

**Livelihood impacts of protected areas: a global analysis of  
assessments and methodologies**

**By Vanessa Anne Richardson**

**“A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master  
of Science and the Diploma of Imperial College London”**

**September 2008**

## Abstract

A global debate, with little reliable evidence on either side, has ensued as to whether overall protected areas (PAs) are 'good' or 'bad' for local communities. The need to link protected areas to the benefit for local people and appropriately assess their contribution to livelihoods has been widely recognised by the international community. However there is a lack of a universal, systematic approach or toolbox for measuring the effects of protected areas on local livelihoods. This study has been commissioned by the UNEP-WCMC workshop (15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> May 2008) which aims to *Review Approaches, Methodologies and Tools for Social Assessment of Protected Areas*. The characteristics of protected areas which have carried out livelihoods assessments and the types of methodologies that have been applied globally were examined through a global survey of protected area managers and scientists (in both English and Portuguese) and a qualitative review of peer reviewed and grey literature.

A total of 182 PAs revealed that livelihood assessments were significantly conducted more often in those that had component for one in their management plan (Chi-sq=61.417 P=0.0001). Moreover PAs were more likely to conduct an assessment if; they were found in Africa and Oceania (Chi-sq=34.068 P=0.0001) to be in countries of low or middle low World Bank Economy groups (Chi-sq=34.257 P=0.0001), had an area smaller than 100 000km<sup>2</sup> (Chi-sq= 8.033 P=0.045) and were established before 1970 or between 1990 and 1999 (Chi-sq= 10.986 P=0.012). There were no correlations with IUCN category or governance regime. Significantly fewer Portuguese responses had conducted livelihood assessments or had a component in their management plan for one (Chi-sq=23.58 P=0.0001) than responses from the English version.

All data presented suggest that there is a vast gap in both methodologies, their application on the ground, and in the literature to improve scientific rigour of assessments and essentially to improve objectivity and sensitivity in data collection methods. The great majority of assessments both as methodologies, on the ground and in the literature were created and applied by International NGOs or academics, produced qualitative data and made limited attempts to use any controls. There is great need to increase transparency, reduce bias and disseminate methodologies to valid stakeholders. Potential innovations could arise from adapting social impact assessment tools and engaging with other fields of research such as political ecology, environmental economics, anthropology and sociology.

## **Acknowledgments**

Thanks must go to everyone at UNEP-WCMC for providing me with logistics, and helpful comments and for giving me the opportunity to participate in the UNEP-WCMC May 15<sup>th</sup> Workshop, particularly Alison Campbell, Colleen Corrigan, Matt Walpole, and Charles Bescacon. I would also like to express gratitude to all those participants of the workshop for their expert advice and contributions, in particular David Wilkie, Phil Franks, Kwaw Andam and Dilys Roe.

A very special thank you must go to all my supervisors: Professor E.J. Milner-Gulland for all her input, invaluable advice and comprehensive reviewing of the drafts. Neil Burgess: especially in adapting the characteristics table and his email forwards that always contained such useful and interesting documents. Enormous thanks must go however to Dr. Lauren Coad: for initiating the project and taking me on board. Moreover for always being on hand to provide precious practical guidance, support and entertainment in the office!

I am very grateful to my family for their kindness and support all the way from Brazil, especially in their time spent proof reading my Portuguese. Lastly, I am very grateful to all those conservation practitioners and protected area management staff that kindly responded to the survey, and took an interest in the project.

## Table of Contents:

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 The potential costs and benefits of protected areas.....	4
2.2 Debating the importance and complexity of the tradeoffs between conservation and poverty.....	5
2.3 The international community: current legislation and initiatives.....	7
<b>2.4 The major challenges with assessing livelihood impacts .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.5 Tools and frameworks used to define livelihoods and human wellbeing .....	12
2.51 Livelihood frameworks .....	12
2.52 Social impact frameworks .....	14
2.53 Indicators and indices.....	14
<b>3. RESEARCH METHODS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 The current methodologies for assessing the costs and benefits of protected areas.....	16
3.11 Identifying the methodologies .....	16
3.12 Characterising the methodologies and their users.....	17
3.13 The checklist .....	17
3.2 A Global Survey.....	18
3.21 Contacts and logistics .....	18
3.22 Designing the email questionnaire (English version).....	19
3.23 Email questionnaire (Portuguese version) .....	19
3.24 Designing the online survey (English version) .....	20
3.25 Designing the online survey (Portuguese version) .....	21
3.3 Reviewing the published literature with case studies.....	21
3.31 Choosing the case studies .....	21
3.32 Gathering data.....	21
3.4 Combining survey data with WDPA protected area information.....	23
3.5 Some methodology criteria definitions .....	23
3.6 Statistical analyses.....	24
<b>4. RESULTS: REVIEWING THE METHODOLOGIES.....</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1 Potential users .....	25
4.2 Forms and Sources of data .....	27
4.3 Methodologies that assess livelihood impacts of protected areas .....	28
4.4 Characterising the methodologies .....	33
<b>5. RESULTS: THE GLOBAL SURVEY .....</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1 The email questionnaire.....	37
5.11 To what extent have livelihood assessments been carried out in PAs? .....	37
5.12 What sorts of PAs conduct livelihood assessments?.....	37
5.13 To what extent are livelihood assessments institutionalised in PA management plans? .....	44
5.14 What sorts of PAs have livelihood components as part of their management plans?.....	44
5.15 Portuguese versus English responses.....	47
5.2 The online survey .....	47

5.21	Motivations behind conducting assessments and their design.....	49
5.22	Scope and sensitivity .....	50
<b>6.</b>	<b>RESULTS: THE CASE STUDIES .....</b>	<b>52</b>
6.1	How do the case studies compare to the online survey responses? .....	52
6.2	Why and how were case studies published?.....	56
6.3	Methodology details.....	58
<b>7.</b>	<b>DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>59</b>
7.1	Strengths and weaknesses of current methodologies that assess livelihood impacts of PAs.....	59
7.2	The extent of livelihood assessment application on the ground .....	62
7.3	The way forward.....	64
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>67</b>
	<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>72</b>
	Appendix A.....	73
	Appendix B.....	74
	Appendix C.....	76
	Appendix D.....	77
	Appendix E .....	79
	Appendix F .....	82
	Appendix G.....	84
	Appendix H.....	85

## Index of Figures

Figure 1.	DFID Sustainable Livelihood Framework .....	13
Figure 2.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by IUCN category.....	39
Figure 3.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by IUCN governance regime.....	40
Figure 4.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by UN World Region.....	41
Figure 5.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by PA country of origins World Bank economy groups. ....	42
Figure 6.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by PA area in km <sup>2</sup> . ....	42
Figure 7.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not by PA data of establishment.....	43
Figure 8.	Graph of the number of PAs that conducted livelihood assessments and those that did not and if this was part of their management plan. ....	44
Figure 9.	Graph of the percent of case studies that based their methodologies on existing frameworks or other methodologies.....	53

Figure 10. Graph of the percent of case studies that had results that were used to influence PA management. ....	53
Figure 11. Graph of the percent of case studies that looked at positive and negative PA impacts on livelihood.....	54
Figure 12. Graph of the percent of case studies that analysed PA impacts by the various livelihood components..	54
Figure 13. Graph of the percent of case studies that analysed PA impacts by different population characteristics.	55
Figure 14. Graph of the percent of case studies that used participatory techniques, environmental economics or interviews to collect data. ....	55
Figure 15. Graph of the percent of case studies and online survey respondents by the various types of data collectors. ....	56

## Index of Tables

Table 1. Potential users of methodologies that assess livelihood impacts of protected areas.....	25
Table 2. Summary of the strengths and weaknesses of seven frameworks that assess livelihood impacts of protected areas. ....	28
Table 3. The checklist of characteristics and criteria that differentiate methodologies. ....	32
Table 4. Summary of Chi-square tests related to the likelihood of conducting a livelihood assessment in PAs by different variables. ....	38
Table 5. The proportion of PAs from the email questionnaire by IUCN category. ....	38
Table 6. Summary of Chi-square tests related to the likelihood of having a component for livelihood assessments in PA management plans by different variables.....	45
Table 7. The Online Survey questions and number of responses. ....	47
Table 8. Case study publishers and data output forms (numbers of case studies and percentages). ....	57

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

<b>ADB</b>	Asian Development Bank
<b>AMAP</b>	Accelerated Micro enterprise Advancement Project)
<b>AWF</b>	African Wildlife Foundation
<b>CBD</b>	Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>CCF</b>	Cambridge Conservation Forum
<b>CEESP</b>	Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
<b>CGIAR</b>	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
<b>CI</b>	Conservation International
<b>CIESIN</b>	Centre for International Earth Science Information Network
<b>CIFOR</b>	Centre for International forestry Research
<b>CMP</b>	Conservation Measures Partnership
<b>CORALI</b>	Sustainable Livelihood Enhancement and Diversification through Coral Reefs and Livelihoods initiative
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development (UK)
<b>DFID</b>	SLF Department for International Development (UK) Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
<b>EF</b>	Ecological Footprint
<b>EPI</b>	Environmental Performance Index
<b>ESI</b>	Environmental Sustainability Index
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
<b>FFI</b>	Fauna and Flora International
<b>GCRMN</b>	Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network
<b>GDI</b>	Gender-Related Development Index
<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>GEM</b>	Gender Empowerment Measure
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System
<b>HDI</b>	Human Development Index
<b>HPI</b>	Human Poverty Index
<b>IAIA</b>	International Association for Impact Assessment
<b>IBA</b>	Important Bird Area
<b>ICDP</b>	Integrated Conservation Development Programmes/Projects
<b>ICRAN</b>	International Coral Reef Action Network
<b>IGCP</b>	International Gorilla Conservation Programme
<b>IIED</b>	International Institute for Environment and Development
<b>IISD</b>	International Institute for Sustainable Development
<b>IUCN</b>	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (World Conservation Union)
<b>LLMA</b>	Locally-Managed Marine Area
<b>LSMS</b>	Living Standards Measurement Study
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>MEA</b>	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
<b>MPA</b>	Marine Protected Area
<b>NGO</b>	Non Government Organisation
<b>NOAA</b>	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
<b>ODI</b>	Overseas Development Institute
<b>OECD DAC</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>PA</b>	Protected Area
<b>PAEL</b>	Protected Areas, Equity and Livelihoods Task Force
<b>PCLG</b>	Poverty and Conservation Learning Group
<b>PEP</b>	Poverty Environment Partnership
<b>PoW on PA</b>	Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD)
<b>PPA</b>	Participatory Poverty Assessment
<b>PPP</b>	Purchasing Power Parity
<b>PRSP</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
<b>PSIA</b>	Poverty and Social Impact Assessment

<b>RLS</b>	Rural Livelihood systems
<b>SEAGA</b>	Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis
<b>SIA</b>	Social Impact Assessment
<b>SIE</b>	Social Impact Evaluation
<b>TILCEPA</b>	Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas
<b>TNC</b>	The Nature Conservancy
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNEP-WCMC</b>	United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation
<b>UNFCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>WB</b>	World Bank
<b>WCC</b>	World Conservation Congress
<b>WCPA</b>	World Commission on Protected Areas
<b>WCS</b>	Wildlife Conservation Society
<b>WDPA</b>	World Database on Protected Areas
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization
<b>WPC</b>	World Parks Congress
<b>WRI</b>	World Resources Institute
<b>WWF</b>	World Wide Fund for Nature