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Background on Peru

- 3rd largest country in South America (Approximately the size of Alaska)
- 84 life zones (Mega-diverse country)
- 28 million (72% urban and 28% rural population)
- Largest indigenous population in South America (12.6 million)
- Economy based on the use of natural resources: mining, fishing, tourism (ecotourism)
Tourism Activity in Protected Areas (PA)

- 36/77 PAs tourism activity
- Concentrated in 6 PA
- Generates 51% of the public funds for the system
- 45% of national tourism revenues
- $1.8 million SINANPE/$10 million PNR
- 38% growth in tourism (2010-2011)
Master Plans - Tourism Plans in PA

- By law, they should be developed with broad participatory processes
- They should promote conservation and sustainable development
- Should cover a 5 year timeframe (renewable)
- Should promote partnerships between organizations and local groups
- Should identify the opportunities of stakeholders and communities to engage in the activities (authorizations, concessions, contracts, agreements and permits)
Engaging Communities in PA

- Methodology to map stakeholders’ involvement through time
- Formation of Citizens’ Advisory Committee
- Tourism-site plans with the input of stakeholders
- Community ownership and support of the plan and its implementation “partners in conservation”
- Some tourism plans have not been fully implemented (communities are not engaged)
- Social science – understanding what participants want and how they perceived participatory processes.
Participants’ perception of the participatory processes

- Fairness of the process
  - Decisions
  - Inclusiveness
  - Information

- Competence of the process
  - Process
  - Knowledge

- Support and Ownership
  - Commitment
  - Good Plan
  - Support

- Network
  - Improve livelihood
  - Improve relationships

- Successful implementation of plan
  - Social, economical, conservation

- Participants’ actions
Participants’ Perception of the Participatory Processes

- Post-positivist research paradigm
- Two phase sequential mixed methods
  - Survey research (Qt)
  - Semi-structured interviews and archival data (QI)
- Contrasting cases
  - Different types of participatory processes (workshops, focus group, surveys)
  - Participants’ support of the plan
  - At least 2 years of implementation
  - Huascaran National Park and Yanachaga Chemillen National Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F1_Decisions</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F2_Inclusiveness</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F3_Information</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F4_Competence Process</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5_Competence Knowledge</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership and Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F6_Commitment</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F7_GoodPlan</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F8_Support</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F9_Improve Livelihood</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F10_Improve Relations</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F11_No Barrier Politics</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F12_No Barrier GovProcedures</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation (HNP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F13_Succ Conservation</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F14_Succ Social</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F15_Succ Econo</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison HNP vs YCHNP</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>HNP vs YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1_Decisions</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2_Inclusiveness</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3_Info</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4_Competence Process</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5_Competence Knowledge</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ownership and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F6_Commitment</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7_GoodPlan</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F8_Support</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Networking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F9_Livelihood</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F10_Improve Relations</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Barriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F11_No Barrier Politics</td>
<td>HNP &lt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F12_No Barrier GovProcedures</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Implementation (HNP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions</strong> (%)</td>
<td>HNP &gt; YCHNP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizens’ Perspectives

- F1_Decisions
- F2_Inclusiveness
- F3_Information
- F4_ComProcess
- F5_ComKnowledge

F7_GoodPlan

F8_SupportPlan

F9_Livelihood

- F13_Succ Conservation
- F14_Succ Social
- F15_Succ Econo
- Participants’ Actions

Adj R^2 = .23

Adj R^2 = .29

.19

(-)

(-)

(-)

.48
Agency Perspective

- **F1_Decisions**
- **F2_Inclusiveness**
- **F3.Information**
- **F4_ComProces**
- **F5_ComKnowledge**

**F7_GoodPlan**

- Adj $R^2 = .50$

**F8_SupportPlan**

**F9_Livelihood**

**F10_Improve Relations**

**F13_Succ Conservation**

**F14_Succ Social**

**F15_Succ Economic**

**Participants’ Actions**

- Adj $R^2 = .19$

- Adj $R^2 = .16$
Conclusions

- The perceptions and predictors are different for citizens and agency representatives.
- Fairness and competence are both important for citizens.
- Competence was more important for agency respondents.
- Models are different for citizens and agency respondents.
- The proposed model was partially supported (hard to develop a general model).
Key Things to Consider

- Laws and regulations that promote community engagement

- Thinking of ways to approach these two different groups during the participatory processes

- Procedures to ensure fair and competent processes

- Monitoring the impact of ecotourism planning and management on stakeholders’ perspectives (community and government) about the improvement on social, ecological and economic factors.