- Breakout Session- B
- 1) What should the next 10 years of LCLUC look like?
- program will continue to support the social work in order to be relevant to global issues
- finer resolution imagery and more detailed categories (in land cover/land use projects)
- environmental monitoring, ecosystem services → national campaigns are focused on this, but perhaps in the present political and economic environment, NASA cannot focus on these topics
- land use change as a result of climate change and adaptation → are we ready for this?
- surface water → we should focus on irrigation systems detection (irrigated vs. non-irrigated croplands); urban water needs (the social aspect) and whether these can be satisfied ; wetlands/deltas of the worlds (new project).
- work on linking patterns to process (a term that has fallen into disfavor)
- is there a future for coarse global land cover maps? → if you have a poorly defined class scheme, then regardless of time and effort, you will get poor results (so this is a hard question to answer).
  - if there was a Global 30m landcover, would that spell the end of MODIS landcover? → it is a backup for certain areas especially where clouds are prevalent, and for multi-resolution, hierarchical problems
  - continue to use coarse resolution imagery as a hotspot identifier for change – from there acquire higher resolution imagery
-

- 2) Should we place emphasis on land use instead of land cover (in the context of this morning's presentations)?
- separate land use maps from land cover
  - people generating land cover products are not comfortable generating land use maps in a land cover context; Boston would prefer a LCCS type system (more in depth description)
  - at present, no way to tie land cover biophysics to associated land use
  - there are certain isolated cases where there are other triggers that clue you into the land use of an area (e.g. pasture in Australia from auxiliary information, including fire)
  - change maps → embedded into multi-temporal land cover classifications
- is it important to define the questions first before doing the land use?
  - the scale certainly comes out of it… socioeconomic questions are at local-to-regional in analysis, but to be funded need to be regional-to-global in relevance
  - discrete vs. continuous classes?
- land use product might include layers of information like phenology (natural veg) and phenology (managed vegetation)
- we are returning to getting land use information from aerial sources
- more difficult to look at changes in herbaceous cover in the context of use (e.g. pasture, fallow, agriculture) than it is to look at a change in absolute cover (forest to agriculture, grassland to impervious/urban).
- 3) Any other recommendations?
- international connections with corporations, esp. Google (if Google acquires imagery for Google Earth, then you have to buy it from Google, not the imaging company)
- Drivers
  - bring in economists or a range of disciplines to model incentives and disincentives of our policies for these drivers (long list of all possible drivers for land use and land cover conversions)
  - how do we predict future drivers?