



Abstract

In this talk, I argue that for the purpose of advancing IDRiM research and practice, “conceptualization” should also be regarded as a broadened sense of “modeling” which works for comprehensive, integrative thinking and knowledge sharing. More precisely, my focus is to explain and demonstrate how field-based experiences help us visually condense the notion of a holistic agenda as felt, conceived and derived from the real, living ground. My 3 decade-long field practices have made me confident that even if these conceptualization outcomes are largely grounded on, and limited to the realities and local specifics, we could strategically revise them to apply more to common cases if careful and repeated examination and transboundary comparative efforts are conducted together by researchers, experts, administrators, residents, NGOs, etc., all from different disciplines, countries and cultures. This means that local, field-based conceptual models have potential to be more generalized to overarch the local specifics, thus helping us develop a roadmap for discussing what we commonly share and mutually complement.

With that viewpoint in mind, I have taken the initiative to propose several conceptual models since the beginning of IDRiM Society,. They are intended to be used for reexamining relevant perspectives, and roadmapping research directions for the future IDRiM. The list includes “Implementation Gap,” “Octopus Model,” “Vitae System,” “SMART Governance” under Persistent Disruptive Stressors (PDSs), and Case Station-Field Campus (CASiFiCA) System.” Beside them, I will highlight the following three.

- A. Pagoda Model (applicable for for SDGs discussions)
- B. Yonmenkaigi System Method (YSM) (applicable for designing a communicative space)
- C. BE-CAUSE Process Model (applicable for IDRiM communication for extended knowledge sharing and collaboration)

After my talk, I welcome your questions, clarifications, and suggestions.