WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

Event co-leaders:	Phil Franks and Dilys Roe
Time and date:	18 November 2014, 18:30 -20:00
Rapporteurs:	Dilys Roe
Presenters:	Phil Franks, Helen Schneider, Gaspard Abitsi and Neil Burgess

Convened by partners of the Social Assessment of Protected Areas (SAPA) Initiative, this capacity building event focused on assessment of the social impacts (benefits and costs) of PAs and in particular:

1. *Experience in simple, low cost methods to assess social impacts of PAs of all governance types that can be implemented by PA managers and their local partners*. Phil Franks of IIED provide a summary of the development of the SAPA Initiative over the last 5 years. He then presented an overview of the methodology for social assessment of PAs that has been developed which includes four key elements: the analytical framework, experimental design, the multi-stakeholder process and a tool-kit. Early results and experience from piloting of the assessment methodology at Ol Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya were then presented by Helen Schneider of Fauna and Flora International. Gaspard Abitsi of the Wildlife Conservation Society then contributed some experience from piloting at Monts De Cristal National Park in Gabon.

2. *Linkage of PA social assessment, governance assessment and management effectiveness evaluation*. Neil Burgess of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) present a study of how PA management effectiveness (PAME) evaluation tools address issues of social impact and governance showing that both are poorly addressed in terms of the way that key issues are defined and the process, i.e. relying on self assessment by PA managers. A modular approach was proposed whereby SAPA and governance assessment are used alongside PAME allowing PAME to focus on PA management and even possibly drop social and governance issues. Alternatively the governance and social elements of PAME need substantial strengthening.

A key issue raised in discussion was whether an approach like SAPA can be used in situations of conflict between local communities and PA management where there is not enough trust for a multi-stakeholder process to work.   SAPA is based on a "constructive engagement" rather than "name and shame" approach and therefore is probably not suitable for high conflict situations. A second key concern raised in discussion was social assessment may not capture lack of

recognition of rights of local people where there is no hope that such rights might be recognised.

Key emerging lessons:

- Most studies to assessment the social impact of PAs have used complex and costly methodologies which often require the studying control communities. While simpler, rapid methods such as SAPA are less rigorous in conventional scientific terms they can provide useful information that can enable PA managers to reduce negative and enhance positive social impacts.
- A multi-stakeholder process of assessment is key both in terms of accuracy (validating results) and credibility.
- The broad scope of impacts that the SAPA methodology explores can reveal important intangible impacts that are often missed – in the case of Ol Pejeta Conservancy the benefits for security and reduced human-wildlife conflict resulting from fencing along the PA boundary
- The coverage of social and governance issues in PA management effectiveness evaluation is very superficial and in most cases not meaningful or credible.

Exemplary case/s and other useful links:

Original presentations and report are available in the event's folder (see link in annexed "Repository of original Powerpoint presentations and Rapporteur reports").

Key recommendations:

1. Social assessment along with governance assessment should be recognised as both playing a crucial role in relation to assessment of equity in PA management (part of Aichi 11).
2. There is a need for closer integration of PA management effectiveness evaluation, social assessment and governance assessment through linkage of processes and nesting of indicators but not a single assessment tool.

The above key recommendations have direct/indirect links to the following final recommendations of the Stream:

Rec#	Title
1	Enhancing governance
2	Standards and guidance
11	CBD Guidance