1027
- Introducing River Modelling in the Implementation of the DPSIR Scheme in the Water Framework Directive  
*S. Marsili-Libelli, S. Cavalieri, F. Betti* .....p.1033
- Sensitivity analysis of a network-based, catchment scale water quality model  
*L. Newham, F.T. Andrews, J. Norton* .....p.1039
- Dealing with Unidentifiable Sources of Uncertainty within Environmental Models  
*A. van Griensven, T. Meixner* .....p.1045
- Assessing SWAT Model Performance in the Evaluation of Management Actions for the Implementation of the Water Framework Directive in a Finnish Catchment  
*I. Bärlund, T. Kirkkala, O. Malve, J. Kämäri* .....p.1051
- Assessing the Effects of Agricultural Change on Nitrogen Fluxes Using the Integrated Nitrogen Catchment (INCA) Model  
*K. Rankinen, H. Lehtonen, K. Granlund, I. Bärlund* .....p.1057
- Implications of Complexity and Uncertainty for Integrated Modelling and Impact Assessment in River Basins  
*V. Krysanova, F.F. Hattermann, F. Wechsung* .....p.1064
- Coupling Surface and Ground Water Processes For Water Resources Simulation in Irrigated Alluvial Basins  
*C. Gandolfi, A. Facchi, D. Maggi, B. Ortuni* .....p.1069
- Investigating Spatial Pattern Comparison Methods for Distributed Hydrological Model Assessment  
*S. Wealands, R. Grayson, J. Walker* .....p.1075
- Reduced Models of the Retention of Nitrogen in Catchments  
*K. Wahlin, D. Shahsavani, A. Grimvall, A. Wade, D. Butterfield, H.P. Jarvie* .....p.1081
- The Evaluation of Uncertainty Propagation into River Water Quality Predictions to Guide Future Monitoring Campaigns  
*V. Vandenberghe, W. Bauwens, P.A. Vanrolleghem* .....p.1087

# Principles of Human-Environment Systems (HES) Research

Roland W. Scholz and Claudia R. Binder

Natural and Social Science Interface, Institute for Human Environment Systems. Department of Environmental Sciences, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zürich (ETH), Switzerland

**Abstract:** This paper presents the basic principles, applications, and a methodological discussion of the approach of Human-Environment Systems (HES). In general, HES includes all environmental and technological systems that are relevant for or affected by humans. The basic principles of the HES approach are: (1) human and environmental systems are constructed as complementary systems, (2) a hierarchy of human systems with related environmental systems are considered, (3) environmental systems are modeled in their immediate and delayed dynamic reactions to human action, (4) the behavior of the human system is modeled from a decision theoretic perspective differentiating between goal formation, strategy formation, strategy selection and action, (5) a conceptualization of different types of environmental awareness in each of these three steps can be developed, and finally (6) a distinction is made, with corresponding modeling reflecting this distinction, between primary and secondary feedback loops with respect to human action. We illustrate the principles with an example from bio-waste management. It is shown how the human-environment interaction can be analyzed.

**Keywords:** Human-environment systems, regulatory mechanisms, feedback mechanisms, interfering regulatory mechanisms, bio-waste management.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The investigation of complex environmental systems that are affected by human action is considered a major scientific challenge. This challenge has to overcome both the gap between natural and social sciences and to master modeling on different scales. Thus, there is a need for integrating knowledge from natural and social sciences. Human-environment systems (HES) are defined as the interaction of human systems with corresponding environmental or technological systems.

We provide a process and structure model, which is derived from integrative modeling, system theory, basic cybernetic feedback loop modeling, cognitive sciences, and decision research (Ashby, 1957; Simon, 1957; Scholz, 1987). This process and structure model should allow for investigating regulatory, feedback, and control mechanisms (RFC-mechanisms) in HES. Our motivation is to conceptualize environmentally sensitive regulatory, feedback, and control systems of the anthroposphere. Our goal is to understand the evaluation, transformation, and regulation processes of human systems with respect to environmental and resource systems. This is done when considering a multi-hierarchy level of human systems. The HES approach is considered a framework for the understanding of the mechanisms underlying environmentally sensitive action,

for reflecting on interferences among different levels (i.e., the individual and societal level), and for reflecting on different feedback loops or RFC mechanisms that may lead to sustainable action.

### 1.1 Relationships between human and environmental systems in environmental sciences

The HES approach conceptualizes a mutualism between human and environmental systems. The human and the environmental system are conceived as two different systems that exist in essential dependencies and reciprocal endorsement. The term human systems, meaning social systems ranging from society to individuals (Apostle, 1952), has been used since the time of the ancient Greeks. These systems are supposed to have a memory, language, foresight, consciousness etc. In contrast to the concept of human or social systems, the term environmental systems arose late in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century (Simpson & Weiner, 1989 p. 315), even though Hippocrates had already dealt with environmental impacts on human health in early medicine in 420 BC.

In the history of environmental sciences at large, the relationship between human (H) and environmental (E) systems was dealt with from different perspectives. The H→E impact chain was initially examined from the human perspective. In the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, forest engineers investigated

how legal or economic restrictions affect the texture of forests agricultural, forest. Resource economics evolved in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century and focused on the question of how agricultural and forest yields can be sustainably (von Carlowitz, 1732) or most efficiently obtained (Goodwin, 1977). From the environmental research perspective, the  $H \rightarrow E$  impact chain has quite a different focus, namely how human activities affect the environment or environmental equilibrium and how these impacts can be mitigated (Wood, 1995, Freedmann, 1995).

There are different ways for the relationship of what we denote as Human and Environmental Systems to be conceptualized.

The GAIA-approach (Lovelock, 1979) “views the earth as a single organism, in which the individual elements coexist in a symbiotic relationship. Internal homeostatic control mechanisms, involving positive and negative feedbacks, maintain an appropriate level of stability.” (Kemp, 1998, p.160) GAIA is an example of an integrative, qualitative approach for studying HES. In the GAIA approach the equation  $H \cap E = H \cup E$  holds true.

In integrated modeling (Odum, 1997; Holling, 2001) variables from the social system (such as resource availability) and variables from environmental systems (such as economic growth) are considered within one system structure, mutually and functionally related and sometimes even hierarchically related. Integrative modeling starts from coupled systems and provides a quantitative analysis (Bossel, 1998; Carpenter et al., 1999).

The HES approach presented below separates human and environmental systems and studies their mutualism. Note that the concept of environment emerged in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, a time when the upcoming industrial age unmistakably revealed the interaction and mutual dependency between these two systems. Mutual dependency, reciprocity, and the  $H \leftrightarrow E$  impact chains can be approached from the environmental as well as from the human perspective. The former looks at optimizing environmental quality by integrating human models into ecosystem analysis (Naveh & Lieberman, 1994). The latter investigates the impact of regulatory mechanisms on the state of the environment when taking an anthropogenic perspective (Hammond, et al., 1995).

## 2. BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR MODELING HES

### 2.1 Six basic principles

This paper follows an approach, which begins from six basic assumptions from the modeling of HES (Figure 1)

- (1) Conceive human and environmental systems as two different, complementary, interrelated systems with human action and “immediate environmental reaction” being part of both systems.
- (2) Consider a hierarchy of human systems with related environmental systems.
- (3) Construct a ‘state of the art’ model of the environmental system and its long-term dynamics.
- (4) Provide a decision theoretic conceptualization of the human system with the components goal formation, strategy formation, strategy selection and action.
- (5) Characterize and conceptualize different types of environmental awareness in each component of (4).
- (6) Distinguish and model primary and secondary feedback loops with respect to human action.

We will explain these principles and illuminate the specific contribution of the HES approach.

Principle (1) “departs from approaches that try to understand and predict complex dynamics resulting from endogeneous interactions without any exogeneous interference (human intervention)” (quoted from an anonymous review). The Human species is treated as a separate entity (left part of Figure 1) with complementary environmental systems presented at the right side of the figure. This is done because we have different insight and access to natural and social systems and as we acknowledge that knowledge about these systems is organized in disciplines, which emerged from an understanding of natural and social systems. The links between these systems are, in a first view, the immediate physical impacts or perceivable changes caused by human action, i.e., the felled tree, which might cause an accident at work.

For human systems, Principle (2) departs from Miller’s (1978) hierarchical levels and distinguishes between the individual, the group, the organization, and society. Of course systems of a smaller scale such as organ, cell, RNA etc. and systems of a higher level such as supranational systems can also be considered. At each hierarchy level specific human – environment relationships and regulatory mechanisms are encountered. As Forman (1995, p. 505) notes, these specific interactions between human end environmental systems are of importance as “... control or regulation mechanisms that produce stability are usually interpreted in terms of hierarchy, ...” (Forman, 1995, p. 505) Thus it is a specific challenge for researcher, when considering human action, to construct the appropriate complementary environmental systems.

Within each hierarchy level, insights from sub-disciplines can be integrated into the process and structure model  $M$ . This is particular of interest, if sustainable action is the object of research: “One way to generate more robust foundations for sustainable decision making is to search for integrative theories that combine disciplinary strengths while filling disciplinary gaps.” (Gunderson, Holling, & Ludwig, 2002, p. 8).

Perhaps, to scientists, the ‘state of the art’ request in Principle (3) seems to be trivial. The message of this principle, however, is twofold. First it implies that long term predictions, e.g. on species biodiversity, resource availability, changes of resilience etc. are statements on fuzzy and context bound as they include unknown dynamics due to adaptability or general contextual changes. But, second, the ‘state of the art’ attribute also indicates that analysis with the HES approach should refer to the (robust) current body of knowledge but cannot go beyond.

Principle (4) is characteristic for the adopted decision theoretic perspective. We start with intended action or goals and consider human behavior to be functional and purposeful (Brunswik, 1952; Scholz & Tietje, 2002). We distinguish goal formation, strategy formation, and strategy selection. According to a decision theoretic framework, preferences and strategies are the basic components of behavior. In this context we refer to a game theoretic conception of a strategy in extensive games (Osborne & Rubinstein, p. 92). We define a strategy as a complete plan – which the researcher has to construct – that provides a behavioral directive for each situation in the course of goal attainment. The goals establish preference structures that underlie strategy evaluation. The latter, of course also depends on the capability, experiences and constraints of the HES under consideration. The goal systems is conceived a rather stable, situational activated, and based on onto- and phylogenic history (Scholz, 1987). We assume that – at least starting from hierarchy level of the individual upwards – human system can subjectively evaluate the supposed expected utility or gain of a strategy. This stage is called foresight or anticipation.

In Principle (5) we conceptualize environmental awareness. This can be done, for example, on three levels with the level of a) completely ignoring the impacts resulting from action, b) incorporating environmental sensitivity and change, and c) altruistically neglecting oneself and only targeting the benefits for the environment as is partly the case in deep ecology approaches.

The action and the immediate reaction are conceived of as the changes in the HES system resulting from a certain strategy, under given environmental circumstances and constraints. This

is the interface,  $H \cap E$ , between the two systems. The human and the environmental systems are in a physically different state after a human action is performed. A critical issue is what is conceived of as immediate and what is conceived of as a delayed reaction. According to the decision theoretic perspective, an environmental reaction is defined by the episode, period or events that are temporally and at least partly causally related to the consequences of the action. The time period depends on the memory and the environmental model of the human unit. Note that this statement holds both for cell conditioning (Brembs et al., 2002) as well as for governmental environmental protection programs.

Principle (6) differentiates between two types of post-decisional evaluation. One takes place temporally proximally to the environmental reaction and can be conceived of as learning by primary feedback. Another post decisional evaluation is considered to take place temporally and spatially proximally to the environmental reaction. However, human action can result in side effects, i.e. unintended dynamics and dislocated reaction, which alter the environmental system in a favorable or unfavorable manner and which can show rebound effects. Side effects are often delayed (Venix, 1996) or dislocated as, from the human system perspective, they are not directly related to the perceived environmental reaction. These temporal (or spatial) delays (dislocations) in the environmental system are considered to be second order feedback to the human system, as the individual will notice the effects later (or at other places). A critical question is whether, in which way (i.e. by which “algorithms”), and when a delayed or dislocated impact is evaluated. If we follow the principles of bounded rationality, optimizing primary and secondary learning depends (i) on economically sampling of appropriate cues or evidences related to action, (ii) on setting suitable and robust time and spatial boundaries, and (iii) efficiently changing goal formation, strategy selection, and strategy evaluation.

Of particular interest is the fact that human action at one level of the human system, may lead to environmental impacts, which in turn provide feedback to the human system at a level different to the one of action. That is, feedback loops do not necessarily occur within one scale or level of the human system, but across levels. In addition, the human systems might differ in their goals, and strategies, generating interfering actions and environmental feedbacks. For example, fast financial success in a market can trigger slow, but deep changes in structures on another level. “Thus modern economists are frustrated in their attempts to understand the interactions between fast- and slow moving variables that create emergent dynamics.” (Gunderson et al. 2002, p. 8)




Figure 1. A structure - process model of HES.

### 2.3 The concept of regulatory, feedback and control (RFC-) mechanisms

One peculiarity of the HES model is that it challenges environmental research to investigate RFC-mechanisms, in particular, adaptive cycles that describe real and/or sustainable behavior. The critical issue in this is the appropriate balance between change and stability. According to evolutionary approaches homeostasis and stationary, dynamic or evolutionary stable equilibria are of specific interest. From ecosystem sciences and theories of development, however, we have learnt that adaptive cycles pass stages such as release, reorganization, exploitation and conservation (Holling & Gunderson, 2001). In principle, these ideas and other assumptions (e.g., those related to chaos) can be linked to the development by stages (Piaget, 1953).

Let us illustrate the idea of RFC-mechanism in HES by considering the case of formation of a biofuel company. A crucial step of HES research would be to determine the key actors (e.g. the technology pioneer or the head of a credit department of a large bank) and their drivers (i.e. goals). This can be done based on decision psychology (see Scholz et al 2003). The environmental changes can be in a first approach modeled by the physical and financial flows with their environmental impacts. Then, a sophisticated HES model would describe a primary feedback loop illustrating both the impacts would be of certain strategies (i.e. business plans of the pioneer; credit rating and portfolio considerations of the credit officer) and the short-term impacts on the material fluxes and its environmental impacts. The secondary feedback loop would include insight

into environmental quality (from the green side) and market dynamics (including material and money flows) from the bankers' side.

### 3. THE EXAMPLE OF BIOWASTE MANAGEMENT

In the following, we report the application of the model presented above for the case of bio-waste management in Zurich (see Lang et al., 2003). We present an ex-post case analysis. We begin by studying the history of decision-making in the human system until the environmental reaction was obtained. In order to do so we will study the change in the system between the years 1995 and 2002. The regulatory level taken is that of the canton of Zurich, which felt

uneasy with the resource depletion of organic waste by incineration.

#### 3.1 Methods and data

Data were obtained from the environmental agency in Zurich (AWEL), which has been gathering data on the quantity and quality of bio-waste material since 1991.

To model the environmental system (i.e., environmental reaction), we extended the method of Material Flux Analysis (MFA; Baccini and Bader, 1996) to include agents in the system analysis so that the environmental system can be linked to the human system (Binder et al., 2004). To investigate the human system we used literature analysis, oral history and expert interviews.

Utilizing the case study methodology, the impacts and underlying rationale of the development were reconstructed and the key agents in the process of technology implementation and their operations were identified. The methodology for this proceeding is described in Scholz & Tietje, 2003; pp. 84; Laws et al. 2002; Binder et al., 2004).

#### 3.2 System analysis

Figure 2 presents the system analysis for bio-waste management in the canton of Zurich. The system border is the canton of Zurich. The system is composed of 5 processes and 10 flows. There are three main bio-waste delivery processes, i.e., municipal collection, gardeners, and industry. Separately collected bio-waste can be treated in two ways: composting or anaerobic digestion, which are considered as action alternatives that are components of mixed strategies (i.e., an allocation of fractions treated with these two modes of waste processing; for the sake of simplicity, incineration

is not considered see Schleiss and Scholz, 2002). The main agents are directly related to the processes. Additional agents are municipalities, the canton of Zurich and the State (i.e., Switzerland).




Figure 2. System analysis for bio-waste management in the canton of Zürich (Adapted from Lang et al., 2003)

### 3.3 Results

From 1995 to 2002 the total amount of biowaste separately collected and treated (and not being incinerated) increased by 37%, which corresponds to 36'500 tons (Lang et al., 2003). The largest relative increase was found for industries followed by gardeners and municipalities. The latter had already had a high collection and delivery rate in 1995 whereas industries had not separately collected their bio-waste before (Table 1). Nearly all the newly collected bio-waste was treated by anaerobic digestion.

Table 1. Amount of bio-waste delivered by the main agents in 1995 and 2001 in t/year (Source: Lang et al., 2003)<sup>a</sup>

Year	Municipalities	Gardeners	Industry
1995	51'000	27'500	1'400
2001	70'000	40'000	10'500

a: Rounded values

To explain the development in bio-waste management we present three major stages and related impact factors.

First, the anaerobic digestion technology improved from in the mid of the 1990ies so that it became an economic and ecologically feasible alternative to composting for treating bio-waste. This development was initiated by some pioneers in the field of green technologies (i.e., KOMPOGAS).

Second, for Swiss industries (including large retailers such as MIGROS, which has more than 1/3 of the market share), environmental impacts

became increasingly important, with environmental performance becoming more and more of an issue of prestige where the goal is to demonstrate that they run an ecologically and socially responsible business. Therefore, the option of delivering bio-waste for anaerobic digestion and utilizing the fuel for driving their business trucks seemed a good option for showing their commitment towards utilizing "clean energy".

Third, for municipalities it was not always easy to have a well managed composting plant, thus, the plants provided severe odor emissions, which led to complaints within the population. Thus, a less odor intensive treatment seemed to be an appropriate solution (Lang et al., forthcoming).

Finally, Switzerland has signed the Kyoto protocol and committed itself to reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Given the decentralized structure in Switzerland, the canton Zurich saw a possibility to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emission by fostering biogas production. Thus, it issued the article 12a of the Zurich energy law, which became effective in January 1996. This article states that if it is technically and economically viable "all compostable wastes, which cannot be composted locally, have to be processed to marketable goods in central facilities utilizing their energy-potential"<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, the combination of several goals at completely different hierarchical levels led to the observed environmental reaction of an increase in the collection of bio-waste and consequent treatment in anaerobic digestion plants. The feedback at all levels was visible as the share of anaerobic digestion increased and is likely to grow further. This example, however, clearly shows, that processes and change within HES have to be studied by including not only the physical flows or the social perspective. Rather a combination and integration of these analyses within a concise framework of the process structure model allows for a better understanding of the system and might support transition processes in these systems.

## 4. DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Current research with HES

The HES approach is currently being used to organize a new, medium-scale institute with an identical name at the ETH Zurich. The focus on environmental decision-making is dominant in this institute. In HES research, at present, the case study approach is dominant. Apart from case studies on technology breakthrough, historical case studies, e.g. on the mastership of cholera and pest

<sup>1</sup> Original German wording: "Kompostierbare Abfälle, die nicht dezentral kompostiert werden können, sind unter Ausschöpfung des Energiepotentials in zentralen Anlagen zu marktfähigen Produkten zu verwerten, soweit dies technisch und wirtschaftlich möglich ist." (1983, §12a)

control were carried out as they ideally allow the examination of interfering regulatory systems. However, in principle, psychological experiments can also be carried out so long as the environmental dynamics are simulated with appropriate computer programs.

#### 4.2 Critical issues of HES research

HES research is under construction. The following four challenges deserve special attention:

- How can reconstructions of human decision making with the HES framework be validated?
- <sup>2</sup>In which way can we construct appropriate “secondary feedback loops”? How can we show that systems become stabilized or system transformations become optimized if secondary, long-term dynamics is taken into account?
- What role can RFC-mechanisms play in sustainability management?
- Is decision research (including game theory and risk analysis), with its conception of games against nature, not only a language but also a tool for integrating knowledge and overcoming both the gaps between social and natural sciences and those between theory and practice?

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS

We presented a process structure model that allows for studying adaptation and development processes within Human-Environment systems. This model divides the human and the environment system, providing so the basis for integrating disciplinary knowledge within one framework. Therefore, complex systems consisting of interactions among several agents can be understood and transition processes initiated.

#### 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank an anonymous reviewer for excellent remarks, Daniel Lang for research cooperation and Peter Loukopoulos for assistance in the editing.

#### 7. REFERENCES

Apostle, H. G., 1952. Aristotle's philosophy of mathematics Chicago: Chicago University Press.  
 Ashby, W.R., 1956, An Introduction to Cybernetics. John Wiley, New York.  
 Baccini, P. & Bader, H.-P., 1996. Regionaler Stoffhaushalt, Erfassung, Bewertung und Steuerung, Heidelberg: Spektrum.  
 Brembs et al., 2002. Operant reward learning in aplysia: neuronal correlates and mechanisms, Science 296: 1706-1709

Bossel, H., 1998. Earth at a crossroads: Path to a sustainable future. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Brunswik, E., 1952. The conceptual framework of psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
 von Carlowitz H. C., 1732. Sylvicultura oeconomica oder hausswirthliche Nachricht und naturmässige Anweisung zur wilden Baum-Zucht Leipzig: bey Johann Friedrich Braunsel. Erben.  
 Binder C.R., Hofer C., Wiek A., and Scholz R.W. Transition towards improved regional wood flow by integrating material flux analysis with agent analysis: the case of Appenzell Ausserrhoden, Switzerland, Ecological Economics, Vol 49/1 pp 1-17, 2004.  
 Carpenter, S., Brock, W., & Hanson, P., 1999. Ecological and social dynamics in simple models of ecosystem management. Conservation Ecology, 3(2):pp. 351-360.  
 Goodwin, J.W., 1977. Agricultural economics. Reston: Reston.  
 Gunderson, L.H. & Holling, C.S., & Ludwig, D., 2002. In quest of a theory of adaptive change. Gunderson, L.H. & Holling, C.S.: Panarchy. Understanding transformations in human and natural systems (pp.3-24). Washington: Island Press.  
 Hammond, A., Adriaanse, A., Rodenburg, E., Bryant, D., & Woodward, R., 1995. Environmental indicators: A systematic approach to measuring and reporting on environmental policy performance in the context of sustainable development. Washington: World Resources Institute.  
 1983. Energiegesetz [Energy law] (Stand am 1. Juli 2002 ). Pages 5 in.  
 Holling, C.S., 2001. Understanding the Complexity of Economic, Ecological, and Social Systems. Ecosystems, 4, 390 - 405.  
 Kemp, D., 1998. The environment dictionary. London: Routledge.  
 Lang D.J., Binder C.R., Stäubli B., and Scholz R. W., 2003, Optimization of waste management systems by integrating material fluxes, agents and regulatory mechanisms – The case of bio-waste. Paper presented at Environment 2010: Situation and Perspectives for the European Union , Porto, Portugal, May 6-10, 2003,  
 Laws, D., Scholz, R.W., Shiroyama, H., Susskind, L., Suzuki, T. & Weber, O., 2002. Expert views on sustainability and technology implementation.  
 Miller, G. A. (1978). Living systems. New York: McGraw-Hill.  
 Naveh, Z., & Liebermann, A. S., 1994. Landscape ecology: Theory and application (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.  
 Odum, E. P., 1997, Ecology: a bridge between science and society. Sunderland, MA : Sinauer.  
 Osborne, M.J. & Rubinstein, A., 1994. A course in game theory. Cambridge: MIT Press.  
 Piaget, J., 1953. The origin of intelligence in the child. London: Routledge & Kegan.  
 Schleiss, K. & Scholz, R. W., 2001. Alternativen der Kompostbewirtschaftung. Müll und Abfall, 79-82.  
 Scholz, R. W., 1987. Cognitive strategies in stochastic thinking. Dordrecht: Reidel.  
 Scholz, R.W., Mieg, H.,A. & Weber, O., 2003. Wirtschaftliche und organisationale Entscheidungen, In: Auhagen, A.E., & Bierhoff, H.W. Wirtschafts- und Organisationspsychologie (pp. 194-219). Weinheim: Beltz.  
 Scholz, R. W., & Tietje, O., 2002. Embedded case study methods. Integrating qualitative and quantitative knowledge. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.  
 Simon, H.A., 1957. Models of man. New York: Wiley.  
 Venix, J.A.M., 1996. Group model building – facilitating team learning using system dynamics. Wiley: West Sussex.

<sup>2</sup> From a theory of science perspective, in many cases a “gentle verification” by agreements of participants seems possible.