

# Participatory Mapping Tool Review

## Public Engagement Tools

TABLES Project 2012: Mini reviews	
<b>Guidance</b>	Using your experience and expertise, consider the following tasks in relation to the tool. It may not be possible to complete all tasks for each tool due to a lack of available information, the task not applying to the tool, etc. <b>Please note where this is the case by writing in the reason in the space provided.</b> Please use a maximum of 6 pages of A4 (excluding diagrams and appendices). <b>Your responses are required in the white spaces.</b>
<b>Task 1: Basic information</b>	
<b>Name of the tool</b>	Participatory Mapping
<b>Type of tool (list all that apply)</b> <i>Learning and skills (pedagogic); participatory; regulatory; collaborative; mapping; valuation; modelling; decision; futures; financial; ecosystem services</i>	Participatory; mapping
<b>Group members</b>	1. Mark Everard 2.
<b>Please provide a brief synopsis of the tool</b>  <i>This may include: background context, development (and ownership if appropriate), current use and applications etc.</i>  <i>Please also note any desired outcomes of the tool so that you can make reference back to these in Task 7: SWOT analysis</i>	<p>Participatory mapping is an approach that has wide application in international development and in some other situations wherein consensus-building is sought to inform decisions. Given the spatially-explicit nature of ecosystem service ‘production’ and ‘consumption’, participatory mapping can be a helpful means to tease out relationships across landscapes and between stakeholder groups, and to promote common understanding of different perspectives, interdependencies and of potentially more mutually-beneficial management.</p> <p>In a developed world context, formalised maps may provide a logical baseline upon which different stakeholder groups can express their aspirations for, for example, clean water and air and access to green spaces, etc. However, in a developing world context, starting from a ‘clean sheet of paper’ is generally a more helpful way for stakeholders to articulate what they find important; the mapped output may not be strictly geo-referenced, but is generally a far clearer means to articulate the value systems of that community including, for example, access to safe water, woodland for fuel wood collection, routes to market, etc. This then promotes insight between stakeholder groups into what is important for other constituencies, and may form a basis when differed ‘value maps’ are integrated to reveal key ecosystem-mediated interdependencies between people that may have gone unrecognised.</p> <p>It is important that this process is stakeholder-driven rather than imposed by management, either in terms of asserting a particular form of map or framework for collective thinking. However, effective facilitation, essential to ensure trust-building and successful outcomes from participatory mapping, can also include probing communities about a wider palette of ecosystem services to elicit their views.</p> <p>Participatory mapping can this thus form a basis for shared understanding and</p>

collective planning and action to overcome former barriers and work towards a common, mutually-beneficial vision.

### Task 2: Use of the tool

Position / Use	Stage	Currently used	Could be used
<p><i>If you can, please indicate which stage(s) of the decision / policy making process your tool is / could be used in (these stages were identified in the specification document)</i></p>	Ideas	Participatory mapping is generally implemented mainly in a developing world context	Participatory mapping is generally implemented mainly in a developing world context, but has relevance elsewhere
	Survey	-	-
	Assess	Participatory mapping is a useful medium to assess different value systems and uses of ecosystems	Could be used to tease out more uses of ecosystems and interactions between stakeholder group aspirations
	Policy / decision	Real social engagement in policy and policy-related decisions is still largely top-down	However, there is wide recognition of the need to take a more participatory approach for which this mapping approach is helpful
	Implement	Some use in UK, though mainly in developing world	Opportunities to develop more consensual programmes
	Evaluate	Uncertain	Could be used as an adaptive management feedback loop

### Task 3: Existing literature about the tool

<p><b>Are you aware of any KEY policy and / or academic literature evaluating your tool?</b> <i>(e.g. reports, journal articles, books)</i></p>	Please add any further comments here:			
	Author & Date	Title	Vol pages	Web link (if available)
	There is a lot in the developing world context: I have yet to find some key references			

### Task 4: Your experience of working on the tool

<p><b>Have you done any research/consultancy work on this tool in terms of its development, testing and/or evaluation?</b></p>	<p>I have used participatory mapping when developing common understanding in catchments, including founding one Water User Association, between formerly racially divided groups in South Africa.</p>
--	---

<i>If so, please provide an outline.</i>	
<b>Guidance</b>	For Tasks 5-7, please also try to consider the <b>future</b> development and application of this tool in the TABLES project in your answers.

**Task 5: Incorporating the ecosystem approach (EA) and ecosystem services (ES)**  
*\*\*Please refer to the summary text about ES for concept clarification at the end of this template (appendix)\*\**

<b>Using examples (from practice, research or consultancy), explain how EA and/or ES are currently incorporated in/by the tool</b>  <i>If neither approach is currently incorporated, please move to the next question</i>	There is usually a central services to participatory approaches, generally good and/or water, though the approach is amenable for inclusion of wider services for example in terms of community planning.
--	---

<b>How <u>could</u> the ecosystem approach and/or ecosystem services be (further) incorporated within the existing tool?</b>	Yes it could, but introducing more interdependencies between stakeholder groups and the ecosystems they inhabit or use.
--	---

**Task 6: Situating the tool within priority questions/criteria arising from the scoping interviews**

<b>Explain how the tool can be situated within the priority questions/criteria that arose in the scoping interviews</b>  <i>Complete as many boxes as required</i>	<b>Priority question/criteria</b>	<b>Does your tool address/implement this question/criteria? Or does it have the potential if it was better integrated with an EA/ES approach? Please explain how.</b>
	<b>Language and communication</b>	
	1. Contribution to aiding the development of shared vocabulary within which principles of EA and ES can be shared with multiple stakeholders across built and/or natural environment	Participatory approaches can bring different groups of people together, and we have explicitly used an ecosystem services language in South Africa to achieve this
	2. Capacity of the tool to develop shared	Yes, this is the whole point of participatory mapping!

	understandings of the many identities and values of places from the perspectives of multiple visitors, residents and businesses		
	3. Capacity of the tool to improve or enable engagement across different publics so avoiding the usual suspect problem	Yes again, central to the participatory mapping approach	
	<b>Learning from experience/pedagogy</b>		
	4. Capacity of the tool to help reveal and value 'hidden' assets that are not recognised by communities or publics that use them	Participatory mapping can help reveal dependencies and interdependencies on common ecosystem resources	
	5. Extent to which tool is building on other tools or EA/ES progress	This tool could build on other approaches, such as 'Sustainable Livelihoods', 'Natural Capital Accounting', etc.	
	6. Extent to which tool is locally derived or grounded or can be adjusted to closely reflect 'local' context. Is the tool suitable for an open source approach?	The tool is entirely amenable to context-specific implementation	
	7. Extent to which the tool is open to interpretation and application in a variety of forms (that reflect 'cultural' differences)	The tool is entirely amenable to context-specific implementation	
	<b>Developing and selecting tools</b>		
	8. Is the tool	Requires confident facilitation to build trust	

	dependent on a specific funding source? How onerous is the application procedure? What are the chances of success?	
	9. Does skills development (essential or optional?) and support exist for the tool or is there a body to ensure the optimal and correct use of it?	There is a body of practice mainly in a developing world context
	10. Extent to which current statutory hooks can be exploited by the tool or will benefit the quality or application of the tool (e.g. NNPF's duty to cooperate, SUDS, ecol. networks)	Participatory mapping could be used to implement community-based planning, stakeholder dialogue around Water Framework Directive plans, etc.
<b>Informing resultant policies effectively</b>		
	11. Extent to which the tool informs or improves policies/decisions. What does the tool cover? (full range of positive and negative economic, social and environment impacts / tradeoffs?)	Application of the tools is as broad as the frame of reference in which it is applied
	12. How does the tool link into the planning system (applications and processes). At what cost / extra burden?	Not currently, but it is an ideal vehicle for fostering participation
<b>Delivering management objectives</b>		
	13. Suitability or capacity of the	If necessary, this can form part of the terms of reference amongst stakeholders

	<p>tool to assist with managing visitor needs and pressures within protected areas / the considered area? How?</p>			
	<b>Local ownership/new governance</b>			
	<p>14. To what extent can the tool assist in developing statutory plans (local and management plans) and improve ownership and use by publics?</p>	<p>Participatory mapping is an ideal vehicle for fostering participation and ownership</p>		
	<p>15. To what extent does/could the tool contribute to a new form of community governance in management of the environment?</p>	<p>Participatory mapping is an ideal vehicle for fostering participation</p>		
	<b>Improved tools: understanding flows, interconnections and spatial issues</b>			
	<p>16. Capacity to improve spatial understandings of the flows and interactions of various ecosystem services between sectors and at different scales</p>	<p>This mapping approach addresses links between stakeholder needs and aspirations and the ecosystems that support them, and also interactions between these ecosystem service dependencies between stakeholder groups</p>		
	<p>17. Capacity of the tool to reconcile assessments of options and benefits across different scales (and sectors)</p>	<p>Exposing interdependencies creates a dialogic space for conflict resolution and optimal planning</p>		
	<p>18. Extent to which the tools is capable or can be manipulated to work across sectoral and administrative</p>	<p>Participatory mapping facilitates cross-sectoral understanding and co-management</p>		

	boundaries		
	19. Extent to which the tool can handle data shortages and gaps (or is effectiveness considerably compromised?)	The tool is driven by user perceptions, so data gaps are not a substantive problem	
	20. To what extent has/could the tool put landscape/nature conservation and designated species/sites on the radar (positively or resulting in resentment?)	If this is a priority for some stakeholder groups, it will be a feature of ensuring dialogue	

Please add any further comments here:

### Task 7: A SWOT analysis of the tool

Referring back to the relevant policy and academic literature (listed in Task 3), plus your own expertise (listed in Task 4) and the way in which the tool is situated within the priority questions/criteria (listed in Task 6), please complete a summary SWOT analysis ensuring that each point is well justified

Where possible, this analysis should reflect the tool's past and current application, as well as its effectiveness in policy and decision making processes

#### Strengths (of the tool in delivering intended outcomes)

- An already established approach, amenable to use in a UK context
- Promotes social inclusion, participation and ownership
- Recognises ecosystem dependencies and stakeholder interdependencies
- Graphic representation overcomes linguistic and related barriers

#### Weaknesses (factors that detract from the tool's ability to deliver intended outcomes)

- Requires strong facilitation
- Is time-consuming
- Does not automatically produce outputs that inform plans

#### Opportunities (consider opportunities for application of the ecosystem approach and services)

- Can help implement the ecosystem approach into existing policy and planning mechanisms
- Can increase participation in existing as well as new tools

#### Threats (factors which negatively affect the tool and its outcomes)

Classify these by their "seriousness" and "probability of occurrence" in the table below, and pay particular attention to the threats associated with potential use of ecosystem approach/ecosystem services.

Threat	Seriousness (high, medium, low)	Probability of occurrence (high, medium, low)
Risks capture by those with narrow service interests	High	Medium
Poor facilitation can prejudice outcomes	High	Medium

Please add further comments here:

