Rule of law, stakeholder participation, and environmental management: Evidence from 143 Biosphere Reserves in 55 countries

Andreas Duit

Dept. of Political Science & Stockholm Resilience Centre Stockholm University andreas.duit@statsvet.su.se

Stockholm Resilience Centre Research for Governance of Social-Ecological Systems







"The stakeholder express"

- "Stakeholders" are increasingly seen as indispensible actors in policymaking in general and in environmental management in particular.
- Adaptive management and adaptive comanagement attribute a pivotal role to stakeholder participation in natural resource management.
- Stakeholder participation is good because:
 - 1) Legitimacy
 - 2) Conflict resolution
 - 3) Local knowledge
 - 4) Access to civil society networks (bridging organizations)

Two questions

1) Causes of stakeholder participation: Does rule of law facilitate stakeholder participation?

2) Effects of stakeholder participation: Does stakeholder participation lead to increased conservation performance?



World Network of Biosphere Reserves 2009



551 Man and the Biosphere (BR) areas in 107 countries (2009).

BRs are designated by UNESCO with the mission of "maintaining and developing ecological and cultural diversity and securing ecosystem services for human-wellbeing"

BRs are expected to fulfill three functions: 1. conserving biodiversity fostering sustainable social and economic development 3. supporting research, monitoring, and education.

Survey in 2008: 143 BR areas in 55 countries.

- Management practices - Patterns of stakehood participation

Coago	de raises (50 3100 - 150 3	100 Count	ry codes - codes de pays i	20 310
ARE-Uni	ted Arab Emirates, Emirats	BRAJ	Persanal	COD -
Arabes Ur	is, Emirates Arabes Unidos	BRA 4	Casting	Républ
ARE I	Markesh Bloaphere Reserve	BRAS	Central Amazon	Republ
ARG-AN	entina, Argentine, Argentina	BRAS	Espiritaco Ranpe	
	San Guillering	CAN - Car	ada, Canada, Canadá	COL
ARG2	Lanura Blanca	CANI	Mont Saint Hilaire	CO
ARG3	Costero del San		Waterton	COG -
ARGA			Long Polys	COI
ARGS		CAN4	Riding Mountain	COI
ARGE			Chartevolx	COL-
	Mar Chiquita	CANS	Nagara Escarprent	COL
	Delta de Parana	CAN 7	Clayopuct Sound	CO
ARG9			Lac Saint-Plane	CO
ARG 10	Laguna Oca de Rio Paraguay		Mount Arrowstabh	CO
	Las Yungas		Redberry Lake	CO
	Andino Norpacagonica		South West Nova	CRI-I
	Poregna Iracia	CAN 12	Thousand Islands-Frontenac Arch	CRI
NUS-Au	tralia, Australie, Australia	CANES	Georgian Bay Littoral	CRI
	Croaingolong	CAN 14		CR)
AUS 2	Kosciuszka		Manicocagan Uapishita	CUB-
AUS.3	Macquarie Island		tral African Republic, République	CUI
AUS4	Prince Regent River		ine, República Centroafricana	CUS
AUS5	RiverLand		Basse-Lobaye	CUE
AUS6 AUS7	Ukuni (Ayen Rock-Moure Olga)		Samingui-Bargoran	CUE
	Umaned		zerland, Suisse, Suiza	CUE
AUS 9	Yettong Fittperaid River	CHE I	Parc Suksa	CUE
AUS 10	Harran-Kullone & Marran-Kullone		Entleboch	CZE-
AUST	Wilson's Promotory		e, Chili, Chile	Repúbl
AUSIZ		CHLL	Fray Jorge	CZI
AUS 13			Juan Fernandez	CZE
AUS IA	Nocaa		Torres de Paine	CZE
AUS IS		CHL4	Laguna San Rafael	CZE
		OE.5	Laisea	C75

		the second se	- N.
ngo,	557.6	Catoria Secura y Las villas	
	ESP 7	Mariamas Idel Oldel	
	ESP 8	La Patria	
	552.9	Uedalbal	
	E57 10	Sierra Nexada	
	ESP 11	Cuenca Alta del Río Matzanares	GI
	ESP-12	Lanzanote	G
	552-13	Menorca	
	ESP 14	Sierra de las Nieves y su Entorno	
	ESP-15	Cabo de Gata-Nijar	GF
	ESP.16	ista de El Hierro	
	ESP 17	Bardenas Reales	
	ESP 18	Muniellos	G
	ESP 19	Somiedo	
	ESP 20	Redes	
a	ESP 21	Las Dohesas de Sierra Morena	2.67
4	ESP 22	Terras do Miho	
	ESP 23	Valle Laciana Gran Cantabrica	H
	ESP 24	Picos de Europa, Gran Cantabria	
	ESP 25	Monfragile	H
	ESP 24	Valle de lidera Leza, Cidacos y Alhana	
	ESP 27	Babia	
	ESP 28	Alto de Bernesga	
	ESP 29	Area de Allariz	
	ESP 30	Gran Canaria	
	859 31	Argizelica	ID
	ESP 32	Los Valles de Omaña y Luna	10
tque,	E5P.33	Sierra del Rincón	
	ESP 84	Las Sierras de Bejar y Francia	
	£5P.35	Los Ancanes Lisoneses	
	ESP-36	Los Ancares Lucences y Montes	
		de Cervaroes	

	GNR G	Intra-Bittan, Guini e Bittan,
	Guines-Bi	
10	GNB 1	Boloma Boagos
2	GRC - Gr	rece, Gréce, Grecia
		Gorge of Sanaria
		Mount Olympus
	GTM - G	atemala, Guatemala, Guatemala
	GTH1	
		Sierra de Las Minas
		induras, Honduras, Honduras
		Rio Pizano
		atis, Creatie, Creacia
		Velebit Mountain
		ingary, Hongrie, Hungria
10.010	HUNT	Aggreiek
		Hortobagy
	HUN3	Kishunsag Laire Ferto
	HUNK	
	IDN - Ind	cinesia, Indonésie, Indonesia Cinedat
		Cibodas Kornodo
		Lore Lindu
		Tariong Putin
	IDN 5	Gurung Leaser

KER43 Maind-Watanu KER45 Kulongi KER45 Ambotai KER45 Maint Egon KGZ – Kergyststan, Kerghiaista KGZ – Sary-Chele KGZ – Layk Kal KGZ – Layk Kal KH41 – Cambelai, Cambedge, Camboya KH41 – Torin Sap

HEX.21 Customs of Politering HEX.23 Haziko HEX.23 La Encruciada HEX.25 La Encruciada HEX.25 La Septemin HEX.25 Lo Sectors HEX.27 Los Nortas HEX.27 Los Nortas HEX.27 Los Nortas HEX.29 Hazinas de Camen HEX.29 Hazinas de Camen PER 3 Marcinste PHL - Philippines, Palippines, Falipinas PHL - Ranto Galera PHL - Palan, Palaos, Palas PLW - Palan, Palaos, Palas PLW - Palan, Palaos, Palas PCL - Nature Response, Polonia PCL - Bacha Gora PCL - Bacha Gora Televis TKM - Tark Disercial Sociaria TKM - Tark Minasch-Qensies Kas-Pelieire Wanado-Qensies Kas-Pelieire TKM - TKM - Tark Wanado - TKM - Tark Wanado - TKM - Tark Commenter Islands - TKM - Tark Darindity - TKM - Tark

nistan, Turkovénistan, USA 2 USA 2 tek USA 2 Tanisén, Tanez USA 2 oli Sou-Histra USA 2 oli Sou-Histra USA 3 oli Sou-Histra USA 3 Zembra et Zenbretta USA 3 RESERVAS DE BIOS TRANSFRONTERIZ TRANSFRONTERIZ BIOSPIERE RESERV BIOSPIERE RESERV RESERVES DE BIOS TRANSFRONTERES

Measuring stakeholder participation:

Four stakeholder categories:

- 1. Scientists
- 2. NGOs and volunteers.
- 3. Local nature administration
- 4. Local resource users and inhabitants

Two BR functions:

1. Decision making:

- 1. Representation in BR coordinating team
- 2. Representation in BR steering committee
- 3. Involvement in BR goal setting
- 4. Involved in designing BR projects

2. Implementation:

- 1. Involved in implementing projects or management measures
- 2. Involved in day-to-day management of ecosystems
- 3. Involved in monitoring changes in biodiversity or other changes in the BR ecosystem.

Measuring BR conservation effectiveness:

Normalized Difference Vegetation Index

(NDVI). Change in biomass index between 1996 and 2004 within BR areas (%). Satellite image data.

Self-assessed effectiveness in biodiversity conservation.

Survey data. Regression factor scores from BR managers' ratings of seven different aspects of BR performance.

Measuring rule of law

1.Property rights index. Legal protection of ownership rights 0 = lowest protection, 100 highest protection. (Heritage Foundation: data year 2002).

2.Political rights index. Associational and Organizational Rights, 0 (lowest) -12 (highest). Freedom House, data year 2005

Patterns of stakeholder participation



Rule of law and stakeholder participation: rates of participation in decicion making activities

	Scientists	NGOs	Locals	Local admin.
BR age	017	019	036***	018
BR size (log)	066	.112	029	.005
Pristine / cultural landscape	116	304	035	674**
HDI index	-2.307	254	-1.902*	566
Population density	001	.000	001	001
Property rights	.016	002	.014*	007
Political rights	108*	.091	037	081
Chi ²	10.57	15.28*	25.02**	24.02**
R^2	.07	.10	.15	.15

Table shows seemingly unrelated regression coefficients. p > .05 = *, p. > .01**, p. > .001 = ***. N = 136

Rule of law and stakeholder participation: rates of participation in implementation activities

	Scientists	NGOs	Locals	Local admin.
BR age	002	017	017	011
BR size (log)	040	.010	.004	078
Pristine / cultural landscape	075	354	240	537*
HDI index	.611	597	.214	506
Population density	.001	004	001	001
Property rights	.002	8.410	.003	001
Political rights	045	.105**	061*	013
Chi ²	4.73	19.77**	16.57*	8.72
R^2	.03	.12	.10	.06

Table shows seemingly unrelated regression coefficients. p > .05 = *, p. > .01**, p. > .001 = ***. N = 136

Rule of law: Summary

- Overall weak effect of rule of law on stakeholder participation
- Property rights seem to influence participation of locals in BR decision making procedures.
- Political rights have a positive effect on NGO participation in implementation activities, but a negative effect on the participation of scientists in decision making and locals in implementation.

Rule of law and stakeholder participation in BR decicion making: effects on conservation effectiveness

	NDVI change 1996- 2004 (%)	Self-assessement of BR managers
Scientists	103	.248**
NGOs	.116	228**
Locals	-692	.017
Local admin.	.845	028
BR age	047	.015
BR size (log)	778	007
Pristine / cultural landscape	-2.229	.384
HDI index	6.443	.995
Population density	015	009
Property rights	148*	008
Political rights	1.117**	.021
R ²	.21	.22
Ν	105	115

Table shows OLS regression coefficients. p > .05 = *, p. > .01**, p. > .001 = ***

Rule of law and stakeholder participation in BR implementation: effects on conservation effectiveness

	NDVI change 1996-2004 (%)	Self-assessement by BR managers
Scientists	-1.244*	.338***
NGOs	1.358	294**
Locals	1.759*	.053
Local admin.	.304	012
BR age	.012	.101
BR size (log)	860*	027
Pristine / cultural landscape	-1.848	.390
HDI index	7.982	103
Population density	012	001
Property rights	169**	002
Political rights	1.061**	.017
R ²	.27	.25
Ν	105	115

Table shows OLS regression coefficients. p > .05 = *, p. > .01**, p. > .001 = ***

Stakeholder participation and conservation effectiveness: summary

- No agreement between self-assessment and NDVI models.
- No effects of stakeholder participation in decision making on biomass change.
- Positive biomass change is associated with higher rates of local stakeholder participation in implementation, but also negatively linked to scientist's participation.
- Self-assessed conservation effectiveness is associated with a higher rate of scientist participation and a lower rate of NGO participation in both decision-making and implementation.

Conclusion

Does rule of law facilitate stakeholder participation?

- Probably not.

Does stakeholder participation lead to increased conservation performance?

 Yes, but the strongest effect are from participation of local stakeholders on the implementation side.