

Biodiversity and Poverty from the Perspective of a Development NGO

Phil Franks
CARE International



CARE International Vision

We seek a world of hope, tolerance and social justice where poverty has been overcome and people live in dignity and security



Integrated Conservation and Development Projects in the 90's

- Was the overall goal
 - Biodiversity conservation (through development)? OR
 - Development (through biodiversity conservation)
 - If biodiversity conservation then for whom – humanity?
 - Not adequate in defining target beneficiaries
- **Relevance to CARE - strong to almost zero**

Integrated Conservation and Development Projects 2000-

- *ICD is an approach to management/conservation of natural resources in areas of significant biodiversity value that aims to reconcile the biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development interests of multiple stakeholders at local, national and international levels*
- Frames ICD goal from a perspective of multi-functionality/pluralism - TEV in economic terms
- **Relevance to CARE clearer in theory but in reality still very dependent on personal interpretation**

Pro-poor Conservation

- *PPC is an approach to conservation of natural resources in areas of significant biodiversity that aims to deliver substantial net benefits to poor communities with particular emphasis on poorer more vulnerable households, whilst conserving biodiversity (ICD with affirmative action)*
- Requires a shared, unified vision centred on the conservation agenda of the poor
- **Clear relevance to CARE**

Pro-poor conservation in CARE

- Under what circumstances can biodiversity conservation, and pro-poor conservation in particular, contribute to poverty reduction and social justice?
- Focus on PAs (but in the broadest sense)



PA Conservation Activities and Poverty Reduction - National Level

- Very major contribution where PAs support critical pillars of the national economy, e.g. tourism, water for agriculture etc.
- Substantial contribution in providing a safety net for more vulnerable households/individuals who move in and out of extreme poverty
- Little or no contribution where a PA (in its current form) presents major opportunity costs that exceed national benefits
- **Relatively low relevance to CARE versus national level intervention in other development sectors**

PA Conservation Activities and Poverty Reduction – Local Level

- 72 out of 88 GEF projects supporting PAs involved restricting resource use by local people. Only 40% of these made an attempt to address negative social impacts, and only 20% reported success (GEF Local Benefits Study)
- PAs have a crucial role in sustaining local livelihoods but
 - cases where government-managed and co-managed PAs make a substantial contribution to poverty reduction are relatively rare.
 - There is widespread problem of PAs creating poverty at local level
- High relevance to CARE if targeting specific groups of biodiversity-dependent communities/households/individuals:
 - Poorer/marginalised groups being impoverished by conservation activities (social equity/justice)
 - Poorer/marginalised groups with real opportunities for livelihood improvement (poverty reduction)
 - Poorer/marginalised groups whose livelihoods are highly dependent on biodiversity & related ecosystem services (building resilience)