

**DRAFT – FOR PARTICIPANTS’ REVIEW**



# **Vision 2020 Workshop**

---

**Cambridge (UK), 20-21 February, 2007**

## **Workshop Report**

## 1. Summary

On 20-21 February 2007, The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre hosted the “Vision 2020 workshop” in partnership with IIED and the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group. The main purpose of this workshop was to review the state of knowledge on methodologies to assess the impact of protected areas on people living within or around them. The workshop brought together representatives from a core group of both conservation and development NGOs, from all regions of the world currently working on issues related to the linkages between poverty and protected areas.

The goal of the workshop was to explore the feasibility, potential for funding and institutional partnerships necessary to develop the ‘Vision 2020 – Long term assessment of the contribution of protected areas to conservation and development goals’ project.

The workshop reached several conclusions:

- The development of an internationally recognized set of criteria and methods to assess the socio-economic impact of protected areas is both desirable and timely
- The first step towards the creation of a set of criteria and methods to assess the socio-economic impact of protected areas is to carry out an in-depth analysis of indicators and methodologies that have been developed thus far in this field, where they have been implemented and to summarise their results
- The development of an internationally recognized set of criteria and methods to assess the socio-economic impact of protected areas is a very complex task and should therefore be performed not by a single organization but through partnership
- UNEP-WCMC is well situated to lead the process of partnership development and fundraising for this work

## 2. Introduction

UNEP-WCMC organised and hosted a workshop called ‘Vision 2020’ on 20 and 21 February, 2007. The workshop, sponsored by the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG), was designed to explore the feasibility, potential for funding and institutional partnerships necessary to develop the ‘Vision 2020 – Long term assessment of the contribution of protected areas to conservation and development goals’ project.

## 3. Background and Goals of the Workshop

Despite the key role that protected areas play in conserving biodiversity, the amount of funds they attract, and the widely debated relationship between protected areas and the communities living in and around them, at present there is no mechanism in place to systematically assess the contribution that protected areas make to conserving biological diversity, the effectiveness of their management, and the impact that these areas have on people.

‘Vision 2020’ is a project concept recently developed by UNEP-WCMC which aims to take up this challenge by developing a process for the periodic assessment of the biodiversity value, management effectiveness and human impact of a subset of the world’s protected areas, to demonstrate the contribution that protected areas are making to conservation and development, and how this is evolving over time.

The purpose of the workshop was to explore the feasibility, potential for funding and institutional partnerships necessary to develop the 'Vision 2020' project. More specifically, the issues addressed included:

- Discussing the state of the knowledge on methodologies and indicators that could be used to assess the human impact of protected areas
- Defining the scope of the 'Vision 2020' project (geographic reach, expected outputs and outcomes, potential limits and weaknesses, etc.) Identifying the appropriate institutional partners for the implementation of this project and start gathering ideas for a funding strategy

## 4. The Program

A copy of the workshop agenda is included in Annex 2. The workshop began with introductory presentations from Jon Hutton and Charles Besançon on the Vision 2020 project and on the goals of the workshop. This was followed by a morning and early afternoon session on poverty and protected areas, during which a large number of short presentations were given by workshop participants on current work carried out by them, or by the organisation represented by them. The first day of the workshop ended with an open discussion around the issues raised by the presentations.

The second day of the workshop started with a brief summary of the activities and discussions that took place on the first day. This was followed by a breakout session during which workshop participants were asked to answer a series of questions identified as 'key' on the first day. In the afternoon, after a brief review of the conclusions reached by each group during the morning, a second open discussion took place which lasted until the conclusion of the workshop. The focus of this discussion was on reaching an agreement on the issues raised during the two day meeting. In particular, views were solicited by workshop participants to assess what should be the next steps for the 'Vision 2020' project.

## 5. Day One      Tuesday 20 February

### 5.1 Introductory Session

The workshop was opened by Jon Hutton, Director of UNEP-WCMC and workshop chair, who welcomed participants and stressed the importance of working in partnership if we want to improve our knowledge of the socio-economic aspects of protected areas, and if we want to develop and implement actions aimed at improving the relationship between people and protected areas.

Following Jon Hutton's opening remark, the session continued with a quick round of introductions, during which each participants stated their name, the name of the organization they belong to, and their field of expertise within the wider theme of poverty-protected areas linkages.

The introductory session ended with two presentations. The first presentation made by Charles Besançon, Head of the Protected Areas Programme at UNEP-WCMC and workshop co-chair, aimed at 1) providing everyone with the necessary logistical information about the workshop; 2) briefly introducing the 'Vision 2020' project; 3) reminding everybody of the focus and objectives of the workshop. In the second presentation Dilys Roe, Senior Researcher at IIED, briefly described the rationale, characteristics and objectives of the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG), and how the support to the 'Vision 2020' project fits in the PCLG's wider program of work.

### 5.2 Presentations

Following the introductory session, a considerable part of the day was devoted to hearing and discussing presentations made by each workshop participant. The presentations were intended to highlight a recent relevant piece of work, carried out by the participants or by their organization, on the linkages between poverty and protected areas. The following table summarises the results of this session of the workshop.

<b>Presentation by</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Alessandra Giuliani	A Review of Methodologies and Indicators that Can Be Used to Assess the Human Impact of Protected Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lack of baseline information about people's well-being before the establishment of a PA is a very important point</li> <li>Economic indicators are missing from this analysis</li> <li>Various indicators and methodologies have been developed to assess the human impact of PAs, however their implementation on the ground is always very problematic</li> </ul>
Phil Franks	WCPA Protected Areas, Equity and Livelihoods Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern Europe is not currently covered by the work of the Task Force. This is mainly due to a lack of resources, rather than a lack of interest in the problems of this region</li> </ul>
Alex de Sherbinin	Protected Areas Indicators Protected Areas & Poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When exploring the linkages between PAs and human well-being, identifying correlations between different variables is an important step. However correlations do not say anything about the causal relationships between the variables</li> </ul>
Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend	The IUCN Protected Area Matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This matrix, which classifies PAs by IUCN category and governance type, provides a way for understanding conservation which takes into consideration local communities</li> </ul>
Katrina Brandon	Advancing an Understanding of the Costs & Benefits of Protected Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CI, like other conservation organizations, faces the problem of whether it can be 'trusted' when and if its work will deliver any result on the impact that conservation activities have on people</li> <li>Climate change has the potential to significantly change the scenario we are working in at the moment, and it will certainly pose many new challenges to conservation organizations</li> </ul>
Dan Brockington	Eviction for Conservation	

Barney Dickson	Do no harm? Protected areas and poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 'do no harm' principle, although simple and apparently straightforward, raises interesting issues, like the need to establish a baseline condition against which we can measure whether harm or no harm has been done. Moreover, in specific local situations is not always easy to decide what to do in order to 'do no harm'</li> </ul>
Phil Franks	Assessing the Costs and Benefits of PAs with a Local Perspective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to distinguish between the impacts that PAs have on different groups of poor people within a community</li> <li>Further thought should be given to the issue of how to transfer benefits from the international to the local level</li> <li>It is important to assess the costs and benefits of PAs from an economic point of view</li> </ul>
Ashish Kothari	A few comments on the 'Vision 2020' project concept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be worthwhile to collect information (and possibly incorporate it in the WDPA) on: governance type, implementation of policies and laws within PAs, non-monetary impacts of PAs (e.g. empowerment). It would be useful also to study the interplay between these different factors</li> </ul>
Mike Morris	A few comments on the linkages between poverty and PAs based on his past experiences and on his current work at WWF UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of participatory techniques for the identification of indicators has many advantages, but is also a very long and skill intensive process</li> <li>Measuring impacts can be very complex. For example, when measuring assets it is important to look not just at the total amount of assets available, but also at the combination in which assets are available</li> </ul>
Baskar Vira	The linkages between assessing the human impact of PAs and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	
David Wilkie	A few comments on the 'Vision 2020' project concept and on the discussion carried out so far	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When trying to assess the human impact of PAs it is important to use controls and to repeat measurements over time</li> </ul>
Neville Ash	Indicators for Assessment – an overview of the landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are many international indicators initiatives in progress, some of which involving UNEP-WCMC, which are addressing issues similar to the ones that will be faced by the 'Vision 2020' project. There is therefore great potential for coordination and mutual learning between these different initiatives</li> </ul>

### 5.3 General Discussion Highlights

The last part of the day was dedicated to an open discussion around the issues raised by the presentations and around the 'Vision 2020' project concept. These are the highlights from the discussion:

- The 'Vision 2020' project has the potential not just to produce information about the impacts that protected areas have on people, but also to influence the associated policy processes.
- Before deciding *how* to measure the human impact of PAs, it is important to reflect on *whether* it is worth undertaking such an assessment at all. We already know any assessment methodology we might develop will be flawed and disputable, therefore, it could be more productive to spend the limited resources available on 'doing' rather than 'measuring'.
- The component of the 'Vision 2020' project regarding management effectiveness has already been developed. What UNEP-WCMC is trying to determine at the moment, and the reason why this workshop was organised, is whether it would be worth developing a similar component to assess other associated impacts of PAs including those related to society and people.
- Many workshop participants raised questions about the goals of the 'Vision 2020' project, in particular with regards to the type of information it aims to collect. Having a clear idea of what the project aims to achieve is crucial in order to discuss potential methodologies to carry it out.
- The 'Vision 2020' project is motivated by the need to develop a set of measures to assess the livelihoods impact of PAs, which, combined with the information already available on management effectiveness and biodiversity conservation, could better inform the decision making process regarding PAs.
- When the management effectiveness component of the 'Vision 2020' project was developed, many organizations had already been working on this topic for some time and produced a variety of indicators and methodologies. However, the lack of coordination between these organizations meant the results often overlapped. Learning from that experience, and given the state of knowledge on assessing the socio-economic impacts of PAs, there is now a great potential to work in partnership with other organizations to develop a commonly agreed set of criteria and methods to assess the human impact of PAs, thus avoiding duplication of efforts.

### 5.4 Conclusions

At the end of the open discussion on day one there was a general agreement among workshop participants, on the value of developing an internationally recognized set of criteria and methods to assess the human impact of PAs.

Given that the development of such set of criteria poses numerous and onerous challenges, and in order to avoid duplication of efforts, workshop participants agree that this work should be carried out by UNEP-WCMC in partnership with other organizations, including both conservation and development organizations.

Finally, participants agreed that a more in-depth analysis of which indicators and methodologies have been developed so far to assess the livelihood impact of PAs is needed.

## 6. Day Two      Wednesday 21 February

### 6.1 Introductory Session

The morning of day two started with a presentation made by Helena Pavese on 'Protected area management effectiveness evaluation - global study'. In the discussion that followed it was clarified that this methodology, already widely adopted, has been modified to be adapted to different situations. The methodology has therefore the merit of trying to overcome one of the most common problems connected with management tools, which is that they tend to treat all PAs as uniform.

The second part of the morning was dedicated to a discussion around the following questions:

1. Is it important to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, and the way this changes over time? List the reasons why we might want to do this, and why we might not.
2. What efforts to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, or the broader relationship between PAs and poverty, do you know of, and at what scale are these?
3. Using the combined knowledge of the group, list the options for the development of a global indicator of the socio-economic impact of protected areas.
4. In the opinion of the group, is it feasible and worthwhile to develop a global indicator based on the WDPA?
5. Is it sufficient that global indicators are developed for processes such as the MDGs, or should global efforts inform and support the development of local indicators and standards? List the pros and cons of linking across scales.

In order to facilitate the discussion workshop participants were divided into three groups for the duration of this session.

### 6.2 Report from Breakout Session

The afternoon of day 2 started with a brief report from each group on the results of the breakout session. A detailed overview of each group's findings is provided in Annex 3.

### 6.3 Common Themes Among the Breakout Groups

Some common themes emerged among the breakout groups:

- Despite the many shortcomings, overall it is worth measuring the socio-economic impact of protected areas, and the way this changes over time
- Alessandra Giuliani's research 'Assessing the Human Impact of Protected Areas' provides a useful overview of what has been done so far in this field, however, significant further research work is needed to thoroughly review the state of knowledge on this issue, a necessary step before any further action can be undertaken
- More than a single indicator, all groups agreed that it would be worthwhile to develop a set of indicators to assess the socio-economic impacts of PAs

## **6.4 General Discussion Highlights**

The workshop ended with an open discussion session aimed at drawing a few conclusions and identifying the next steps of the 'Vision 2020' project. These are the highlights from the discussion:

- The PCLG symposium in September 2007 could host a discussion on the linkages between poverty and PAs with the aim of reaching an agreement on the state of knowledge in this field.
- The 'Vision 2020' project is strictly connected with the redevelopment of the WDPA. As part of this process UNEP-WCMC aims first of all to add to the database new categories such as: presence of people within the PA, type of management, type of communities living within the PA, etc. In order to allow contribution from many different sources of data and gather as much information as possible, the WDPA will need to be very flexible in its design.
- The 'Vision 2020' project is mainly concerned with exploring the impacts that PAs have on people at a global level. The global level is the most important in order to influence decision makers, and it is the level on which UNEP-WCMC operates. However, the global level cannot be effectively pursued without looking also at the local level. In conclusion, the 'Vision 2020' project has the potential to start a 'positive cycle' which will improve our knowledge of the linkages between poverty and PAs both at the local and at the global level.
- The Convention on Biological Diversity might be interested in taking part in this process, and, given the characteristics of their programme of work on protected areas, they could provide a very valuable contribution. Other organizations that could be interested in joining the process, and that could act as valuable partners, are UNDP and GEF.
- Many ideas were discussed in the course of the workshop, and many options were proposed for what the next steps of this process should be, however, in order to successfully take this project further there is the need to identify a clear project leader and secretariat.

## **6.5 Next Actions**

- The Wildlife Conservation Society is going to host a workshop in June 2007 on the issues of poverty and protected areas. David Wilkie agreed to report the results of the 'Vision 2020' workshop on that occasion.
- Dilys Roe agreed to propose 'Poverty and Protected Areas' as a theme for the PCLG symposium which will be held in September 2007. This idea will be circulated among PCLG members and will be approved if the majority of PCLG members concur on its relevance as a theme for the learning group's yearly symposium.
- TILCEPA agreed to take a lead on developing a toolkit of methodologies and indicators to assess the socio-economic impact of PAs, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, the PCLG and others. To this end, the next steps envisioned by TILCEPA, to be carried out over the next few months, are:
  - Exchange of ideas, suggestions and updates via email within a core group
  - Identification of key questions that the process should aim to address
  - In-depth research on current work carried out worldwide on this topic
  - Development of a toolkit
  - Field testing of the toolkit
  - Dissemination of the results at the CBD Ad Hoc Group on PAs in early 2008



## 7. Acknowledgements

UNEP-WCMC would like to thank the many participants who attended the meeting, especially the international participants who traveled long hours, for contributing their time and expertise to the goals of the 'Vision 2020' project.

UNEP-WCMC would particularly like to thank the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group for its generous financial support.

UNEP-WCMC in particular would like to thank Dilys Roe of IIED for her valuable contributions throughout the workshop and for hosting us for dinner at her home the first evening.

Lastly, many thanks to Alessandra Giuliani for her organizing and good cheer through the entire process of the development of this workshop.

**Annex 1: Agenda**

**Annex 2: List of participants**

**Annex 3: Report of the results from the breakout session**

## Annex 1 – Participants List

	<b>Participant's name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>E-mail address</b>
1.	<b>Adriana Dinu</b>	UNDP/GEF	<a href="mailto:adriana.dinu@undp.org">adriana.dinu@undp.org</a>
2.	<b>Alessandra Giuliani</b>	Consultant (IIED)	<a href="mailto:Alessandra.Giuliani@unep-wcmc.org">Alessandra.Giuliani@unep-wcmc.org</a>
3.	<b>Alex de Sherbinin</b>	CIESIN/PERN	<a href="mailto:adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu">adesherbinin@ciesin.columbia.edu</a>
4.	<b>Arshiya Urveeja Bose</b>	University of Cambridge	<a href="mailto:arshiyabose.research@gmail.com">arshiyabose.research@gmail.com</a>
5.	<b>Ashish Kothari</b>	TILCEPA/Kalpavriksh	<a href="mailto:ashishkothari@vsnl.com">ashishkothari@vsnl.com</a>
6.	<b>Barney Dickson</b>	Fauna and Flora International	<a href="mailto:barney.dickson@fauna-flora.org">barney.dickson@fauna-flora.org</a>
7.	<b>Bhaskar Vira</b>	University of Cambridge	<a href="mailto:bhaskar.vira@geog.cam.ac.uk">bhaskar.vira@geog.cam.ac.uk</a>
8.	<b>Charles Besançon</b>	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:Charles.Besancon@unep-wcmc.org">Charles.Besancon@unep-wcmc.org</a>
9.	<b>Dan Brockington</b>	Manchester University	<a href="mailto:daniel.brockington@manchester.ac.uk">daniel.brockington@manchester.ac.uk</a>
10.	<b>David Wilkie</b>	WCS	<a href="mailto:dwilkie@wcs.org">dwilkie@wcs.org</a>
11.	<b>Dilys Roe</b>	IIED	<a href="mailto:Dilys.Roe@iied.org">Dilys.Roe@iied.org</a>
12.	<b>Franziska Kohler</b>	University of Cambridge	<a href="mailto:fk246@cam.ac.uk">fk246@cam.ac.uk</a>
13.	<b>Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend</b>	TGER/TILCEPA/CEESP/WCPA	<a href="mailto:gbf@cenesta.org">gbf@cenesta.org</a>
14.	<b>Helena Pavese</b>	Cambridge Univ./UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:Helena.Pavese@unep-wcmc.org">Helena.Pavese@unep-wcmc.org</a>
15.	<b>Jon Hutton</b>	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:Jon.Hutton@unep-wcmc.org">Jon.Hutton@unep-wcmc.org</a>
16.	<b>Katrina Brandon</b>	Conservation International	<a href="mailto:k.brandon@conservation.org">k.brandon@conservation.org</a>
17.	<b>Liesbeth Renders</b>	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:Liesbeth.Renders@unep-wcmc.org">Liesbeth.Renders@unep-wcmc.org</a>
18.	<b>Muhtari Aminu-Kano</b>	BirdLife International	<a href="mailto:Muhtari.Aminu-Kano@birdlife.org">Muhtari.Aminu-Kano@birdlife.org</a>
19.	<b>Mike Morris</b>	WWF UK	<a href="mailto:mmorris@wwf.org.uk">mmorris@wwf.org.uk</a>
20.	<b>Neville Ash</b>	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:Neville.Ash@unep-wcmc.org">Neville.Ash@unep-wcmc.org</a>
21.	<b>Phil Franks</b>	CARE International	<a href="mailto:phil@ci.or.ke">phil@ci.or.ke</a>

People who were invited to attend the workshop and, despite being unable to attend, expressed the desire to be part of the process:

	<b>Participant's name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>E-mail address</b>
1.	<b>Gonzalo Oviedo</b>	IUCN	<a href="mailto:gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org">gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org</a>
2.	<b>Kay Schmidt-Soltau</b>	Consultant	<a href="mailto:SchmidtSol@aol.com">SchmidtSol@aol.com</a>
3.	<b>Lea Scherl</b>	TILCEPA	<a href="mailto:lea.scherl@bigpond.com">lea.scherl@bigpond.com</a>
4.	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	GEF	<a href="mailto:mzimsky@thegef.org">mzimsky@thegef.org</a>
5.	<b>Nigel Dudley</b>	Equilibrium	<a href="mailto:Equilibrium@compuserve.com">Equilibrium@compuserve.com</a>
6.	<b>Norbert Henninger</b>	WRI	<a href="mailto:norbert@wri.org">norbert@wri.org</a>
7.	<b>Roger Mitchell</b>	Earthwatch	<a href="mailto:rmitchell@earthwatch.org.uk">rmitchell@earthwatch.org.uk</a>
8.	<b>Steve Watkins</b>	TNC	<a href="mailto:swatkins@tnc.org">swatkins@tnc.org</a>
9.	<b>Tony Whitten</b>	World Bank	<a href="mailto:Twhitten@worldbank.org">Twhitten@worldbank.org</a>
10.	<b>Valerie Kapos</b>	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="mailto:val.kapos@unep-wcmc.org">val.kapos@unep-wcmc.org</a>

## Annex 2 – Workshop Agenda

### Day One *Tuesday 20 February 2007*

9.00 – 9.30	Registration
9.30 – 9.50	Welcome and introductions: Jon Hutton
9.50 – 10.20	The Vision 2020 Project Concept: Charles Besancon The Poverty and Conservation Learning Group: Dilys Roe Assessing the Human Impact of PAs: Alessandra Giuliani
10.20 – 10.40	A Task Force on Protected Areas and Equity: Phil Franks
10.40 – 11.00	Protected Areas, Indicators and Poverty: Alex de Sherbinin
11.00 – 11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>
11.30 – 13.00	Presentations by workshop's participants (5 minutes each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'Communities, natural resource governance and livelihoods', by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend</li> <li>- 'Advancing a global understanding of the costs and benefits of protected areas', by Katrina Brandon</li> <li>- 'A global review of eviction and protected areas', by Dan Brockington</li> <li>- 'Do no harm? Conservation and the livelihoods of the poor', by Barney Dickson</li> <li>- 'Assessing the costs and benefits of protected areas with a local perspective', by Phil Franks</li> <li>- 'Integrating community governance and poverty indicators', by Ashish Kothari</li> <li>- Mike Morris</li> <li>- 'Assessing responses: some observations from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment process', by Bhaskar Vira</li> <li>- 'The need for controls in assessing the impacts of protected areas on local household welfare', by David Wilkie</li> </ul>
13.00 – 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 – 14.15	Using management effectiveness assessments to look at poverty reduction in protected areas. Presentation by Nigel Dudley
14.15 – 14.30	The value of indicators as an assessment tool and the current work of UNEP-WCMC on indicators: the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnerships. Presentation by Neville Ash
14.15 – 15.00	Discussion: Assessing the relationship between PAs and human well-being  During the discussion we try to identify the main questions related to the issue of <i>why</i> it is important to assess the relationship between PAs and human well-being. These are the questions that will be addressed in the following breakout session.
15.00 – 15.45	Breakout session 1
15.45 – 16.00	<i>Coffee break</i>
16.00 – 16.30	Report from breakout session 1
16.30 – 17.00	Feedback and response from breakout session 1
17.00 – 17.15	Results and conclusions for the day

## Day Two

## Wednesday 21 February 2007

9.00 – 9.15	Review of the results of the first day of the workshop and introduction to the second day: Jon Hutton
9.15 – 10.00	Discussion: How to assess the relationship between PAs and human well-being  The discussion aims to identify the most significant questions raised by the issue of <i>how</i> to assess the human impact of PAs. These are the questions that will be addressed in the following breakout session.
10.00 – 11.00	Breakout session 2
11.00 – 11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>
11.30 – 12.00	Report from breakout session 2
12.00 – 13.00	Feedback and response from breakout session 2
13.00 – 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 – 15.30	Open Discussion: Where shall we go from here?
15.30 – 15.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
15.45 – 16.45	Conclusions, recommendations and proposals for future actions
16:45 – 17.00	Closing of the workshop: Jon Hutton
19:30	<i>Dinner at the Galleria</i>

## ***Annex 3 – Report of the results from the breakout session***

### ***Breakout session – Group 1 (AdeS, DR, GBF, JH, KB, MAK)***

**First question: Is it important to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, and the way this changes over time? List the reasons why we might want to do this, and why we might not.**

In general, measuring impacts is worthwhile, but no consensus on what to measure or what is happening.

Note of caution: do not try to do global measurements unless they are firmly rooted at the local level, otherwise we have a high chance of getting meaningless results.

A concern regarding this type of assessments is that, taken in the wrong way, they could convince that PAs are bad.

#### Other comments on this question:

- It is important to make a good case for the benefits deriving from PAs, which we can predict will increase in a world with scarce natural resources
- Most PAs are economic black holes, they are deeply resented and seen as negative, so people tend to affect PAs negatively. However, PAs have the potential to improve things.
- It is important to look at the relationship between people and PAs in both directions: how are people affected by PAs and how are PAs affected by people. However, it would be worthwhile also just to look at the impact of PAs on people
- It would be better to phrase the question as 'is it important to measure the governance process and well-being impact of the different constituencies'. Governance is critically important and there should be a way to look at governance threats and improvements
- It is important to define the type of governance, but also the quality of governance (although this is more difficult), authority, responsibility and accountability
- Governance can be a key mechanism for transferring local benefits downward, however assessing governance quality will be hard
- A possibility could be to have a core dataset and aggregate upwards. This process, highly valued by the global community, offers a way to measure the benefits at both local and global levels. However, care should be used when aggregating data, as there is always a potential problem of comparability
- It is important to start at local level and to have good quality data. Then we can scale up to national, regional, and global level, but if you try and do global level directly the results will be poor and possibly wrong. But if you use global demand to create standards at the local level, then it can feed up into bigger processes
- Any assessment of this type will be very expensive, therefore we need the support of other organizations (e.g. UNDP)

**Second question: What efforts to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, or the broader relationship between PAs and poverty, do you know of, and at what scale are these?**

There is the need to carry out a global assessment of who is doing what in this field. The PCLG could contribute to such an assessment by convening a process among its members aimed at assessing who is doing what. In particular, this research should address the issue of scale, not addressed in AG's report.

**Third question: Using the combined knowledge of the group, list the options for the development of a global indicator of the socio-economic impact of protected areas.**

It is not desirable to have one single indicator. It is more important to look at a variety of issues. In addition, no single indicator developed so far seems appropriate for this type of analysis.

A lot of monitoring and measuring experiences are currently being implemented - we need to see what are the available metrics and indices, and, more broadly, whether they can be adapted to different circumstances.

Other comments on this question:

- There are a number of options: from creating new indicators/indices (although it might be 5 years before we have results) to looking at existing datasets as indicators of poverty – this would be possible only for places where data is good enough (CIESIN are keepers of infant mortality rate, but is this a good measure? IMR misses a lot of other information and does not explain the correlation between causes and effects)
- There is the need to improve the quality of existing datasets, especially at the sub national level, to obtain a meaningful dataset. This can be a very expensive process. UNEP and UNDP should work together to capture more environment/development data
- It is important also to decide on the methodology we want to use to collect information: Survey? Questionnaire? Participatory techniques? Maybe participatory techniques could be used just in a sample of PAs
- It is difficult to find indicators to measure governance
- We should clarify which types of PAs we want to look at. Are we including also CCAs? We should have an indicator also to measure this
- An idea could be to use warning flags connected to some sort of threshold: if you have enough warning flags there is something of particular value

**Fourth question: In the opinion of the group, is it feasible and worthwhile to develop a global indicator based on the WDPA?**

In general, the group agrees that we should look for a variety of metrics, not a single indicator.

Possible options:

- Wiki process
- No single metric but a stratified sample to follow over time – maybe through expert groups in within countries, and/or through regional meetings

**Fifth question: Is it sufficient that global indicators are developed for processes such as the MDGs, or should global efforts inform and support the development of local indicators and standards? List the pros and cons of linking across scales.**

Pros:

- It is essential to be able to assess the benefits in order to identify appropriate compensation measures and to decide on the tradeoffs
- To meet the obligations of the CBD programme of work it is important to have aggregate columns of cost and benefits
- Use of local level indicators to strengthen the global process of national MDG frameworks
- Global process can help catalyze helpful local processes

Cons:

- It is expensive and time consuming
- Requires a high degree of cooperation, though this might also be seen as a pro
- If the results show that PAs have negative impacts on people, this could negatively affect the conservation community and its efforts

Further comments:

- At the local level there is the opportunity that PAs could come up with biodiversity-poverty indicators that could then be used in national-level frameworks, and therefore influence international processes without political problems connected to national level sources
- The precautionary principle should be used when doing this kind of assessment (e.g. Nick Winers work on conservation organizations and their human-rights approach)



## **Breakout Session – Group 2 (AG, AUB, CB, DB, DW, PF)**

**First question: Is it important to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, and the way this changes over time? List the reasons why we might want to do this, and why we might not.**

Reasons why it is important to do this:

- Conservation organisations want to make sure they contribute to poverty reduction
- Conservation contributing to equity in benefits sharing (social justice)/Are conservation practices in accordance with IUCN vision?
- Donors: show them conservation is not doing any harm/Can we prove to donors that conservation is not harming local people?
- Desire for an honest third party assessment?
- Adaptative management
- Need for standards to which organisations can be held accountable
- To improve management

Reasons why we might not want to do this:

- Fear of agenda driven assessments
- Fear that assessment exercise will divert already scarce resources

**Second question: What efforts to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, or the broader relationship between PAs and poverty, do you know of, and at what scale are these?**

In addition to the report by AG, further sources to research are:

- Article by Caroline Upton (to be published in the journal Oryx)
- Remote sensing
- McNeely and Scherr: study on agriculture in PAs
- Mike Fay – Megatransect II
- The work of Conservation International

**Third question: Using the combined knowledge of the group, list the options for the development of a global indicator of the socio-economic impact of protected areas.**

Principle: **PAs do no harm**

Criteria to prove that PAs do no harm:

- no impoverishment
- no increase in exclusion
- no increase in conflict
- fair compensation for loss of assets
- no loss of cultural integrity
- no loss of property rights

N.B. The assumption here is that we know the baseline state

Principle: **PAs do good**

Criteria to prove that PAs do good:

- promotion of prosperity
- promotion of good governance
- fair payments for effective stewardship/guardianship
- sustainable stream of environmental services
- enhanced sense of cultural belonging
- empowerment of local communities
- strengths of property rights

Having identified these principles and criteria, in order to develop indicators to assess the socio-economic impact of PAs it is necessary to:

- Define the unit of analysis/level of disaggregation
- Define the scale at which to assess the criteria:
  - Focus on local communities – do no harm principle
  - Focus on broader population – do good principle

TEV is considered inadequate for this process

The development process must be seen as legitimate

Sampling options :

- IUCN class and region
- Biome
- Size
- Age
- Human footprint/population density
- Management system

Suggestions for how to take these topics and this project further:

- Keep socio economic assessment separate from management assessment, but linked:
  - Rolled into CBD – May 2008
  - WDPA
- Find champions to pilot assessment (key to the process)
- Find donors. Potential donors:
  - Moore Foundation
  - MacArthur Foundation
  - Howard Buffet Foundation
- Identify a small group made of researchers and practitioners, with a full time leader based at UNEP-WCMC. This group should work independently, but have frequent reality checks with the broader community.

#### **Fourth question: In the opinion of the group, is it feasible and worthwhile to develop a global indicator based on the WDPA?**

A single index value is not desirable, since multidimensional comparisons would be very difficult. A group of 10-15 indicators would be more appropriate. However, by representing these indicators on a radar diagram, we could still get a single value for each situation to compare.

## **Breakout Session – Group 3 (AD, AK, FK, HP, MM)**

**First question: Is it important to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, and the way this changes over time? List the reasons why we might want to do this, and why we might not.**

A few comments on the wording of the question:

Impact: not just impact of PAs on people, but also other aspects such as more general changes in governance systems - two-way effects.

It would be better to change the word 'impacts' into 'aspects' (dynamic notion: attention to changes over time)

What *aspects* to look at:

- Rights-based approach
- Livelihood indicators (e.g. empowerment, governance, etc.)
- Economic indicators
- Cultural relations with areas that are being conserved

Furthermore, it is important to:

- be aware of the differences between households, communities, gender, groups within community, etc.
- respect the subjective perceptions of one's own poverty (relative deprivation, and how that impacts on human well-being)
- keep in mind what are the main goals/objectives of the PA (if the main goal of a PA is to improve the flow of cash and employment opportunities, this might affect how successful people perceive the PA to be in changing their socio-economic status)

Why is it important to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas?

- To assess people's impact on PAs
- To improve PAs management, by involving people and dealing with impacts
- Subsidiarity: management is done best by those who are closest (most knowledgeable) to the PA and who are most dependent upon it
- For conservation agencies, since proving positive impacts might open a source of funding
- To assess PA objectives/planning and to help change policy in positive directions (e.g. appropriate governance type)
- To evaluate trade-offs and support decisions which optimize the situation
- To appreciate the complexity of a situation, to involve all stakeholders, and to improve governance
- To involve local stakeholders, since involvement in decisions that affect one's life is a basic human right
- To contribute to inter-generational and intra-generational equity

Why should we not want to do this?

- Too complex, expensive, and time-consuming
- Might mean the end of a conservation project, if the impact assessment shows negative social impacts
- A global set of measures may not be locally relevant

The conclusion of the group is that there are many more and more important reasons to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, than not to do it.

**Second question: What efforts to measure the socio-economic impact of protected areas, or the broader relationship between PAs and poverty, do you know of, and at what scale are these?**

In addition to the report by AG, further sources to research are:

- UNDP HD Index
- Rights-based indicators/methods
- Capability index
- Participation indices
- CBD indicators
- Indigenous people's indicators

All these methodologies could potentially be used for the goals of this research, but more information/knowledge is needed on how to adapt them to this context.

**Third question: Using the combined knowledge of the group, list the options for the development of a global indicator of the socio-economic impact of protected areas.**

- Issues with *global* indicator
  - Lack of appropriate, reliable data
  - Usefulness
  - Dangers of global indicators – we rather need a framework for guidance and flexibly adaptable
- There is the need to assess existing methodologies for local contexts and to determine how to transfer these methods to a higher level:
  - Local assessment methodologies well developed - challenge to go beyond community level
  - Challenge of developing indicators for governance:
    - Capability Index (UN)
    - Save the Children Index
    - Institutional hierarchy (Williamson) (assesses the rules that govern relationships between people and organizations)
  - Like for governance, it is difficult to develop indicators for cultural impacts, but it is nevertheless necessary
- The goal should be to have a nuanced set of guidelines/methods, not a simple matrix
- It is critical to have a clear guidance on process of socio-economic assessments. Process and methodology need to be simple to make them most useful.
- No shortcuts should be used: attention must be paid to include all stakeholders

**Fourth question: In the opinion of the group, is it feasible and worthwhile to develop a global indicator based on the WDPA?**

- Given the complexity of each local situation, it is not desirable, nor even possible, to develop global indicators, especially indicators used in ranking
- Information on socio-economic aspects could be added to the WDPA on the base of framework and local assessments. It is very important that this information should reliably reflect the local context
- The WDPA should be open to the public to post information on socio-economic aspects
- It is important to look at trends and links between the various elements of the WDPA – management effectiveness, governance type, socio-economic aspects – over time

- Establishment of a baseline > historical analysis and backwards extrapolation

#### Process of socio-economic assessments

- Identification and involvement of all rights-holders and stake-holders
  - Disaggregate according to gender, class, social groups
  - Empowerment and capacity
- Clarification of concepts, e.g. rights-holders, empowerment
- Long-term process (repeated assessments)
- Flexible and locally adaptable
- Feedback mechanisms and learning lessons for adaptive management
  - Management driven research in PA
  - Ensure that the assessment is used to change management

**Fifth question: Is it sufficient that global indicators are developed for processes such as the MDGs, or should global efforts inform and support the development of local indicators and standards? List the pros and cons of linking across scales.**

- Linking across scales: the global scale is relevant for biodiversity (might be dying out in one place, but not in another)
  - Hardly possible in case of socio-economic indicators > MDG as a guideline, but need for local context
  - Awareness of limitations to relevance of global indicators
- In order to create a global picture, local assessments have to be aggregated
- Threats to PAs and people reach from local to global:
  - Population pressures, trade, climate change
  - Threats change and management has to react to external and internal changes
- Benefits of PAs across scales

In general, threats and benefits should be measured at different scales, although the local should be the most important level.