

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Decision-Making in
Conservation: A Model to
Improve the Allocation of
Resources amongst
National Parks

Abigail Jane Margaret Allan

2008

Decision-Making in Conservation: A Model to Improve the Allocation of Resources amongst National Parks

A dissertation presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Natural Resource Management

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand



Abigail Jane Margaret Allan

2008

ABSTRACT

Protected areas are of prime importance to conservation efforts worldwide because they provide society with a range of important environmental, economic, and social benefits. The ability of government agencies to manage threats to their national parks is often compromised by limited resources. There is a growing need to improve decisions about how resources are allocated amongst conservation responsibilities. Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) techniques are integrated decision systems that have the potential to reduce the complexity normally associated with decisions about public and quasi-public goods. The explicit expression of a decision-maker's preferences for certain decision attributes is a key stage in the MCA process. The ability of MCA to increase the understanding, transparency, and robustness of decisions has been demonstrated in many disciplines.

This research describes the development of a MCA model to assist decision-makers with the allocation of resources amongst national parks. After a thorough review of the conservation and protected area literature, a MCA model is developed to determine the utility of a group of national parks based upon environmental, economic, and social significance. The model is tested and applied to the national parks managed by the Parks and Wildlife Commission of the Northern Territory of Australia and to selected parks managed by the Department of Conservation of New Zealand.

The research highlights the need for protected area management agencies to take lessons from the commercial sector and incorporate elements of business practices, particularly comprehensive inventory and data management, into conservation decision-making. It is shown that the integrated decision-making approach taken in this research aggregates complex data in a way that improves managers' ability to make better informed decisions concerning the allocation and distribution of resources.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

Student name: Abigail Jane Margaret Allan

Student I.D.: 98007067

I declare that:

- This is an original thesis and is entirely my own work.
- Where I have made use of the ideas of other writers, I have acknowledged the source in every instance.
- Where I have used any diagrams or visuals I have acknowledged the source in every instance.
- This thesis will not be submitted as assessed work in any other academic course.

Student's signature:

Date:

For Mum and Dad

"One of the most valuable things that we as conservationists can contribute to effective park management is to set clear goals. However, although this is universally applicable, the fact that it is also universally ignored, confused or contradictory should sound warning bells."

- Brian Child (2004, p. 254)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful for the guidance of my supervisors, Associate Professor John Holland and Dr. Sarah Leberman.

I am thankful for the ongoing support of my parents, brother, and friends. Thank you Callum for sharing the journey, Ngaio for your unparalleled friendship, and Matt for your love and patience.

This thesis would not have been possible without the generous assistance of many individuals who shared their knowledge, resources, and time with me. I am indebted to the following for their assistance: Frank Vorhies, John Hanks, David Cumming, David Duthie, Julie Clark, Tony Leiman, Melissa Fourie, Glenn Phillips, Leo Braack, Helen Suich, Jane Turpie, Rob Little, Alexander Belokurov, Michanne van Rees, Kristen Schuyt, Peter Veit, Lee Thomas, Joshua Bishop, Eddie Gonzalez, David Smith, Lincoln Fishpool, Dixon Waruinge, Craig Beech, Esther Reilink, Theo Stevens, Anton Meister, Phil Murray, Matt Irwin, the staff of the Northern Territory Parks and Wildlife Commission, Ben Sparrow, Chris Day, Tony Bowland, Greg Leach, Jill Weighell, Chris Pavey, Ian Cowie, Dave Albrecht, Keith Saalfield, and Steve Eldridge. Thank you also to the staff of Beker Findlay Allan Ltd who suffered the presence of an academic in their office, Pete McGregor for assistance with proof-reading, and Denise Stewart for help with formatting and printing.

This research was funded by Massey University and the New Zealand Federation of Graduate Women.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Statement of Originality	iii
Acknowledgements	vii
Table of Contents.....	ix
List of Tables.....	xiii
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Equations.....	xviii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Problem Statement.....	2
1.2 Aim	3
1.3 Objectives.....	3
1.4 Limitations	3
1.5 Importance of the Research	4
1.6 Contribution to Knowledge	5
1.7 Definitions.....	6
1.8 Thesis Outline	7
BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH	9
2.1 Institutions for Conservation	9
2.1.1 Nature-Oriented Organisations	10
2.1.2 Protected Areas	13
2.1.3 Protected Area Management Agencies.....	17
2.2 The Role and Function of National Parks.....	23
2.2.1 Evolving Conservation Objectives.....	24
2.2.2 Economic Rationale	31
2.2.3 Failure to Fulfil Conservation Objectives.....	36
2.3 The Financial Crisis Facing State-Protected Areas	37
2.3.1 The Income Problem.....	38
2.3.2 The Expenditure Problem	48

2.4	Improving Resource Allocation Decisions	55
2.4.1	Decision Theory for the Public Sector.....	55
2.4.2	A Model to Support Resource Allocation Decisions.....	63
2.5	Conclusion	70
CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING NATIONAL PARKS.....		73
3.1	Natural Heritage Criteria	74
3.1.1	Landscape Level/Ecological Context.....	77
3.1.2	Ecosystem Level/Representativeness	87
3.1.3	Species Level/Rarity and Distinctiveness	90
3.1.4	Genetic Level.....	102
3.2	Economic Value Criteria.....	106
3.2.1	Economic Benefits	106
3.2.2	Economic Costs.....	118
3.3	Social Benefit Criteria.....	121
3.3.1	Spiritual Significance.....	126
3.3.2	Scientific Significance	126
3.3.3	Educational Significance.....	127
3.3.4	Significance for Recreation and Tourism	129
3.3.5	Cultural Significance	139
3.3.6	Scenic/Aesthetic Significance	142
3.3.7	Stakeholder Needs and Participation.....	144
3.3.8	Peace Parks	150
3.4	Threat Assessment Criteria.....	154
3.4.1	Selected Threats Facing National Parks.....	155
3.4.2	Threat Taxonomy.....	158
3.4.3	Measuring Individual Direct Threats	162
3.4.4	Combining Threats	164
3.5	Conclusion	167
SELECTING A DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK.....		169
4.1	Frameworks Developed to Identify Areas for Protected Area Designation	170

4.1.1	Frameworks Based On Species Criteria	172
4.1.2	Frameworks Based On Habitat Criteria.....	176
4.1.3	Frameworks Incorporating Economic and/or Social Criteria.....	182
4.2	Frameworks for Evaluating The Effectiveness Of Protected Area Management	190
4.3	Cost-Based Assessment	200
4.3.1	Cost Benefit Analysis	201
4.3.2	Cost Effectiveness Analysis	202
4.3.3	Cost Utility Analysis.....	203
4.3.4	Opportunity Cost Analysis	204
4.4	Multiple Criteria Decision-Making Frameworks	204
4.5	Framework Selection.....	212
4.6	Multiple Criteria Analysis	216
4.6.1	Components of A Multiple Criteria Analysis Decision.....	216
4.6.2	The Multiple Criteria Analysis Procedure	217
4.7	Conclusion.....	221
MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND RESULTS		223
5.1	Developing the MCA Model.....	223
5.1.1	Formal Objectives	224
5.1.2	Preference Elicitation	224
5.1.3	Choice of Software (Method and Model).....	227
5.1.4	Building the Model.....	231
5.1.5	Entering Levels	254
5.1.6	Choosing Weight Assessment Methods.....	255
5.1.7	Sensitivity Analysis.....	266
5.1.8	Pilot Study Design.....	267
5.2	Pilot Study A: The National Parks of the Northern Territory, Australia	268
5.2.1	Developing the Northern Territory Model	269
5.2.2	Analysis.....	286
5.2.3	Results	291
5.2.4	Assumptions and Limitations.....	296

5.3	Pilot Study B: The National Parks Of New Zealand	300
5.3.1	Developing the New Zealand Model	301
5.3.2	Analysis	310
5.3.3	Results.....	312
5.3.4	Assumptions and Limitations	316
5.4	Summary.....	317
DISCUSSION		319
6.1	Inadequate Data for Decision-Making	319
6.1.1	Data Quality and Performance Evaluation	321
6.1.2	Fiefdoms and Institutional Culture	325
6.2	Integrated Assessment and National Parks	327
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		333
7.1	Resource Allocation Decisions.....	334
7.2	Methods for Setting Conservation Priorities	335
7.3	Data Management and Protected Area Management Agencies	335
7.4	The Usefulness of the Multiple Criteria Analysis Approach.....	337
7.4.1	Benefits.....	337
7.4.2	Limitations.....	338
7.5	Recommendations	339
7.5.1	Data Collection and Management.....	339
7.5.2	Protected Area Management Planning	340
7.5.3	Resource Allocation Decisions	340
7.5.4	Further Research.....	341
REFERENCES		343
Appendix A: The Convention on Biological Diversity, Articles 7 and 8.....		381
Appendix B: Selected Park Management Agencies.....		385
Appendix C: Goal Hierarchy of the Northern Territory Model.....		415

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Selected Multilateral Environmental Agreements of Global Relevance.....	12
Table 2.2	IUCN Protected Area Categories and Their Management Objectives.....	16
Table 2.3	Characteristics of Protected Area Management in Selected Countries	22
Table 2.4	Traditional and Emerging Protected Area Paradigms	30
Table 2.5	The Roles of the IUCN's Six Commissions.....	31
Table 2.6	Classes and Characteristics of Goods	32
Table 2.7	Characteristics of Goods and Services Associated with Protected Areas.....	35
Table 2.8	Summary of Conservation Planning Procedures	51
Table 2.9	Comparing the Rational and Heuristic Approaches to Decision-Making.....	62
Table 2.10	Characteristics of Economic Values Associated with Protected Areas in Developed and Developing Countries.....	67
Table 2.11	Indicators Associated with National Parks in Accordance with the IUCN Guidelines.....	71
Table 3.1	Descriptive Categories for Park Size.....	79
Table 3.2	Park Shape Categories.....	82
Table 3.3	Landscape Configurations to Enhance Connectivity for Animal Populations at Different Spatial Scales.....	83
Table 3.4	Reported Advantages and Disadvantages of Linkages for Biodiversity Conservation	84
Table 3.5	Selected Field Survey Techniques for Fauna Inventory.....	92
Table 3.6	Characteristics of Selected Focal Species.....	98
Table 3.7	Summary of Potential Natural Heritage Criteria for Comparing National Parks.....	104
Table 3.8	Functions and Services of Natural and Semi-Natural Ecosystems.....	112
Table 3.9	Summary of Potential Economic Criteria for Comparing National Parks	122
Table 3.10	Intangible Attributes of Protected Areas as Defined by the WCPA Task Force on Non-Material Values.....	125
Table 3.11	Personal Benefits of Leisure	130

Table 3.12	Benefits to Society from an Individual's Leisure	131
Table 3.13	Summary of Visitor Monitoring Techniques	133
Table 3.14	Activity and Management Characteristics Associated with Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Classes in New Zealand's National Parks	134
Table 3.15	Scoring for Site Importance criteria used in the Visitor Service Levels Framework by Parks Victoria	138
Table 3.16	Definitions for Cultural Landscape Elements	141
Table 3.17	Descriptive Criteria for Amenity Value	144
Table 3.18	Participation Levels: Education, Advisory Committee and Co- management	148
Table 3.19	Selected Co-Management Models from Australia.....	149
Table 3.20	Summary of Potential Social Benefit Criteria for Comparing National Parks	152
Table 3.21	An Initial Taxonomy of Direct Threats.....	161
Table 3.22	Proposed Continuous and Categorical Measurements for Threat Variables	165
Table 4.1	Groups of Decision-Making Frameworks Reviewed in this Chapter	169
Table 4.2	Selected Species-Based Frameworks for Selecting Areas for Protected Area Designation.....	174
Table 4.3	Selected Habitat-Based Frameworks for Selecting Areas for Protected Area Designation.....	179
Table 4.4	Selected Frameworks for Selecting Areas for Protected Area Designation that incorporate Economic and/or Social Criteria.....	184
Table 4.5	Evaluation and the Protected Area Management Cycle	192
Table 4.6	Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems	194
Table 4.7	Example of a Simple Scoring System.....	195
Table 4.8	Frameworks for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Protected Area Management Developed by The Nature Conservancy and WWF	196
Table 4.9	Selected examples of MCDM Applications to Environmental Problems	209
Table 4.10	Characteristics of Decision-Making Frameworks	214
Table 5.1	Characteristics of Methods for Eliciting Preferences from Groups	226
Table 5.2	Characteristics of MCA Software Packages Designed for Discrete Choice Problems	229

Table 5.3	Selected Characteristics of Logical Decisions® for Windows™ Software	230
Table 5.4	Criteria that did not meet the Conditions for Inclusion in the Model	234
Table 5.5	Descriptive Levels for the Habitat Continuity Measure.....	239
Table 5.6	Importance Scores for Ecosystems based on Representation within the National Park Network.....	241
Table 5.7	Descriptive Levels for the Education Significance Measure.....	246
Table 5.8	Definitions for the Cultural Landscape Components Measure Categories	247
Table 5.9	Descriptive Levels for the Importance for Recreation Measure	248
Table 5.10	Descriptive Levels for Geological Features.....	249
Table 5.11	Categorical Measurements for Threat Scope and Severity.....	251
Table 5.12	Hypothetical Example showing Levels for the ‘Contribution to Ecosystem Representation’ Measure	254
Table 5.13	The Scale of Relative Importance	263
Table 5.14	The Absolute Weights Calculated for Each Preference Set.....	265
Table 5.15	Determining Category Multipliers for Ecosystems Represented with the National Parks of the Northern Territory	274
Table 5.16	Regional spending on Personnel and Operations in the 2004-2005 Financial Year.....	277
Table 5.17	Historical Worth Ratings for the Northern Territory National Parks	280
Table 5.18	Classification of Type 1 and Type 2 Northern Territory National Parks for Visitor Monitoring Purposes	282
Table 5.19	Feral Animals Occurring in Northern Territory National Parks	284
Table 5.20	Measure and Goal Weights with each Preference Set for the Northern Territory Model.....	289
Table 5.21	New Zealand National Park Data from other Publicly Available Sources	301
Table 5.22	New Zealand National Park Data from the National Park Management Plans.....	302
Table 5.23	Measure and Goal Weights with each Preference Set for the New Zealand Model.....	312

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Potential National Park Stakeholders	19
Figure 2.2	A Typical Planning Hierarchy for Protected Area Management Agencies.....	20
Figure 2.3	The Evolving Role of National Parks: From Isolation to Integration	25
Figure 2.4	Guidelines for the National Park Management Category.....	27
Figure 2.5	Categories of Economic Values Attributed to Environmental Assets (with examples from a Tropical Forest).....	34
Figure 2.6	Income Sources for Parks Victoria in 2006.....	47
Figure 2.7	The Rational Model of Decision Making	60
Figure 3.1	Biodiversity at Various Spatial Scales.....	76
Figure 3.2	Red Data List Threat Categories	96
Figure 3.3	RAPPAM Scorecard for Pressures and Threats.....	163
Figure 3.4	Rule-Based Procedure for Calculating Threat Magnitude.....	166
Figure 4.1	RAPPAM Scorecard for Biological Importance	199
Figure 4.2	Simple Classification of Multiple Criteria Decision Making Techniques.....	206
Figure 4.3	Choosing an Appropriate Framework for a Decision Problem	215
Figure 4.4	Overview of the Multiple Criteria Analysis Process.....	218
Figure 5.1	Simple Goal Hierarchy in Logical Decisions® for Windows™ showing Goals, Measures, and Measure Categories	232
Figure 5.2	The Decision Hierarchy of the Model Showing Measures with Measure Categories	237
Figure 5.3	Rule-Based Procedure for Calculating Threat Magnitude.....	251
Figure 5.4	Goal Hierarchy of the Multiple Criteria Analysis Model.....	253
Figure 5.5	Specifying the Most and Least Preferred Levels for the ‘Contribution to Ecosystem Representation’ Measure.....	255
Figure 5.6	Single-measure Utility Function for the ‘Fauna Species Present’ Measure	257
Figure 5.7	Default Linear Utilities for Labels on the ‘Importance for Recreation’ Measure	257
Figure 5.8	Modified Utilities for Labels on the ‘Stakeholder Participation’ Measure	257
Figure 5.9	Modified Utilities for Labels on the ‘Peaceful Relations’ Measure	258
Figure 5.10	The SMARTER Method for Weight Assessment	260

Figure 5.11	The SMART Method for Assessing Measure Weights	261
Figure 5.12	The SMART Method for Assessing Overall Goal Weights using Representative Measures	262
Figure 5.13	Pairwise Comparison using the Analytic Hierarchy Process for Weight Assessment.....	263
Figure 5.14	Assessment Matrix for Weight Assessment using the Analytic Hierarchy Process.....	264
Figure 5.15	Sensitivity Assessment showing the Utility Score for each Alternative resulting from the Different Weight Assessment Methods.....	267
Figure 5.16	Map showing the National Parks of the Northern Territory.....	271
Figure 5.17	Goal Hierarchy of the Northern Territory Model	287
Figure 5.18	Modified Utilities for Labels on the ‘Historical Worth’ Measure.....	288
Figure 5.19	Park Rankings with SMARTER Weight Assessment biased towards Natural Heritage Benefits	292
Figure 5.20	Park Rankings with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Natural Heritage Benefits.....	292
Figure 5.21	Park Rankings with SMARTER Weight Assessment biased towards Social Benefits	293
Figure 5.22	Park Rankings with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Social Benefits	293
Figure 5.23	Comparison of National Park Utility with Biased AHP Preference Weightings	294
Figure 5.24	Utilities for Selected Parks with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Natural Heritage Benefits.....	295
Figure 5.25	Utilities for the Selected Parks with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Social Benefits	296
Figure 5.26	Goal Hierarchy of the New Zealand Model	310
Figure 5.27	SMARTER Rankings for the ‘Maximise Social Benefits’ Secondary Goal in the New Zealand Model	311
Figure 5.28	Park Rankings with SMARTER Weight Assessment biased towards Natural Heritage Benefits	313
Figure 5.29	Park Rankings with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Natural Heritage Benefits.....	313
Figure 5.30	Park Rankings with SMARTER Weight Assessment biased towards Social Benefits	314
Figure 5.31	Park Rankings with AHP Weight Assessment biased towards Social Benefits	314
Figure 5.32	Comparison of National Park Utility under each Preference Set	315

Figure 5.33	Percentage and Effective Measure Weights with the Socially Biased AHP Preference Set	316
Figure 6.1	The Nature of Information.....	320
Figure 6.2	A Typology of Problems.....	328

LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation 3.1	The Simpson Index.....	101
Equation 3.2	The Shannon Index	101
Equation 5.1	Calculation of a National Park's Contribution to Ecosystem Representation using Measure Categories in Logical Decisions® for Windows™	241