



**HAL**  
open science

## Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socioal-ecological approach

G. S. Cumming, Craig Allen, Natalie Ban, Duan Biggs, Harry C. Biggs, David H.M. Cumming, Alta de Vos, Graham Epstein, Michel Etienne, Kristine Maciejewski, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

G. S. Cumming, Craig Allen, Natalie Ban, Duan Biggs, Harry C. Biggs, et al.. Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socioal-ecological approach. *Ecological Applications*, 2015, 25 (2), pp.299-319. 10.1890/13-2113.1 . hal-01134583v2

**HAL Id: hal-01134583**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01134583v2>**

Submitted on 22 Sep 2015

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



# ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

*Ecology/Ecological Monographs/Ecological Applications*

## PREPRINT

This preprint is a PDF of a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in an ESA journal. It is the final version that was uploaded and approved by the author(s). While the paper has been through the usual rigorous peer review process of ESA journals, it has not been copy-edited, nor have the graphics and tables been modified for final publication. Also note that the paper may refer to online Appendices and/or Supplements that are not yet available. We have posted this preliminary version of the manuscript online in the interest of making the scientific findings available for distribution and citation as quickly as possible following acceptance. However, readers should be aware that the final, published version will look different from this version and may also have some differences in content.

The doi for this manuscript and the correct format for citing the paper are given at the top of the online (html) abstract.

Once the final published version of this paper is posted online, it will replace the preliminary version at the specified doi.

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A., Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015). Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socioal-ecological approach. *Ecological*

1 UNDERSTANDING PROTECTED AREA RESILIENCE: A MULTI-SCALE,  
2 SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL APPROACH

3  
4 GRAEME S. CUMMING<sup>1</sup>, CRAIG R. ALLEN<sup>2</sup>, NATALIE C. BAN<sup>3</sup>, DUAN BIGGS<sup>4</sup>, HARRY C. BIGGS<sup>5</sup>,  
5 DAVID H. M. CUMMING<sup>1</sup>, ALTA DE VOS<sup>1</sup>, GRAHAM EPSTEIN<sup>6</sup>, MICHEL ETIENNE<sup>7</sup>, KRISTINE  
6 MACIEJEWSKI<sup>1</sup>, RAPHAËL MATHEVET<sup>8</sup>, CHRISTINE MOORE<sup>1</sup>, MATEJA NENADOVIC<sup>9</sup>, MICHAEL  
7 SCHOON<sup>10</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup> Percy FitzPatrick Institute, DST/NRF Centre of Excellence, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, Cape Town  
10 7701, South Africa. E-mail [graeme.cumming@uct.ac.za](mailto:graeme.cumming@uct.ac.za)

11 <sup>2</sup>U.S. Geological Survey, Nebraska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, School of Natural Resources,  
12 University of Nebraska – Lincoln, 68583

13 <sup>3</sup>School of Environmental Studies, University of Victoria, PO Box 1700 STN CSC, Victoria BC V8W 2Y2, Canada

14 <sup>4</sup>Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, Centre for Biodiversity and  
15 Conservation Science, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

16 <sup>5</sup>Conservation Services Division, South African National Parks, Private Bag X402, Skukuza 1350, South Africa

17 <sup>6</sup>The Vincent and Elinor Ostrom Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, 513 North  
18 Park Ave, Bloomington, IN, 47408, USA

19 <sup>7</sup>INRA Ecodevelopment Unit, Site Agroparc 84914, Avignon Cedex 9, France

20 <sup>8</sup>UMR 5175 Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, CNRS, 1919 route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier Cedex  
21 5, France

22 <sup>9</sup>Duke University Marine Laboratory, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University  
23 135 Duke Marine Lab Rd, Beaufort, NC 28516, USA

24 <sup>10</sup>School of Sustainability, Arizona State University, PO Box 875502, Tempe, AZ 85257, USA  
25

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

26 *Abstract.* Protected Areas (PAs) remain central to the conservation of biodiversity. Classical PAs  
 27 were conceived as areas that would be set aside to maintain a natural state with minimal human  
 28 influence. However, global environmental change and growing cross-scale anthropogenic  
 29 influences mean that PAs can no longer be thought of as ‘ecological islands’ that function  
 30 independently of the broader social-ecological system in which they are located. For PAs to be  
 31 resilient (and to contribute to broader social-ecological resilience) they must be able to adapt to  
 32 changing social and ecological conditions over time in a way that supports the long-term  
 33 persistence of populations, communities, and ecosystems of conservation concern. We extend  
 34 Ostrom’s social-ecological systems framework to consider the long-term persistence of PAs, as a  
 35 form of land-use embedded in social-ecological systems, with important cross-scale feedbacks.  
 36 Most notably we highlight the cross-scale influences and feedbacks on PAs that exist from the  
 37 local to the global scale, contextualizing PAs within multi-scale social-ecological ‘functional  
 38 landscapes’. Such functional landscapes are integral to understand and manage individual PAs  
 39 for long-term sustainability. We illustrate our conceptual contribution with three case studies that  
 40 highlight cross-scale feedbacks and social-ecological interactions in the functioning of PAs and  
 41 in relation to regional resilience. Our analysis suggests that while ecological, economic and  
 42 social processes are often directly relevant to PAs at finer scales, at broader scales the dominant  
 43 processes that shape and alter PA resilience are primarily social and economic.

44

45 Key words: conservation, cross-scale, resilience, social-ecological system, national park, reserve,  
 46 spatial resilience

47

48

49 INTRODUCTION

50 Protected areas (PAs) remain one of conservation biology’s most important approaches for  
 51 ensuring that representative examples of ecological populations, communities, and ecosystems  
 52 are maintained for current and future generations. Historically, most PAs were created as places  
 53 that would remain ‘natural’ (Brandon et al. 1998). Over time, as the original focus of  
 54 conservation biology on rare and endangered species has expanded into a more general  
 55 awareness of the relevance of ecosystems (and the services they provide) for human wellbeing,  
 56 our understanding of PAs and their objectives has changed. PAs now range from strict PAs, in  
 57 which no harvesting of fauna or flora occurs and human visitation is restricted, to multiple use  
 58 areas in which sustainable use of natural resources is the norm (Table 1; Dudley (2008)). PAs  
 59 can no longer be viewed as purely ecological islands (Janzen 1983). Instead, as we come to  
 60 better understand (1) the driving roles of regional processes (i.e., those that occur over broader  
 61 extents than most PAs) in the composition of ecological communities and their spatial and  
 62 temporal population dynamics; (2) the complex political and economic influences that underpin  
 63 PA establishment and maintenance; (3) the role of PAs as providers of benefits for local  
 64 communities and society within a broader landscape context; and (4) the potential costs of PAs,  
 65 including opportunity costs, it is becoming increasingly clear that PAs are social-ecological  
 66 systems that both respond to and influence a wide range of ecological, social, and political  
 67 processes.

68  
 69 TABLE 1 HERE

70

Version preprint

71 PAs are human constructs in which institutions are used to try to achieve ecological and social  
 72 goals. Human activities in most PAs are limited so that recognized natural, ecological and/or  
 73 cultural values for some social groups are maintained (Table 1; Dudley 2008). In order to meet  
 74 ecological goals, conservationists have strived to influence PA location, pattern, management  
 75 and governance. The creation of state-owned or public conservation areas is usually driven by  
 76 the ecological consciousness and political will of the participants (Mathevet and Mauchamp  
 77 2005) but must also confront a variety of ecological and political constraints. Defining the formal  
 78 boundaries of protected areas is impossible without support from external institutions such as  
 79 national and international policies, laws, and agreements. This means that the creation and  
 80 maintenance of PAs is heavily dependent on their compatibility with institutions in the broader  
 81 social and economic system. Each PA has social and ecosystem characteristics, often including  
 82 stated management goals, that influence (and are influenced by) governance, affecting economic  
 83 outputs and social outcomes in the social-ecological system (Ostrom 2009).

84  
 85 PAs are vulnerable to political change (Agrawal 2005, Clement 2010), economic fluctuations,  
 86 and ecological change. Understanding what makes PAs resilient to both ecological and  
 87 socioeconomic change is therefore important for conservation. We view resilience as being  
 88 comprised of (1) the ability of a system to remain within the same regime (system state  
 89 characterized by key processes) following a perturbation; and (2) the capacity of a system to  
 90 adapt to change and persist through times of change (Carpenter et al. 2001, Lundy and  
 91 Montgomery 2010). Resilience may also be viewed as the maintenance by a system of a  
 92 continuous identity in space and time (Cumming and Collier 2005). Resilience itself is not a  
 93 normative concept, and the resilience of some social-ecological states (e.g., poverty traps) may

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

94 be negative from a conservation perspective; we focus here on ‘positive’ resilience, in the sense  
 95 of resilience that helps PAs to achieve conservation goals. PAs must change and adapt to  
 96 changing environmental conditions through time (Lee and Jetz 2008), while seeking to maintain  
 97 their cultural and social roles as important elements of their identity. The core of their identity,  
 98 however, lies in the fact that they support, or at least are intended to support, the long-term  
 99 persistence of populations, species and communities of a wide range of organisms, as well as  
 100 related abiotic ecosystem elements and processes (Jax 2010) and ecosystem services. If PAs are  
 101 to be resilient in social, economic and ecological terms, their physical location and boundaries,  
 102 as well as their management and governance, must be politically viable well into the future  
 103 (Folke et al. 1996, Adger et al. 2005) lest they become ‘paper parks’, are made smaller (e.g., the  
 104 extent of Etosha National Park, in Namibia, is currently about a quarter of what it was in 1907),  
 105 or are de-gazetted altogether. Management of decision-making processes is therefore at least as  
 106 important for PA resilience as management of the biophysical system, suggesting that  
 107 conservation science is necessarily interdisciplinary (Mathevet and Mauchamp 2005).  
 108 Furthermore, PAs influence the regions in which they are embedded, and are in turn influenced  
 109 by the broader context of those regions. Clearly, the maintenance and possibly enhancement of  
 110 PA resilience – in a social-ecological context – is a key goal for conservation biology.

111  
 112 The social-ecological nature of PAs has already received considerable recognition within both  
 113 the peer-reviewed literature and cutting-edge conservation practice (Berkes et al. 2003, Fischer et  
 114 al. 2009, Strickland-Munro et al. 2010, Ban et al. 2013). Despite the existence of a solid body of  
 115 inter- and trans-disciplinary work on PAs, however, many gaps remain. Here we focus on three  
 116 particular areas that require further development: (1) the relationships between a social-

117 ecological perspective on PAs and research from other fields on social-ecological systems and  
 118 their resilience; (2) scale and the analysis of cross-scale influences and feedbacks on PAs; and  
 119 (3) assessment of the resilience of PAs. Although many scholars have also argued for greater  
 120 attention to issues of power in studies of environmental governance (Blaikie 2006, Jentoft 2007,  
 121 Clement and Amezaga 2013), we do not explicitly focus on this topic in this paper. Nonetheless  
 122 the close relationship between power and the rules, norms and conventions (i.e., institutions) of  
 123 human societies means that power is rarely far removed from the discussion.

124

125 **PAS AND SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS FRAMEWORKS**

126 The study of social-ecological systems (SESs) has led to a wide range of frameworks, theories  
 127 and models that aim to structure inquiry and explain or predict the dynamic outputs of complex  
 128 adaptive systems. We use ‘system’ to refer to a cohesive, temporally continuous entity that  
 129 consists of key elements, interactions, and a local environment (Cumming and Collier 2005).  
 130 SESs are systems that include social, economic and ecological elements as well as the  
 131 interactions between them. The concept of an SES is useful for PA management because it  
 132 explicitly implies that the manager, other stakeholders, and related institutions are part of a  
 133 cohesive whole, the system. This in turn suggests that approaches that incorporate these  
 134 elements into dynamic models of system interactions - rather than treating them as immutable  
 135 external influences on ecosystems - may identify opportunities to enhance the resilience of  
 136 systems that would otherwise be overlooked. Moreover, PAs do not exist in a vacuum and  
 137 interact with, contain, and/or are nested within other SESs.

138 Frameworks are underlying sets of ideas that serve to connect and make sense of different  
 139 concepts (Pickett et al. 2007). They are used to aid the investigation of complex phenomena by



140 identifying, organizing and simplifying relevant factors, and are generally compatible with  
 141 multiple theories and models (Pickett et al. 2007, Schlager 2007, McGinnis 2011). Frameworks  
 142 that have been explicitly developed for understanding social-ecological systems include,  
 143 amongst many others, resilience (Holling 1973, Resilience Alliance 2007a, b), robustness  
 144 (Anderies et al. 2004), vulnerability (Turner et al. 2003, Adger 2006), Self-organized Holarchic  
 145 Open systems (SOHO) (Kay and Boyle 2008, Waltner-Toews et al. 2008), and sustainability  
 146 science (Kates et al. 2001). All of these approaches have the potential to provide a unified  
 147 approach for the study of SESs across multiple methods and disciplines (Ostrom 2007, 2009,  
 148 Poteete et al. 2010); and all are potentially relevant as a platform to better understand the  
 149 dynamics of PAs. Different frameworks have, however, tended to focus on different elements of  
 150 the same problem, and no single existing framework can be considered fully comprehensive  
 151 (Cumming 2011 pp. 37-40). In the context of PAs there is a strong need to bring key ideas from  
 152 different frameworks together into a more comprehensive body of theory.

153  
 154 We propose an approach that combines elements of resilience analysis (e.g., Holling 1973,  
 155 Resilience Alliance 2007b) and the closely related SES framework of Ostrom (2007, 2009),  
 156 while extending them in several directions. Before we consider how these frameworks can be  
 157 applied to PAs, a brief summary of each set of ideas and their main strengths and weaknesses is  
 158 necessary.

159  
 160 The Resilience Alliance workbooks (Resilience Alliance 2007a, b, 2010) attempt to  
 161 operationalize key resilience concepts by posing a series of questions to strategically define and  
 162 assess SESs. Within this broader framework, a nested framework (adapted from Chapin et al.

163 (2006)) offers a protocol to structure interacting, cross-scale social-ecological components,  
 164 processes, institutions, and feedbacks. The workbooks use the adaptive cycle and panarchy  
 165 models (Kenward et al. 2001, Gunderson and Holling 2002), and the adaptive governance and  
 166 social-network literatures, to facilitate an understanding of system dynamics and interactions,  
 167 assess governance and offer insights about potential actions. What they lack in a unified  
 168 underpinning theory (Cumming 2011) is compensated for by their firm grounding in a rich  
 169 empirical literature spanning many case-studies and multiple disciplines (reviewed in Haider et  
 170 al. (2012)). In providing a practical way to structure multiple resilience perspectives in complex,  
 171 dynamic SESs, the framework offers an approach to understand issues of scale in SESs,  
 172 including PAs, and proposes a novel approach to natural resource management (Walker et al.  
 173 2009, Strickland-Munro et al. 2010, Haider et al. 2012).

174  
 175 The resilience approach has, however, been criticized for being difficult to operationalize  
 176 (Strickland-Munro et al. 2010, Cumming 2011, Holt et al. 2012). Practical problems in applying  
 177 resilience thinking have resulted in a relatively low number of directly comparable case-study  
 178 examples. Practitioners have also lamented its lack of guidance for delineating system  
 179 boundaries, developing tools to navigate a transition to desirable futures, and describing  
 180 governance structures (Strickland-Munro et al. 2010, Haider et al. 2012, Holt et al. 2012). These  
 181 criticisms are particularly relevant for PAs, where implicit geographic or ecologically-relevant  
 182 boundaries (e.g., catchment edges) may not line up with PA boundaries (Mitchell 2011), and  
 183 where identifying social thresholds and variables, articulating governance choices and  
 184 incorporating relations of power (Strickland-Munro et al. 2010, Armitage et al. 2012) may be  
 185 particularly important in defining elements that may contribute to or erode a system's resilience

186 (Walker et al. 2009).

187

188 Ostrom’s SES framework (Figure 1) provides a useful complement to resilience approaches. It  
 189 has its origins in institutional studies of the commons that made significant contributions towards  
 190 a game theoretic understanding of environmental governance (Ostrom 1990, Ostrom et al. 1994).  
 191 It provides researchers an analytical tool with which to capture, organize and analyze a diverse  
 192 set of social and ecological variables that are considered relevant for a particular aspect of a  
 193 system (Ostrom 2007, Poteete et al. 2009). In total, Ostrom’s SES framework includes over fifty  
 194 potentially influential classes of variables that are ordered within a multilevel classificatory  
 195 system. The four core components (resource systems, resource units, actors and governance  
 196 systems) are organized as a partially decomposable system (Simon 1991) where each of the  
 197 potentially influential variables can be further unpacked to capture subclasses and cumulatively  
 198 integrate knowledge concerning their effects on sustainability. There are two additional  
 199 components that allow for linkages across levels of governance, or between systems, and an  
 200 additional two components that are used to evaluate SES interactions and outcomes.

201

202 FIGURE 1 HERE

203

204 Ostrom’s SES framework has been criticized on several fronts that generally point to two main  
 205 issues. First, its origin in institutional analysis neglects alternative social scientific perspectives.  
 206 Most notable among these omissions are the power-laden theories of political ecology that view  
 207 environmental degradation as a direct consequence of imbalances of power between influential  
 208 policymakers (e.g., national governments) and their associates (e.g., local elites and businesses)

209 and marginalized small-scale users (e.g., subsistence farmers and pastoralists) (Peet and Watts  
 210 1993, Robbins 2004). Second, the ecological aspects of the framework and their interactions  
 211 remain underdeveloped (Berkes and Ross 2013). A particularly problematic issue for ecologists  
 212 seeking to apply Ostrom's SES framework is its lack of clear definitions concerning resource  
 213 units and resource systems. For example, resource units have been operationalized at multiple  
 214 levels of biological organization, including species and communities (Gutierrez et al. 2011),  
 215 water and land (Ostrom 2011) and even landscapes for tourism (Blanco 2011). While it could be  
 216 argued that each of these studies presents an internally consistent application of the framework, it  
 217 is unclear whether syntheses between such disparate case studies are feasible or if the findings  
 218 necessarily apply to the broader population of SESs. Third, while dynamic and multi-scale  
 219 analysis is technically possible, nearly all applications of the framework and its institutional  
 220 analysis precursor focus on a single focal action situation (e.g., resolution of a natural resource  
 221 management problem by multiple stakeholders) that occurs once only and in a single location  
 222 (McGinnis 2011). Moreover, until recent modifications to the SES framework were introduced  
 223 by Epstein et al. (2013), the framework was poorly equipped to analyze biophysical processes  
 224 and diagnose ecological contributions to social-ecological outcomes. However, even with these  
 225 changes, Epstein et al.'s (2013) analysis of the successful remediation of Lake Washington  
 226 simply transforms inherently dynamic internal phosphorus loading processes into several static  
 227 one-way relationships with the dependent variable. Although sufficient for their analysis, the  
 228 failure to account for dynamic linkages within and across scales remains a major weakness of the  
 229 SES framework. In fact most applications of the framework have a general tendency to focus on  
 230 a single scale or level of governance, on a single resource, and to treat the problem as if all  
 231 resources and actors were at the same focal scale.

232

233 As analytical approaches for understanding (and hence, better managing) PAs, both resilience  
 234 approaches and Ostrom's SES framework have much to recommend them. Our objective in this  
 235 article is to extend them to better integrate social-ecological feedbacks and cross-scale effects  
 236 that often dominate the dynamics of PAs and other social-ecological systems.

237

238 EXTENDING EXISTING FRAMEWORKS TO INCLUDE SCALE AND CROSS-SCALE FEEDBACKS

239 The obvious tension between ecological and social demands in many PAs suggests that analysis  
 240 of the resilience of PAs requires a hierarchical, cross-scale and multi-level framework in which  
 241 different scales and institutional levels are connected by a set of interactions between different  
 242 actors, resources and processes. Examples of interactions include the movements of actors and  
 243 resources (e.g., tourism, water flows out of PAs to downstream communities) as well as the  
 244 interplay of rules and information across scales. Holling (2001) suggested that complex system  
 245 behaviours, such as those that we observe in PAs, arise from the interactions of processes that  
 246 occur at a minimum of three different spatial and temporal extents; and furthermore, that in many  
 247 cases, shifts between different system states are driven by changes in the slower variables (e.g.,  
 248 buildup of Phosphorus in a shallow lake, or loss of trust in human society) rather than the faster  
 249 variables (e.g., trophic interactions or law enforcement).

250

251 It is important to recognize that PAs, which are institutions (in Ostrom's sense) rather than  
 252 biophysical entities, have been created at a variety of different spatial scales and institutional  
 253 levels. While PAs in the IUCN categories I-IV are often single tenure units, those in categories V  
 254 and VI (such as Biosphere reserves and Transfrontier conservation areas) usually include

255 multiple, nested tenure units that are governed by different rules. For example, the current rules-  
 256 in-use in the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area or the Causse Méjan (both of  
 257 which are discussed in more detail later in this paper) differ between farms, core conservation  
 258 areas, hunting areas, and designated buffer zones. Similarly, while larger areas may be expected  
 259 to change more slowly because of the buffering effect of larger ecological populations, this is not  
 260 inevitable; political change that has an influence at a national extent, for example, can happen  
 261 swiftly. In heterogeneous landscapes, different tenure units at the same spatial scale may also  
 262 interact (e.g., mines and conservation areas).

263  
 264 We propose a system description that includes five hierarchical levels of institutional  
 265 organization. These in turn are related to five hierarchical spatial scales of analysis, with some  
 266 flexibility, depending on the system that is under analysis (Figure 2). The first institutional level  
 267 is defined as the *sub-tenure unit*. It refers to patches of habitat (or any other fine-scale, discrete  
 268 ecological units that are managed differently), and/or specific human use areas, that (1) fall  
 269 within a single tenure unit; (2) have a single management policy; and (3) exist at smaller spatial  
 270 extents than the boundaries of the tenure unit. For example, different rules about making fires or  
 271 leaving your vehicle may apply at picnic sites or bird hides (blinds) within a PA; and different  
 272 habitats in a PA may have different management needs. Sub-tenure units will always, by  
 273 definition, have a smaller spatial extent than a PA. They relate most closely to the *patch scale* of  
 274 analysis, which reflects the grain and extent of habitat heterogeneity within the PA.

275  
 276 The second institutional level is that of a *single tenure unit*. Single tenure units belong to a single  
 277 owner or organization. They may have the same extent or a smaller extent than that of a PA,

278 depending on the diversity of tenure types and human use zones occurring within the PA. Single  
 279 tenure units define one or several scales of analysis that might (for example) correspond to the  
 280 extent of a traditional game park, or to those of core ecological and farming areas respectively  
 281 within a Biosphere reserve.

282  
 283 The third institutional level, the *proximate institutional context*, includes multiple tenure units as  
 284 well as the institutions and organizations that are responsible for coordinating the interactions  
 285 (where these occur) between tenure units. Depending on the nature of the study system, the  
 286 proximate context might define a spatial scale that is only slightly larger than the PA, or a larger  
 287 region that contains a network of PAs that are managed with a shared objective. For example,  
 288 provincial parks in the Western Cape of South Africa form a network that is overseen by a  
 289 regional conservation organization, Cape Nature; the proximate institutional context for any  
 290 single provincial park includes Cape Nature, and related ecological scales of analysis include  
 291 surrounding PAs and unprotected dispersal corridors that connect PAs. The proximate  
 292 institutional context also includes institutions that relate to the governance of resources around  
 293 PAs, particularly where (as in the case of water laws, for example) they relate directly to  
 294 ecological flows (e.g., water, invasive species) that might enter the PA from surrounding areas.

295  
 296 Proximate institutions in turn sit within (or sometimes straddle) a *national institutional context*,  
 297 the fourth level, which typically consists of the institutions of a single nation-state (e.g., its  
 298 constitution and related governance structures). This institutional level aligns with a national  
 299 extent of analysis. However, sometimes, as in the case of transboundary conservation areas, PAs  
 300 may include as many as three or four nations, creating an *international institutional context* that

301 is the fifth and final institutional level. This fifth level includes international power relations and  
 302 the global economy. International contexts are aligned with the broadest scales of spatial  
 303 analysis, ranging from multiple countries to global. While the fifth level may seem ecologically  
 304 far removed from the majority of established PAs, it has particular relevance for migratory  
 305 species and related resources, such as wetlands that are important for migratory waterbirds and  
 306 are supposedly covered by international conventions and agreements (e.g., CBD, Ramsar,  
 307 AEWA; see United Nations 1992, Matthews 1993, Lenten 2001). Similarly, international  
 308 conventions and agreements (or lack thereof) can have a strong influence at the level of a single  
 309 tenure unit, as in the case of the management of species that are listed in Appendix I of the  
 310 Convention in Trade and Endangered Species (CITES).

311  
 312 At each different scale and level, different temporal dynamics occur. The temporal scales that are  
 313 relevant to the ecology of PAs range from short term processes such as predation and  
 314 competition that occur on a daily scale, through seasonal processes such as breeding or wintering  
 315 seasons for birds, to long-term processes such as atmospheric oscillations, ocean acidification,  
 316 and climate change that take place at decadal and centennial scales. Similarly, the temporal  
 317 scales within the social realm also vary from short-term initiatives to establish PAs to long-  
 318 standing national assets such as Yellowstone National Park in the USA. Social history and pre-  
 319 PA politics may also affect the resilience and social-ecological context of a PA. Both ecological  
 320 and social processes act synergistically to produce outcomes and thus neither can be considered  
 321 in isolation (Hughes et al. 2005).

322  
 323 **FIGURE 2 HERE**



324

325 The boundaries of a PA can span multiple nested institutional and ecological levels and scales.

326 Each PA interacts directly with its immediate context (i.e., defined by the scale and level above),

327 which becomes the main source of both inputs and outputs (e.g., information, finances) for any

328 given PA. Since the number and diversity of people involved in SESs at different levels affects

329 both ecological and social processes and the temporal periods over which they occur (Westley et

330 al. 2002), it is crucial to take these interactions into consideration. Practitioners often speak of

331 getting the different levels of governance aligned: for example, a decision made internationally,

332 at say Ramsar Convention level, may or may not promote wetland sustainability, depending on

333 whether the national government/s that are involved take action and are supported by local

334 communities. In other cases, local communities may seek support at the international level for

335 initiatives that lacked support from their own national governments. Alternatively, some of the

336 policies funded and promoted by international donors and organizations may contribute to

337 systematic disenfranchisement of local communities despite a supporting rhetoric of social

338 justice (Blaikie 2006). Positive synergies among scale-dependent institutions therefore usually

339 depend upon brokering organizations that facilitate (even make possible) the interactions

340 between the various levels, including in the reverse direction so that the national governments

341 and Ramsar convention receive the necessary confirmation or other feedback to assist future

342 policy formulation. Worldviews, values, attitudes, and power are key factors that shape PA

343 design and governance and shape the behaviors and practices of social groups operating at

344 different spatial levels that directly or indirectly affect PAs.

345

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

346 Resources and biophysical processes exist over a range of different scales, and vary in their grain  
 347 (or frequency) and their extent (or duration) in space and in time. The scale of socioeconomic  
 348 processes depends heavily on the scale of economic and political organization and the level of  
 349 international interest in a particular PA (Figure 3). It ranges from individuals to networks of  
 350 organizations and includes the effective scales of social institutions (rules, laws, policies, and  
 351 norms) that govern the extent of resource-related rights and management responsibilities  
 352 (Cumming et al. 2006). For example, in creating an urban PA, a country's constitution may  
 353 provide for national-level tenure rights that must then be applied within the local context of  
 354 municipal policies and by-laws. Scale-dependent system components and interactions may  
 355 influence PAs in different ways depending on how their relative magnitude and frequency  
 356 change across different scales. It is often unclear where resilience, or a lack of resilience, resides  
 357 – both within and between scales. The interactions between different spatial and temporal scales  
 358 of both pattern and process, and their potential effects on resilience, are recurring themes in the  
 359 ecological literature (e.g., Peterson et al. 1998, Cumming et al. 2006).

360  
 361 FIGURE 3 HERE

362  
 363 Dealing with the many scale dependencies of PAs is conceptually challenging. However, as Cash  
 364 et al. (2006) point out, ignorance of cross-scale interactions tends to reveal itself in a wide range  
 365 of management problems. Therefore, a useful starting point is to be explicit about the spatial and  
 366 temporal elements of the problem and their key scales (Figure 4). PAs in contemporary  
 367 conservation efforts are developed as networks (Vimal et al. 2012). They are planned and  
 368 increasingly managed as part of local, regional and international conservation systems. For

369 example, in the French national park and biosphere reserve design approach, new PAs are  
 370 designed as a set of zones that range from strictly protected areas (core area of national park or  
 371 nature reserve) to integrated zones in surrounding areas where integrated management of natural  
 372 resources is implemented with local stakeholders and landowners (Batisse 1997, Mathevet et al.  
 373 2010).

374  
 375 Social-ecological interactions occur most intensively within and between entities that operate at  
 376 similar scales (Allen and Starr 1982, Levin 1992, 1999) (Figure 2). For example, in South  
 377 Africa, provincial administrations such as Cape Nature or Ezemvelo-KZN Parks manage  
 378 provincial parks, while national parks are regulated nationally by SANParks. At the same time,  
 379 actors and processes at scales and levels above and below the focal scale influence pattern-  
 380 process interactions via flows between nested elements. Matter includes the exchange of physical  
 381 materials across scales and levels, such as water, carbon, and nitrogen. Organisms, including  
 382 people as well as mobile animals and plant propagules, link scales and levels via their  
 383 movements (e.g., labour, migration, transhumance). Information flows include the exchange of  
 384 ideas, perceptions and skills across scales. These local to global flows and the ways in which  
 385 they are mediated and managed can play an important role in the function and performance of  
 386 the PA (Mathevet et al. 2010, Thompson et al. 2011) and may consolidate ecological and social  
 387 interdependence in biodiversity policy that goes beyond park boundaries, such as the health of  
 388 the tourism sector in and around PAs (Hall 2010, Biggs 2011). Rules link institutions and  
 389 regulations across scales, for example with global treaties affecting regulations within PAs. In  
 390 addition, flows of information, perceptions, and money across scales are central to the  
 391 functioning of the nature-based tourism sector in many of the world's PAs (e.g., Biggs 2011).

392

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

Version preprint

393 The presence of different interlinked subsystems across different scales (Figure 4) suggests the  
 394 presence of multiple action arenas where decisions related to PAs are made and a strong need to  
 395 somehow align multiple subsystems to coordinate responses to common threats (e.g., climate  
 396 change or an escalation of poaching activity). This observation aligns neatly with Holling's ideas  
 397 about panarchies (Holling and Gunderson 2002), which suggest that some degree of synchrony  
 398 in system cycles is a necessary pre-condition for effective interventions (Westley et al. 2002).

399  
 400 The adoption of a multi-scale, social-ecological perspective on the resilience of PAs (Figures 2-  
 401 4) provides a useful way of organizing and thinking through their long-term sustainability. Over  
 402 the last decade, conservation organizations have increasingly recognized that the protection of  
 403 ecosystems requires that key ecosystem functions and processes be maintained at multiple scales  
 404 (Poiani et al. 2000). Several of the world's largest conservation NGOs have developed stratified,  
 405 ecoregional-based plans and approaches to formally structure the process of developing and  
 406 maintaining PA networks (e.g., TNC 2003, Loucks et al. 2004). Poiani et al. (2000), for instance,  
 407 developed a hierarchical classification for habitats (ranging from small patches through the  
 408 matrix to entire regions) and associated species (ranging from small patch species through to  
 409 regional and long-distance migratory species; Figure 4) as part of TNC's 'Conservation by  
 410 Design' initiative.

411  
 412 FIGURE 4 HERE

413  
 414 We propose that a similar leap forward must be taken by recognizing that multi-scale  
 415 socioeconomic (and further, social-ecological) 'functional landscapes' exist, and that they are

416 integral to understanding and managing PAs for long-term sustainability. For example, the Man  
 417 and the Biosphere Programme (UNESCO) integrates social and ecological goals and aims to  
 418 ensure the sustainable use of natural resources, while also emphasizing the interdependencies of  
 419 cultural and natural landscapes (Batisse 1971, IUCN 1979, Batisse 1997, German MAB National  
 420 Committee 2005). Such areas are structured and organized at a range of social and ecological  
 421 scales, depending on the particular set of negotiated goals and objectives. The new concept of  
 422 ecological solidarity, a core feature of the 2006 law reforming national park policy in France,  
 423 similarly stresses the need to reconnect people to their PAs. Ecological solidarity is both social  
 424 and ecological; it is based on social recognition of the spatial interdependence among natural  
 425 organisms, including people, and their physical environment. This sets the scene for a vision of  
 426 nature conservation and management of PAs. Ecological solidarity offers a pragmatic  
 427 compromise between ecocentric and anthropocentric ethics. It suggests that biodiversity  
 428 conservation at different spatial and temporal scales needs to be collectively explored by local  
 429 communities and stakeholders to give social meaning to the establishment of PAs, to the  
 430 expansion of ecological networks, and to the integrated management of cultural landscapes  
 431 (Mathevet 2012).

432  
 433 As an example, conservation of a ‘local-scale species’, such as an endemic butterfly, typically  
 434 requires fewer resources and a much finer scale of management than that which is required to  
 435 conserve species that use their landscape at a regional scale (e.g., migratory songbirds). In the  
 436 same way, meeting local stakeholder needs and demands within and around a PA requires  
 437 different and much finer-scale action than governmental resource policies, the international  
 438 tourist market, or the international trade in animal products. These ideas can be summarized by

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

439 uniting the ecological approach of Poiani et al. (2000) with a socioeconomic perspective (Figure  
 440 5).

441  
 442 FIGURE 5 HERE

443  
 444 Figure 5 provides a way of conceptualizing and comparing the different scales and levels at  
 445 which social and ecological systems are organized. It does not, however, provide a dynamic  
 446 temporal perspective for understanding interactions between scales. One of the key components  
 447 of incorporating scale and scaling in a framework for the analysis of PA resilience is that of  
 448 understanding feedbacks, both within and between scales. Formally, a cross-scale feedback  
 449 occurs if (1) A influences B and B influences A; and (2) A and B are system elements (whether  
 450 human or not, but excluding interactions) that exist at different scales. For instance, global  
 451 demand drives the prices of many commodities but production is often limited to a smaller sub-  
 452 set of locations. If local conditions in the production location influence global prices, a local to  
 453 global interaction occurs. If global prices also influence local actions, a cross-scale feedback  
 454 occurs. Such feedbacks may be extremely difficult to manage given the inherent complexity of  
 455 social-ecological systems (Berkes et al. 2006). For example, the Asian demand for rhinoceros  
 456 horn is driven by cultural beliefs. Coupled with limits on local production (i.e., a small number  
 457 of slowly-reproducing rhinos), it has created spiraling commodity price increases and a massive  
 458 conservation problem for African PAs (Biggs et al. 2013). Our future ability to manage  
 459 individual resources, or PAs as a whole, will depend on our ability to devise a system that can  
 460 detect potentially harmful feedbacks and respond to them in a timely manner (Hughes et al.  
 461 2005, Biggs et al. 2013).

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

Version preprint

462

463 The different social-ecological system elements that determine the resilience of an individual PA

464 may be connected in different ways and to varying degrees of strength (Figures 2-4). One of the

465 challenges in analyzing PA resilience is to determine which influences are the strongest within

466 the system and which are sufficiently weak that they can safely be ignored or disregarded during

467 analysis (keeping in mind that sometimes, weak influences and dormant social networks can be

468 important in times of crisis). Closed feedback loops (A influences B influences C influences A)

469 are also of particular importance because they can produce surprising dynamics, such as

470 dampening or exacerbation of local variability. In practice these feedbacks (and especially those

471 that reinforce one another) are critical for system performance and must be considered in the

472 design of environmental policies as they are directly responsible for the stability of a social-

473 ecological system in a given state. Conversely, if system change is desired, they must in some

474 direct or indirect manner (e.g., through modifying other inter-linkages which feed into it but can

475 be influenced) be overcome. For example, in the Eastern Cape case study discussed below and in

476 Maciejewski & Kerley (in press), managers' perceptions of what tourists want to see provide a

477 powerful driver for the ecological management of private PAs (PPAs). This influence is cross-

478 scale in the sense that tourists come from a far wider extent than the PA. By their actions,

479 managers in turn influence the likelihood that tourists will visit the PA, setting up a cross-scale

480 feedback that can result in harmful ecological effects (e.g., habitat alteration by excessive

481 numbers of elephants, and resulting species loss) within PA boundaries. Breaking this feedback

482 requires that managers be willing to accept data indicating that tourist numbers would be

483 unaffected by lower stocking rates, and willing to take the risk of reducing population levels of

484 charismatic megafauna such as elephants.

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

Version preprint

485  
 486 While many studies have implied or discussed the importance of scaling principles and cross-  
 487 scale dynamics for PAs, few have explicitly analyzed them. Some exceptions include Jones et al.  
 488 (2013) and Mills et al. (2010) (both on MPAs) and Guerrero et al. (2013). Guerrero et al. (2013)  
 489 identified eight ways in which scale mismatches between actors and resources involved in the  
 490 spatial planning process manifest themselves. These include (1) ecosystem or ecological  
 491 processes that extend beyond governance boundaries; (2) the absence of resolution-appropriate  
 492 data for decision making; (3) a lack of implementation capacity; (4) threats to ecological  
 493 diversity that operate at diverse spatial and temporal scales; (5) mismatches between funding and  
 494 the long-term nature of ecological processes; (6) rates of implementation that do not reflect the  
 495 rate of change of the ecological system; (7) lack of appropriate indicators for monitoring  
 496 activities; and (8) the occurrence of ecological change at scales smaller or larger than the scale of  
 497 implementation of management actions or monitoring.

498  
 499 Among the most important questions in this context are (1) whether, and how, PAs may  
 500 contribute to desirable regional resilience (e.g., Plumptre et al. 2007, Slotow and Hunter. 2009,  
 501 Cantú-Salazar and Gaston. 2010, Laurance 2013, Sjöstedt 2013); and conversely, (2) how  
 502 regional resilience may influence the resilience of individual PAs (González et al. 2008, Jones et  
 503 al. 2013).

#### 504 UNDERSTANDING THE RESILIENCE OF PROTECTED AREAS

505  
 506 In the preceding sections we have argued that (1) PAs are multi-scale and multi-level social-  
 507 ecological systems; and (2) an explicit recognition of scale and cross-scale interactions must be



508 incorporated in analyses of PA resilience if we are to advance our understanding of their  
 509 dynamics, manage them better, and ultimately foster their resilience. The third logical step in this  
 510 line of argument is to consider empirical evidence that indicates whether, and how, cross-scale  
 511 feedbacks may in practice influence the resilience of specific PAs, and how PAs may in turn  
 512 influence regional resilience. The starting point is to define different scales and levels; this is  
 513 followed by a more detailed consideration of system dynamics. We illustrate these steps below  
 514 for three real-world examples, noting that space constraints and the goals of this article do not  
 515 permit the next step, which would be a full resilience analysis of each case. As the subsequent  
 516 discussion shows, the nature of the interaction between regional and local resilience may be quite  
 517 strongly dependent on context-specific factors.

518  
 519 *Case Study 1: Social-ecological dynamics of Private Protected Areas in the Eastern Cape*  
 520 Private Protected Areas (PPAs) constitute a high proportion of conservation land in South Africa.  
 521 Exact figures are hard to obtain, but according to the PAs Act 57 of 2003, approximately 7% of  
 522 the country's land is in statutory national parks and 17% in some form of private conservation  
 523 area (Cousins et al. 2008). In southern Africa, ecotourism generates roughly the same revenue as  
 524 farming, forestry and fisheries combined (Scholes and Biggs 2004). Growth in the ecotourism  
 525 industry has had substantial impacts in the Eastern Cape, where large areas of marginal pastoral  
 526 lands have given way to PPAs. Private PAs may fall within any of the IUCN categories. Some  
 527 believe they are better represented under categories IV – VI, although many private PAs fit the  
 528 management objectives of categories I – III (Dudley 2008).

529

530 At the **sub-tenure level and patch extent**, within PAs, former agricultural fields with  
 531 interspersed natural areas have been converted into more economically viable game farms. This  
 532 involves restoring the vegetation and reintroducing wildlife into the area. At the **PA level**, system  
 533 dynamics and related ecological management decisions are heavily driven by economic  
 534 processes. Private PAs aim to build populations of charismatic species at stocking levels that  
 535 ensure tourist satisfaction. It has been estimated that during the establishment of PPAs, the  
 536 introduction of species to the Eastern Cape cost between \$97,500 and \$1.8 million (Sims-Castley  
 537 et al. 2005). Stocked animals are often extralimital species, such as giraffe, which did not  
 538 historically occur in the Eastern Cape. These non-indigenous introductions have several negative  
 539 effects including hybridization, degradation of habitat, and low survival rates and competitive  
 540 exclusion of indigenous species (Chapin et al. 2000, Castley et al. 2001). Stocking charismatic  
 541 species, such as the African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*), above ecological carrying capacity to  
 542 meet social demands and ensure tourist satisfaction may also have negative ecological impacts.  
 543 Numerous studies have documented significant impacts of elephants on biodiversity (e.g.,  
 544 Cumming et al. 1997, Blignaut et al. 2008, Kerley et al. 2008).

545  
 546 At **regional, national, and international levels and extents**, the main driving forces are social-  
 547 ecological processes, represented by two conflicting trends. On one hand the land conversion  
 548 trend increases ecotourism in the Eastern Cape, potentially leading to an increase in income and  
 549 job opportunities, and resulting in social uplift and poverty alleviation in the rural communities  
 550 surrounding the PPAs. On the other hand, the ecological carrying capacity of the PPAs places a  
 551 threshold on the types and numbers of species that can be introduced. The habitat fragmentation  
 552 and land degradation that can result from overstocking large herbivores may reduce the number

553 of national and international tourists visiting the area. In addition, as a consequence of South  
 554 Africa's history, many areas of the Eastern Cape are contested (Cundill et al. 2005); reserve  
 555 creation may engender social resentment and create political opposition to conservation,  
 556 particularly if it entails the loss of jobs formerly provided by agriculture (Brooks et al. 2011).

557

558 *Case Study 2: Man and the Biosphere (MAB) case: Regime shifts on the Causse Méjan*

559 The Causse Méjan is a limestone plateau (1000m average altitude) in the Cévennes Mountains of  
 560 France. It is home to the largest steppe-like grassland in France (Fonderflick et al. 2013), and is  
 561 part of the core area of the Cévennes National Park (372000 ha) and the Cévennes Biosphere  
 562 Reserve. Both PAs were created to maintain a rural way of life (including sheep and cattle  
 563 farming, and cheese production) as well as to support the conservation of indigenous grassland  
 564 and several endangered species (e.g., vultures, Przewalski's horse). The Causse Méjan is an  
 565 IUCN category VI PA. Farmers are the managers of open meadows and steppes, which cover  
 566 37% of the core area; the rest is forest (O'Rourke 1999, Etienne and Le Page 2002). The plateau  
 567 is ecologically vulnerable to bush encroachment and invasion by pine, boxwood and juniper trees  
 568 (Etienne 2001).

569

570 At the **patch scale**, the main ecological driving force is the pine seed rain intensity. There is a  
 571 threshold of grazing pressure above which pine encroachment is impossible. Below this  
 572 threshold, pine tree regeneration can be controlled by mechanical or manual removal of pine  
 573 seedlings. The transformation of grassland to woodland represents a local ecological regime  
 574 shift, but may not be a regime shift at the extent of an individual farm because the main driving  
 575 forces at the **sub-tenure level** are economic. Here, social-ecological regime shifts are provoked

576 by changes in the percentage of a farm covered by pine forest but the threshold will differ  
 577 according to the area of grassland per stock required by the farming system (Kinzig et al. 2006).  
 578 The farmer will select which farming system to practice for cultural and economic reasons that  
 579 are largely derived from higher levels, such as national prices for livestock (Etienne and Le Page  
 580 2002). Both vegetation patches and farms occur within the broader extent of the biosphere  
 581 reserve.

582  
 583 At the biosphere reserve (**PA and PA network levels**) and the **regional extent**, the main driving  
 584 forces are both social and ecological, potentially producing two conflicting kinds of system  
 585 change. On one hand, a regime shift may occur between cheese and timber production,  
 586 depending on the unstable interactions between Roquefort cheese, Fedou cheese (a local cheese  
 587 that like Roquefort, is produced from sheep's milk) and lamb meat producers, and timber  
 588 producers (O'Rourke 1999, Kinzig et al. 2006). On the other hand, the pine-grassland dynamic  
 589 may result in ecological regime shifts and the loss of open grassland biodiversity (Kinzig et al.  
 590 2006). Finally, **national level** institutions, policies and **international** commodity demands will  
 591 influence economic tradeoffs in this system.

592  
 593 Interestingly, two recent changes have provoked a new regime shift and management paradigm.  
 594 First, in June 2011, the Causse Méjan and some neighboring sites of the Cévennes, were declared  
 595 as world cultural heritage sites by UNESCO for their agro-pastoral Mediterranean landscape.  
 596 Second in the summer of 2012, and for the first time in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, wolf attacks were  
 597 registered (n=36) and 22 ewes killed. The Causse Méjan social-ecological system is now at a  
 598 threshold. Will it switch to a bushy and abandoned farmland landscape, supporting the

599 establishment of a permanent wolf pack, or will it remain an agropastoral landscape, giving  
 600 priority to sustainable sheep grazing practices and the conservation of open grassland? This  
 601 dilemma questions the goals and practices of the national park, especially in its core area, as well  
 602 as the adaptive capacity of farmers to integrate predators into their grazing system.

603

604 *Case study 3: The Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area*

605 The Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA, c. 90,000 km<sup>2</sup>) includes  
 606 adjacent parts of Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The core PA comprises three  
 607 national parks (IUCN Category II): Limpopo in Mozambique, Kruger in South Africa, and  
 608 Gonarezhou in Zimbabwe. Other PAs, mostly IUCN Category VI, are included in each country,  
 609 as are areas of communal and private land. State PAs cover 53% and communal lands 34% of the  
 610 area, respectively (Cumming et al. 2013). The core GLTFCA, created by treaty between the  
 611 three countries, is embedded within a provisional transfrontier conservation area that may serve  
 612 as a buffer that increases the resilience of the GLTFCA. Within South Africa, the Kruger to  
 613 Canyons Biosphere initiative (Coetsee et al. 2012) is extending the area under protection (IUCN  
 614 Category VI).

615

616 Historically, Khoisan people occupied the area for millennia before Bantu agro-pastoralists  
 617 arrived some 2,000 years ago. Livestock appeared in areas adjacent to and within the GLTFCA  
 618 between 600 and 1200 AD and various species of antelope, and hippo and elephant were hunted  
 619 and ivory was traded at the coast (Plug 2000). The period 1200 - 1800 was characterised by  
 620 shifting tribal control of the region and Nguni invasions.

621

622 The entry of smallpox and measles into the region in the 1830s and the rinderpest pandemic in  
 623 1895 took their toll on both humans and ungulates respectively. The major transitions and drivers  
 624 and associated social-ecological changes in the GLTFCA landscape are summarised in Fig. 6.  
 625 At the **patch scale and sub-tenure unit level**, within the GLTFCA, changes have occurred in  
 626 ecological habitat connectivity, disturbance regimes, water availability, and herbivore species  
 627 composition and abundance as well as in the settlement patterns of people and their farming  
 628 practices. At the **protected area scale**, numerous changes have occurred in boundaries and  
 629 associated tenure rights (see detailed explanations in Cumming et al (2007), and Anderson and  
 630 Cumming (2013)). The key feature of the changes that have occurred since 1830 is that they  
 631 have largely been driven by political dictates at **international and national levels**. Initial  
 632 change was driven by European colonisation of the three countries, and then by national policies  
 633 of racial segregation resulting in the development of dual agricultural systems in South Africa  
 634 and Zimbabwe. This resulted on the one hand in the development of large commercial farms on  
 635 privately owned land and on the other, in increased densities of traditional small scale agro-  
 636 pastoral farms in communal lands. Superimposed on this matrix were the formation of state PAs  
 637 and the resulting displacement of people.

638

639 The continuing top-down influences of international and national policies and legislation on  
 640 resource management in the GLTFCA continue, with significant impacts on the management of  
 641 animal diseases (e.g. Foot and Mouth Disease) and the conservation and management of three  
 642 species of charismatic mega-herbivores (elephant and black and white rhinoceros) (Biggs et al.  
 643 2013).

644

645 FIGURE 6 HERE

646

647 *Key Elements within Case Studies*

648 Despite the different locations and scales of each of the three case studies, they share  
649 considerable commonality in their key drivers (Figure 7).

650

651 FIGURE 7 HERE

652

653 Interestingly, our case studies suggest that ecological processes are often most directly relevant  
654 to PAs at intermediate to finer scales. In the Eastern Cape case study, carrying capacity and  
655 habitat fragmentation both occur at the patch and PA scales. Similarly, pine seed rain intensity,  
656 grazing pressure, bush encroachment, grassland to woodland transformation, predator-prey  
657 dynamics and species home-ranges are finer-scale elements in the Causse Méjan. In the  
658 GLTFCA, ecological habitat connectivity, disturbance regimes and herbivore species  
659 composition and abundance are also patch- and protected-area scale processes and patterns.

660

661 At broader scales, the dominant processes that shape and alter PAs are primarily sociopolitical  
662 and economic. In our case-studies, the top-down drivers were elements such as tourism demands  
663 (Eastern Cape case study), international policies and commodity demands (Causse Méjan), and  
664 colonization and international and national policy changes (GLTFCA).

665

666 Sociopolitical and economic processes may of course impact ecosystems via impacts on the  
667 abiotic environment, as in the case of anthropogenic climate change, which is driven by human

668 socioeconomic demands for such things as energy, transport, and manufactured goods. The main  
 669 exception to this general pattern arises when migratory species are particularly important  
 670 elements of a PA; this is not the case in any of our examples, but it is not uncommon. We could  
 671 also envisage that regional ecological influences become relatively more important for smaller  
 672 PAs that are more dependent on colonization from nearby natural areas that are not necessarily  
 673 within the boundaries of the PA (Bengtsson et al. 2003).

674

675 *Dynamic interactions within case studies*

676 If we consider a more dynamic representation of cross-scale interactions, the different variables  
 677 summarized in Figure 7 interact to drive change in PAs. In Figure 8 we graph the spatial scale of  
 678 our case-study variables against a notional speed at which these processes typically operate.

679

680 FIGURE 8 HERE

681

682 As these graphical depictions show, temporal scales do not arrange as readily along a hierarchy  
 683 as spatial scales, creating opportunities for spatial-temporal scale mismatches (Cumming et al.  
 684 2006).

685

686 Since system changes are usually driven by feedbacks, particularly cross-scale feedbacks  
 687 (Walker et al. 2006), it follows that slower feedbacks and feedbacks from slower processes will  
 688 take longer to drive change than feedbacks from faster processes. Our examples show that top-  
 689 down, broad-scale processes like tourism demand can change over short time periods, while  
 690 processes like habitat fragmentation manifest at a smaller spatial scale, but can take much longer



691 to manifest and drive change. If, as our PA examples show, ecological processes such as  
 692 succession and trophic cascades generally occur at smaller, slower scales (i.e., more gradually  
 693 and at smaller extents, noting that biophysical perturbations are not ‘ecological processes’) and  
 694 socio-economic drivers occur at broader, faster ones, an emerging hypothesis is that because of  
 695 differential selection, PA social-ecological systems gradually become better adapted to cope with  
 696 changes that result from sociopolitical drivers than with feedbacks from ecological processes. As  
 697 a result of inertia and cross-scale gradients, top-down sociopolitical processes may drive the  
 698 system to develop along a trajectory that renders it less resilient to large shocks that may  
 699 eventually manifest from cross-scale ecological feedbacks. For example, timber demand during  
 700 and after the second world war led to forest fire management policies in the USA that were  
 701 designed to save timber; resulting management approaches eventually led to the hugely  
 702 destructive 1988 fire in Yellowstone National Park.

### 703 *Case Study Insights*

704 Figures 7 and 8 provide strong support for two general points that we have emphasized  
 705 throughout the paper. First, PAs function as social-ecological systems, and hence understanding  
 706 their social and economic components is as fundamental as understanding their ecology if we are  
 707 to analyse and manage their resilience. Second, cross-scale processes are highly relevant to the  
 708 resilience of PAs and should be considered as integral to any analysis, rather than treated as  
 709 subordinate to analyses of system dynamics at a single scale.

710  
 711 In addition to current cross-scale influences, the history and current objectives of each case study  
 712 PA play an important role in their current resilience. In the Causse Méjan, with its long history of  
 713 human use and livelihood support, the PA is politically uncontested and is seen as a way of

714 maintaining its unique regional identity. In southern Africa, with its colonial history, PAs are  
 715 sometimes seen as a form of neo-colonial land grab. This is particularly true in South Africa,  
 716 where the memory of apartheid is still recent. About 40% of National and Provincial PAs in the  
 717 Eastern Cape are under some form of land claim from historically dispossessed local  
 718 communities, and the political acceptability of PPAs is unclear. The potential for land  
 719 redistribution from conservation to agriculture, whether legally or through illegal occupation (as  
 720 has occurred in Zimbabwe), therefore represents a very real possibility. PAs in South Africa  
 721 must maintain their sociopolitical resilience by remaining accessible and continuing to cater for  
 722 and support all strata of society, even if this reduces their overall potential economic viability.  
 723 Similarly, although the GLTFCA was created after the end of apartheid, Kruger Park has a  
 724 contested history and the greater PA was also created in a relatively top-down manner by  
 725 intergovernmental agreements. Its continued viability as a conservation area thus depends  
 726 heavily on maintaining its political acceptability.

727  
 728 It is obvious that PAs and their effectiveness in conserving biodiversity will be influenced by  
 729 regional changes, particularly in relation to politics, governance, and conflict. Uncertainty over  
 730 land tenure can definitively undermine conservation efforts. For example, ongoing conflict in the  
 731 Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the displacement of local communities from their land,  
 732 is endangering key populations of chimpanzees and gorillas; and poor governance and land  
 733 appropriations in Zimbabwe have undoubtedly contributed to declines in rhinoceros populations  
 734 in Zimbabwean PAs. One of the starkest conservation challenges in regions with poor  
 735 governance remains that of working out how to protect PAs against the winds of political  
 736 change.

737

738 Our case studies also suggest that PAs contribute to regional social-ecological dynamics and  
 739 hence to regional social-ecological resilience. For example, in the Eastern Cape, if PAs maintain  
 740 patches of indigenous vegetation that would otherwise be converted to agriculture, they may be  
 741 able to cumulatively reduce local fragmentation and maintain a range of ecosystem services and  
 742 natural processes (as has been shown in similar systems: e.g., seed dispersal by cavity-nesting  
 743 birds that depend on dead wood in old, large trees; Joseph et al. (2011)) that contribute positively  
 744 to human wellbeing (Cumming and Spiesman 2006). Similarly, in the Causse Méjan, the PA  
 745 contributes to building and maintaining a regional identity that includes an awareness of the  
 746 reliance of the community on ecosystems.

747

748

#### DISCUSSION

749 We have argued that if we are to understand and enhance the long-term resilience of PAs, we  
 750 must adopt an inter- or trans-disciplinary perspective that incorporates (at a minimum) elements  
 751 of ecology and social science. Similarly, our analysis shows that questions of scale and  
 752 recognition of cross-scale influences are of fundamental importance for PAs. Our case studies  
 753 illustrate the interlinked nature of PAs as social-ecological systems. Intriguingly, it is particularly  
 754 at broader scales that social, political, and economic considerations become paramount. While  
 755 this may be due in part to ways of thinking or management practices that are still rooted in the  
 756 internationally validated and powerful wilderness discourse, it also reflects the broad-scale  
 757 nature of socioeconomic processes and ongoing globalization.

758

759 Our case study analysis does not explicitly consider an additional element of scale-related  
 760 problems and multi-scale interactions, that of emergent ‘higher-level’ system properties arising  
 761 from the interactions of elements at a single scale. Many PAs belong to socioeconomic networks.  
 762 These may be formal, as in the case of National and Provincial Parks, which are generally the  
 763 responsibility of a governmental management agency; or informal, through exchanges of  
 764 information and resources (e.g., Goss and Cumming 2013). PAs are also members of an  
 765 ecological network that facilitates the propagation and movements of animals and plants.  
 766 Membership in a network may increase the resilience of an individual PA (e.g., by providing  
 767 additional options for problem solving) or decrease it if acts to serve the interests of local,  
 768 regional and global elites (e.g., if membership in a network demands the imposition of locally  
 769 inappropriate management practices). Clearly, network membership and its relevance for PA  
 770 resilience will change with scale and should thus form part of any scaling analysis of PA  
 771 resilience.

772  
 773 Although they remain propositions rather than established generalities, our cross-scale extension  
 774 of Ostrom’s SES framework suggests some general theoretical principles for the resilience of  
 775 PAs. These propositions can serve as the basis for more specific hypotheses that future studies  
 776 about social-ecological resilience of PAs can test. First, there is a relationship between the scales  
 777 and levels at which different system elements exist and the frequency and/or magnitude of their  
 778 interactions. This is a general principle that is derived from hierarchy theory and has been further  
 779 reinforced by ecological research (Allen and Starr 1982, Levin 1992, 2005). Fine-scale processes  
 780 may be irrelevant for understanding system dynamics at larger scales of analysis, or conversely  
 781 may occur at speeds such that larger-scale dynamics are largely irrelevant for their outcomes. For

782 example, the movements of individual atoms are inconsequential to understanding an animal's  
 783 movement path; and continental drift has had a profound influence on global species  
 784 composition but is largely irrelevant for understanding PAs at the time scales that are of interest  
 785 to managers. It may also be easier to generalize about larger-scale pattern-process dynamics  
 786 because a considerable amount of fine-scale variation is averaged out at broader scales (Levin  
 787 1992). Social-ecological feedbacks should therefore be most pronounced when they occur  
 788 between a given functional scale of the ecosystem and the most closely aligned socioeconomic  
 789 scale, and/or the scales immediately above or below the focal scale (see Figure 4). For analyses  
 790 of PA resilience, this means that recognizing and making explicit the ways in which system  
 791 scales and levels align and interact with one another should clarify the most important  
 792 perturbations against which resilience and adaptive capacity must be built, and help in making  
 793 decisions about management tradeoffs. For example, in the GLTFCA, threats to the area's  
 794 protected status from higher-level political processes may suggest enhancing social acceptability  
 795 and community engagement through providing greater access to parts of the PA or the resources  
 796 that it contains (e.g., permitting mopane worm harvesting (Makhado et al. 2009, Gondo et al.  
 797 2010)), whereas threats from pathogens introduced by or transmitted to livestock in neighbouring  
 798 areas may require greater segregation and reduced access (Rodwell et al. 2001, Caron et al.  
 799 2003).

800

801 Second, the kinds of interactions and feedback loops in which PAs participate may have  
 802 differing consequences for system resilience, particularly in relation to the spatial and temporal  
 803 scales of different actors and interactions. Although interactions between closely aligned  
 804 ecological scales and socioeconomic levels (e.g., the extent of grassland that is necessary for

805 game viewing, the scale at which the manager can implement controlled burns, and the monthly  
 806 gate revenue of the PA) may dominate the ‘usual’ dynamics of the PA, very broad-scale or very  
 807 slow variables – acting either directly or indirectly - can have important implications for overall  
 808 system resilience, regime shifts, and management (Carpenter and Gunderson 2001, Lundy and  
 809 Montgomery 2010). For example, a gradual trend towards regional deforestation may affect  
 810 rainfall and temperature patterns within a PA, potentially leading to irreversible changes in  
 811 vegetation composition and long-term impacts on ecosystem service provision to surrounding  
 812 human communities. A closely related phenomenon is that of the shifting baseline, where change  
 813 that is slow by human standards may mean that degraded ecosystem states (e.g., reduced size of  
 814 fishes in marine PAs, or lower levels of forage in a rangeland) become regarded as normal. Slow  
 815 variables in particular can lead to surprises and push PAs into traps (i.e., states in which  
 816 feedbacks maintain an undesirable system state, such as a low-diversity thicket in a savanna  
 817 system) that can result in a loss of resilience and eventual collapse (Carpenter and Turner 2000).  
 818  
 819 Third, we would expect to find decay in the strengths of drivers (and related feedback effects)  
 820 with both distance and time. For example, the numbers of tourists visiting a PA decline with  
 821 increasing distance from airports and major cities (de Vos et al, in prep., this issue). Remote PAs  
 822 thus experience lower human impacts and are managed differently from those that are more  
 823 accessible. Similarly, while path dependencies may be important in understanding the current  
 824 locations of PAs, their influence also diminishes with time. For example, many southern African  
 825 PAs were originally set aside for hunting (rather than exploited for farming) because of the  
 826 presence of sleeping sickness, malaria, and tick-borne diseases. Tsetse flies have been eradicated  
 827 in some areas and their distributions, and those of malaria vectors and ticks, are likely to change

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

828 further as the global climate is altered by people (Rogers and Randolph 1993, 2000, Cumming  
 829 and Van Vuuren 2006), making all three kinds of disease increasingly less relevant to the  
 830 location of PAs. For PA resilience, the principle of time- and distance-based declines in driver  
 831 and feedback strengths suggests that PA resilience will correlate with both ecological and  
 832 socioeconomic connectivity, but in different ways for different drivers, depending on whether  
 833 resilience is enhanced or reduced by the distance effect. Remoteness may result in fewer visitors  
 834 and lower economic resilience, for example, but may also reduce the potential impacts of such  
 835 factors as poaching, pesticide use on neighbouring farmland, and water extraction outside the  
 836 PA.

837  
 838 Fourth, the resilience of a complex system should correlate to its size; larger and older PAs, and  
 839 those established areas that involve more people, should be more resilient (although not  
 840 inevitably so). Note that we use ‘older’ here to refer to PAs that have had natural habitat cover  
 841 for a longer period of time, and in contrast to areas that are reclaimed or restored from farmland  
 842 or other land uses; some newly proclaimed PAs may have ‘old’ ecosystems and ‘young’ social  
 843 systems. Larger, older PAs (1) will be more resilient to natural perturbations, such as fires or  
 844 pest outbreaks, by virtue of their naturally heterogeneous habitats and high species diversity; (2)  
 845 are more likely to contain effectively self-regulating food webs that include such elements as top  
 846 predators and megaherbivores; (3) are more likely to include natural resources that society  
 847 depends on or values highly, such as catchment areas, mountain peaks, or iconic waterfalls; (4)  
 848 will tend to have a greater diversity of stakeholders (since stakeholders are often accumulated  
 849 over time) and a stronger public interest and participation in management (being better known  
 850 and more likely to contain highly charismatic species), making it less likely that a PA is re-zoned

851 or de-gazetted; (5) may have a history that invests them with greater cultural meaning (e.g., more  
 852 people remember childhood holidays there, and it may have achieved ‘iconic’ status, like  
 853 Yellowstone National Park or Kruger National Park); (6) will have larger sunk costs, in the form  
 854 of infrastructure and investment in the park; (7) are more likely to contain multiple IUCN  
 855 categories, thereby achieving multiple goals that different stakeholders might have; and (8) are  
 856 less likely to experience the level of social change that is needed to transform their management  
 857 or for them to be de-proclaimed. It is possible, of course, that ‘revolt’ processes occur that lead to  
 858 change in larger PAs, and/or that their size makes them a more obvious target for land  
 859 redistribution initiatives, but on average we would expect them to be more resilient.

860

861 Fifth, given the many different ways in which power relations work in different societies, the  
 862 relative importance of top-down and bottom-up influences is likely to be asymmetrical and  
 863 dependent on the context in which the PA exists. As we have shown in the three case studies,  
 864 understanding context-dependent factors is essential to the proper functioning of a PA.

865 Therefore, there are no governance panaceas for building PA resilience that can be applied with  
 866 equal success to all situations (Ostrom and Cox 2010). For example, in a nation with a weak  
 867 government, it may be very difficult to buffer PAs from higher-level influences (e.g.,  
 868 development pressures, resource acquisition by the rich and powerful, or regional conflicts) or to  
 869 implement policies and laws at scales relevant for effective PA management. Normative issues,  
 870 value systems, and attitudes will influence PA resilience. Incorporating stakeholders in building  
 871 local resilience, even where regional resilience is low, should be a major focus of conservation  
 872 efforts. Current thinking suggests that the growing role of NGOs, international agencies,  
 873 scientific groups and private operators should be explored in the context of the development of



874 polycentric governance of PAs where community-based management, Integrated and  
 875 Conservation Development Projects and adaptive co-management approaches are promoted and  
 876 implemented. It is not clear yet, however, whether such consensus-based approaches will be  
 877 sufficient to maintain PAs in the face of demographic and globalization processes.

878  
 879 Our framework and proposed principles have implications for PA management and planning,  
 880 although the uptake and application of some of these insights might be challenging. Our case  
 881 studies show that PA managers and planners cannot afford to ignore either ecological or social  
 882 dynamics, or (more importantly) their interactions at scales and levels below and above that of  
 883 the PA. Analyses of the key drivers of change will assist with identifying the relevant scales of  
 884 processes that are likely to influence PA management and planning. Such analyses must be  
 885 undertaken with a clear idea of the PA's social-ecological role, goals, and objectives. When new  
 886 PAs are planned, emphasis on larger, multi-objective and multi-IUCN category PAs may lead to  
 887 improved long-term viability of the area. Cross-scale institutional linkages have the potential to  
 888 serve as a link between top-down and bottom-up influences. However, while incorporating these  
 889 elements into management and planning would be desirable, national and international legal and  
 890 political systems may not readily allow for adaptively managing PAs as interacting cross-scale  
 891 SESs (Garmestani and Allen in press). Similarly, institutional and cultural constraints may  
 892 further exacerbate the challenges of changing embedded management approaches. In particular,  
 893 many PAs have a top-down, command-and-control history and approach to management (e.g.,  
 894 Andersson and Cumming 2013, Goss and Cumming 2013). Challenging these legal, political,  
 895 institutional and cultural constraints is paramount for making PAs more resilient into the future.  
 896

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

Version preprint

897 We have argued throughout this paper that understanding PAs as social-ecological systems is  
 898 integral to developing the approaches, and the science, that will be required to maintain PAs as  
 899 functional and effective conservation tools into the next century. While awareness of the multi-  
 900 faceted nature of PAs has been gradually building in conservation biology for many years, our  
 901 understanding of their dynamics is still weak in some areas, particularly in relation to quantifying  
 902 and managing the ability of PAs to withstand shocks arising from socioeconomic and  
 903 governance-related variance at higher and lower scales. Concepts from social-ecological systems  
 904 research that explicitly address cross-scale feedback loops and resilience appear to offer a range  
 905 of useful conclusions in this context, and we look forward to further growth in this important  
 906 area of research.

907  
 908 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

909 We are grateful to the Resilience Alliance for enabling a meeting of the RA Protected Areas  
 910 Working Group in South Africa, and to Karen Kotschy for her useful comments on an earlier  
 911 draft of this manuscript. This research was supported by the South African National Research  
 912 Foundation, a James S. McDonnell Foundation grant to GC, and the SCALES project (funded by  
 913 the European Commission as a Large-scale Integrating Project within FP 7 under grant 226852).  
 914 The Nebraska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit is jointly supported by a cooperative  
 915 agreement among the U.S. Geological Survey, the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, the  
 916 University of Nebraska, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Wildlife Management  
 917 Institute.

918  
 919 LITERATURE CITED

- 920 Adger, W. N. 2006. Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change* **16**:268-281.
- 921 Adger, W. N., K. Brown, and E. L. Tompkins. 2005. The political economy of cross-scale  
 922 networks in resource co-management. *Ecology and Society* **10**.
- 923 Agrawal, A. 2005. *Environmentality: technologies of government and the making of subjects*.  
 924 Duke University Press Durham, NC.
- 925 Allen, T. F. H. and T. B. Starr. 1982. *Hierarchy: Perspectives for ecological complexity*. The  
 926 University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 927 Anderies, J. M., M. A. Janssen, and E. Ostrom. 2004. A framework to analyze the robustness of  
 928 social-ecological systems from an institutional perspective. *Ecology and Society* **9**.
- 929 Andersson, J. A. and D. H. M. Cumming. 2013. Defining the edge: boundary formation and  
 930 TFCAs in Southern Africa. In: Anderson J. A., de Garine-Wichatitsky, M, Cumming, D.  
 931 H. M., Dzingirai, V., and Giller, K. E. (eds.) *Transfrontier Conservation Areas: People  
 932 Living on the Edge*. Routledge.
- 933 Armitage, D., C. Béné, A. T. Charles, D. Johnson, and E. H. Allison. 2012. The interplay of  
 934 well-being and resilience in applying a social-ecological perspective. *Ecology and  
 935 Society* **17**:15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-04940-170415>.
- 936 Ban, N. C., M. Mills, J. Tam, C. Hicks, S. Klain, N. Stoeckl, M. C. Bottrill, J. Levine, R. L.  
 937 Pressey, T. Satterfield, and K. M. A. Chan. 2013. Towards a social-ecological approach  
 938 for conservation planning: embedding social considerations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the  
 939 Environment* **11**:194-202.
- 940 Batisse, M. 1971. *Man and the Biosphere: an international research programme*. *Biological  
 941 Conservation* **4**:173-179.

- 942 Batisse, M. 1997. Biosphere reserves: a challenge for biodiversity conservation and regional  
 943 development. *Environment* **39**.
- 944 Bengtsson, J., P. Angelstam, T. Elmqvist, U. Emanuelsson, C. Folke, M. Ihse, F. Moberg, and  
 945 M. Nystrom. 2003. Reserves, resilience and dynamic landscapes. *Ambio* **32**:389-396.
- 946 Berkes, F., J. Colding, and C. Folke, editors. 2003. *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems:  
 947 Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge University Press,  
 948 Cambridge.
- 949 Berkes, F., T. P. Hughes, R. S. Steneck, J. A. Wilson, D. R. Bellwood, B. Crona, C. Folke, L. H.  
 950 Gunderson, H. M. Leslie, J. Norberg, M. Nystrom, P. Olsson, H. Osterblom, M. Scheffer,  
 951 and B. Worm. 2006. Ecology - Globalization, roving bandits, and marine resources.  
 952 *Science* **311**:1557-1558.
- 953 Berkes, F. and H. Ross. 2013. Community Resilience: Toward an Integrated Approach. *Society  
 954 & Natural Resources* **26**:5-20.
- 955 Biggs, D. 2011. Understanding resilience in a vulnerable industry - the case of reef tourism on  
 956 Australia's Great Barrier Reef. *Ecology & Society* **16**:30. Available online:  
 957 <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss31/art30/>.
- 958 Biggs, D., F. Courchamp, R. Martin, and H. P. Possingham. 2013. Legal trade of Africa's rhino  
 959 horns. *Science* **339**:1038 – 1039.
- 960 Blaikie, P. 2006. Is small really beautiful? Community-based natural resource management in  
 961 Malawi and Botswana. *World Development* **34**:1942-1957.
- 962 Blanco, E. 2011. A social-ecological approach to voluntary environmental initiatives: the case of  
 963 nature-based tourism. *Policy Sciences* **44**:35-52.

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

- 964 Blignaut, J., M. De Wit, and J. Barnes. 2008. The economic value of elephants. *in* R. J. Scholes  
 965 and K. G. Mennell, editors. *Elephant Management: A Scientific Assessment of South*  
 966 *Africa*. Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg.
- 967 Brandon, K., K. H. Redford, and S. E. Sanderson. 1998. *Parks in peril: people, politics, and*  
 968 *protected areas*. Island Press.
- 969 Brooks, S., M. Spierenburg, L. Van Brakel, A. Kolk, and K. B. Lukhozi. 2011. Creating A  
 970 Commodified Wilderness: Tourism, Private Game Farming, And 'Third  
 971 Nature' Landscapes In Kwazulu-Natal. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale*  
 972 *Geografie* **102**:260-274.
- 973 Cantú-Salazar, L. and K. J. Gaston. 2010. Very large protected areas and their contribution to  
 974 terrestrial biological conservation. *Bioscience*, **60**:808-818.
- 975 Caron, A., P. C. Cross, and J. T. du Toit. 2003. Ecological implications of bovine tuberculosis in  
 976 African buffalo herds. *Ecological Applications* **13**:1338-1345.
- 977 Carpenter, S., B. Walker, J. M. Anderies, and N. Abel. 2001. From Metaphor to Measurement:  
 978 Resilience of What to What? *Ecosystems* **4**:765-781.
- 979 Carpenter, S. R. and L. H. Gunderson. 2001. Coping with collapse: Ecological and social  
 980 dynamics in ecosystem management. *Bioscience* **51**:451-457.
- 981 Carpenter, S. R. and M. G. Turner. 2000. Hares and tortoises: Interactions of fast and slow  
 982 variables in ecosystems. *Ecosystems* **3**:495-497.
- 983 Cash, D. W., W. N. Adger, F. Berkes, P. Garden, L. Lebel, P. Olsson, L. Pritchard, and O.  
 984 Young. 2006. Scale and cross-scale dynamics: governance and information in a  
 985 multilevel world. *Ecology and Society* **11**:8.

- 986 Castley, J. G., A. F. Boshoff, and G. I. H. Kerley. 2001. Compromising South Africa’s natural  
 987 biodiversity—inappropriate herbivore introductions. *South African Journal of Science*  
 988 **96**:365-378.
- 989 Chapin, F. S., E. S. Zavaleta, V. T. Eviner, R. L. Naylor, P. M. Vitousek, H. L. Reynolds, D. U.  
 990 Hooper, S. Lavorel, O. E. Sala, S. E. Hobbie, M. C. Mack, and S. Diaz. 2000.  
 991 Consequences of changing biodiversity. *Nature* **405**:234-242.
- 992 Chapin, I., F.S, A.L. Lovcraft, E. S. Zavaleta, J. Nelson, M. D. Robards, G. P. Kofinas, S. F.  
 993 Trainor, G. D. Peterson, H. P. Huntington, and R. L. Naylor. 2006. Policy strategies to  
 994 address sustainability of Alaskan boreal forests in response to a directionally changing  
 995 climate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
 996 *America* **103**:16637–16643.
- 997 Clement, F. 2010. Analysing decentralised natural resource governance: proposition for a  
 998 “politicised” institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Sciences* **43**:129-  
 999 156.
- 1000 Clement, F. and J. M. Amezaga. 2013. Conceptualising context in institutional reforms of land  
 1001 and natural resource management: the case of Vietnam. *International Journal of the*  
 1002 *Commons* **7**.
- 1003 Coetzee, M., H. C. Biggs, and S. Malan. 2012. Sharing the benefits of biodiversity: a regional  
 1004 action plan to nurture and sustain the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services  
 1005 to livelihoods and resilient economic development within the Kruger to Canyons  
 1006 Biosphere. Available at: [http://www.kruger2canyons.org/consolidated technical report](http://www.kruger2canyons.org/consolidated technical report vfin.pdf)  
 1007 [vfin.pdf](http://www.kruger2canyons.org/consolidated technical report vfin.pdf). SANParks, Nelspruit.

- 1008 Cousins, J. A., J. P. Sadler, and J. Evans. 2008. Exploring the Role of Private Wildlife Ranching  
 1009 as a Conservation Tool in South Africa: Stakeholder Perspectives. *Ecology and Society*  
 1010 **13**:43. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss42/art43/>.
- 1011 Cumming, D., H. Biggs, M. Kock, N. Shongwe, and S. and Osofsky. 2007. The AHEAD  
 1012 (Animal Health for the Environment And Development) - Great Limpopo Transfrontier  
 1013 Conservation Area (GLTFCA) Programme: Key questions and conceptual framework  
 1014 revisited. [http://wcs-ahead.org/workinggrps\\_limpopo.html](http://wcs-ahead.org/workinggrps_limpopo.html).
- 1015 Cumming, D. H. M., V. Dzingirai, and M. d. G. Wichtitsky. 2013. Land and natural resource-  
 1016 based livelihood opportunities in TFCAs. *in* d. G.-W. Anderson J. A, M, Cumming, D. H.  
 1017 M., Dzingirai, V., and Giller, K. E., editor. *Transfrontier Conservation Areas: People*  
 1018 *Living on the Edge*. Routledge.
- 1019 Cumming, D. H. M., M. B. Fenton, I. L. Rautenbach, R. D. Taylor, G. S. Cumming, M. S.  
 1020 Cumming, J. M. Dunlop, A. G. Ford, M. D. Hovorka, D. S. Johnston, M. Kalcounis, Z.  
 1021 Mahlangu, and C. V. R. Portfors. 1997. Elephants, woodlands and biodiversity in  
 1022 southern Africa. *South African Journal of Science* **93**:231-236.
- 1023 Cumming, G. S. 2011. *Spatial Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems*. Springer.
- 1024 Cumming, G. S. and J. Collier. 2005. Change and identity in complex systems. *Ecology and*  
 1025 *Society* **10**:29 [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss21/art29/>.
- 1026 Cumming, G. S., D. H. M. Cumming, and C. L. Redman. 2006. Scale Mismatches in social-  
 1027 ecological systems: causes, consequences, and solutions. *Ecology and Society* **11**:14.
- 1028 Cumming, G. S. and B. J. Spiesman. 2006. Regional problems need integrated solutions: Pest  
 1029 management and conservation biology in agroecosystems. *Biological Conservation*  
 1030 **131**:533-543.

- 1031 Cumming, G. S. and D. P. Van Vuuren. 2006. Will climate change affect ectoparasite species  
 1032 ranges? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **15**:486-497.
- 1033 Cundill, G., C. Fabricius, and M. Neus. 2005. Foghorns to the future: using knowledge and  
 1034 transdisciplinarity to navigate complex systems. *Ecology and Society* **10**:8.
- 1035 Dudley, N. 2008. *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. IUCN, x +  
 1036 86pp.
- 1037 Etienne, M. 2001. Pine trees-invaders or forerunners in Mediterranean-type ecosystems: a  
 1038 controversial point of view. *Journal of Mediterranean Ecology* **2**:221-232.
- 1039 Etienne, M. and C. Le Page. 2002. Modelling contrasted management behaviours of stakeholders  
 1040 facing a pine encroachment process: an agent-based simulation approach. Pages 208-213  
 1041 in *Proceedings International Environmental Modelling and Software Society Conference*,  
 1042 Lugano, Switzerland.
- 1043 Fischer, J., G. D. Peterson, T. A. Gardner, L. J. Gordon, I. Fazey, T. Elmqvist, A. Felton, C.  
 1044 Folke, and S. Dovers. 2009. Integrating resilience thinking and optimisation for  
 1045 conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **24**:549-554.
- 1046 Folke, C., C. S. Holling, and C. Perrings. 1996. Biological diversity, ecosystems, and the human  
 1047 scale. *Ecological Applications* **6**:1018-1024.
- 1048 Fonderflick, J., A. Besnard, and J. L. Martin. 2013. Species traits and the response of  
 1049 open-habitat species to forest edge in landscape mosaics. *Oikos* **122**:42-51.
- 1050 Garmestani, A. S. and C. R. Allen. in press. *Social-ecological resilience and law*. University of  
 1051 Columbia Press.
- 1052 German MAB National Committee. 2005. *Full of Life: UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Model  
 1053 Regions for Sustainable Development*. Springer.

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological  
 Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1



- 1054 Gondo, T., P. Frost, W. Kozanayi, J. Stack, and M. Mushongahande. 2010. Linking knowledge  
 1055 and practice: Assessing options for sustainable use of mopane worms (*Imbrasia belina*) in  
 1056 southern Zimbabwe. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* **12**:127-145.
- 1057 González, J. A., C. Montes, J. Rodríguez, and W. Tapia. 2008. Rethinking the Galapagos Islands  
 1058 as a complex social-ecological system: implications for conservation and management.  
 1059 *Ecology and Society* **13**:13. [online] URL:  
 1060 <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss12/art13/>.
- 1061 Goss, J. and G. S. Cumming. 2013. Networks of wildlife translocations in developing countries:  
 1062 an emerging conservation issue? *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment* **11**:243-250.
- 1063 Guerrero, A. M., R. McALLISTER, J. Corcoran, and K. A. Wilson. 2013. Scale Mismatches,  
 1064 Conservation Planning, and the Value of Social Network Analyses. *Conservation*  
 1065 *Biology* **27**:35-44.
- 1066 Gunderson, L. and C. Holling, editors. 2002. *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human*  
 1067 *and natural systems*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- 1068 Gutierrez, N. L., R. Hilborn, and O. Defeo. 2011. Leadership, social capital and incentives  
 1069 promote successful fisheries. *Nature* **470**:386-389.
- 1070 Haider, L. J., A. E. Quinlan, and G. D. Peterson. 2012. Interacting Traps: Resilience Assessment  
 1071 of a Pasture Management System in Northern Afghanistan. *Planning Theory & Practice*  
 1072 **13**:299-333.
- 1073 Hall, C. M. 2010. Crisis events in tourism: subjects of crisis in tourism. *Current Issues in*  
 1074 *Tourism* **13**:401 - 417.
- 1075 Holling, C. S. 1973. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology*  
 1076 *and Systematics* **4**:1-23.

- 1077 Holling, C. S. 2001. Understanding the complexity of economic, ecological, and social systems.  
 1078 *Ecosystems* **4**:390-405.
- 1079 Holling, C. S. and L. H. Gunderson. 2002. Resilience and adaptive cycles. Pages 25-62 in L. H.  
 1080 Gunderson and C. S. Holling, editors. *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human*  
 1081 *and natural systems*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- 1082 Holt, R. F., R. P. Bio, P. A. G. Utzig, and R. F. P. Pearce. 2012. Assessment and Decision-  
 1083 making for Climate Change: An Overview of Theory and Approaches. West Kootenay  
 1084 Climate Vulnerability and Resilience Project Report #2.  
 1085 URL:[http://www.westkootenayresilience.org/Report2\\_Approaches\\_Final.pdf](http://www.westkootenayresilience.org/Report2_Approaches_Final.pdf).
- 1086 Hughes, T. P., D. R. Bellwood, C. Folke, R. S. Steneck, and a. J. Wilson. 2005. New paradigms  
 1087 for supporting the resilience of marine ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*  
 1088 **20**:380-386.
- 1089 IUCN. 1979. *The Biosphere Reserve and Its Relationship to other Protected Areas*. International  
 1090 Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Gland, Switzerland.
- 1091 Janzen, D. H. 1983. No park is an island, increase in interference from outside as park size  
 1092 decreases. *Oikos* **41**:402-410.
- 1093 Jax, K. 2010. *Ecosystem Functioning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- 1094 Jentoft, S. 2007. In the power of power: The understated aspect of fisheries and coastal  
 1095 management. *Human Organization* **66**:426-437.
- 1096 Jones, P. J. S., W. Qiu, and E. M. D. Santo. 2013. Governing marine protected areas: Social-  
 1097 ecological resilience through institutional diversity. *Marine Policy* **41**:5-13, ISSN 0308-  
 1098 0597X, <http://dx.doi.org/0310.1016/j.marpol.2012.0312.0026>.

- 1099 Joseph, G., G. S. Cumming, D. H. M. Cumming, Z. Mahlangu, and C. Seymour. 2011. Large  
 1100 termitaria act as refugia for tall trees, deadwood and cavity-using birds in a miombo  
 1101 woodland. *Landscape Ecology* **26**:439-448.
- 1102 Kates, R. W., W. C. Clark, R. Corell, J. M. Hall, C. C. Jaeger, I. Lowe, J. J. McCarthy, H. J.  
 1103 Schellnhuber, B. Bolin, N. M. Dickson, S. Faucheux, G. C. Gallopin, A. Grubler, B.  
 1104 Huntley, J. Jager, N. S. Jodha, R. E. Kasperson, A. Mabogunje, P. Matson, and H.  
 1105 Mooney. 2001. *Sustainability Science*. *Science* **292**.
- 1106 Kay, J. J. and M. Boyle. 2008. Self-organizing, holarchic, open systems (SOHOs). *in* D. Waltner-  
 1107 Toews, J. J. Kay, and N.-M. E. Lister, editors. *The ecosystem approach: complexity,*  
 1108 *uncertainty, and managing for sustainability*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- 1109 Kenward, R., R. Clarke, K. Hodder, and S. Walls. 2001. Density and linkage estimators of home  
 1110 range: nearest-neighbor clustering defines multinuclear cores. *Ecology* **82**:1905-1920.
- 1111 Kerley, G. I. H., M. Landman, L. Kruger, and N. Owen-Smith. 2008. The effects of elephants on  
 1112 ecosystems and biodiversity. *in* R. J. Scholes and K. G. Mennell, editors. *Elephant*  
 1113 *Management. A Scientific Assessment for South Africa*. Witwatersrand University Press,  
 1114 Johannesburg.
- 1115 Kinzig, A. P., P. A. Ryan, M. Etienne, H. E. Allison, T. Elmqvist, and B. H. Walker. 2006.  
 1116 Resilience and regime shifts: assessing cascading effects. *Ecology and Society* **11**.
- 1117 Laurance, W. F. 2013. Does research help to safeguard protected areas? *Trends in ecology &*  
 1118 *evolution*. **In press**.
- 1119 Lee, T. M. and W. Jetz. 2008. Future battlegrounds for conservation under global change.  
 1120 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **275**:1261-1270.

- 1121 Lenten, B. 2001. A flying start for the agreement on the conservation of African-Eurasian  
 1122 Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA). *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy* **4**:159-  
 1123 164.
- 1124 Levin, S. A. 1992. The Problem of Pattern and Scale in Ecology. *Ecology* **73**:1943-1967.
- 1125 Levin, S. A. 1999. *Fragile dominion: complexity and the commons*. Perseus Books, Reading,  
 1126 MA.
- 1127 Levin, S. A. 2005. Self-organization and the emergence of complexity in ecological systems.  
 1128 *Bioscience* **55**:1075-1079.
- 1129 Loucks, C., J. Springer, S. Palminteri, J. Morrison, and H. Strand. 2004. From the Vision to the  
 1130 Ground: A guide to implementing ecoregion conservation in priority areas. Worldwide  
 1131 Fund for Nature, Washington, D.C.
- 1132 Lundy, M. G. and W. I. Montgomery. 2010. A multi-scale analysis of the habitat associations of  
 1133 European otter and American mink and the implications for farm scale conservation  
 1134 schemes. *Biodiversity and Conservation* **19**:3849-3859.
- 1135 Maciejewski, K. and G. I. H. Kerley. in press. Elevated elephant density does not improve  
 1136 ecotourism opportunities, suggesting convergence in social and ecological objectives.  
 1137 *Ecological Applications*.
- 1138 Makhado, R. A., G. P. Von Maltitz, M. J. Potgieter, and D. C. Wessels. 2009. Contribution of  
 1139 woodland products to rural livelihoods in the northeast of Limpopo Province, South  
 1140 Africa. *South African Geographical Journal* **91**:46-53.
- 1141 Mathevet, R. 2012. *La solidarité écologique, Ce lien qui nous oblige*. Actes Sud, Paris.
- 1142 Mathevet, R. and A. Mauchamp. 2005. Evidence-based conservation: dealing with social issues.  
 1143 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **20**:422-423.

- 1144 Mathevet, R., J. D. Thompson, O. Delanoe, M. Cheylan, C. Gil-Fourrier, and M. Bonnin. 2010.  
 1145 La solidarité écologique: un nouveau concept pour la gestion intégrée des parcs nationaux  
 1146 et des territoires. *Natures Sciences Sociétés* **18**:424-433.
- 1147 Matthews, G. V. T. 1993. *The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands: its History and Development.*  
 1148 The Ramsar Convention, Gland, Switzerland.
- 1149 McGinnis, M. D. 2011. An Introduction to IAD and the Language of the Ostrom Workshop: A  
 1150 Simple Guide to a Complex Framework. *Policy Studies Journal* **39**:169-183.
- 1151 Mills, M., R. Weeks, R. L. Pressey, S. Foale, and N. C. Ban. 2010. A mismatch of scales:  
 1152 challenges in planning for implementation of marine protected areas in the Coral  
 1153 Triangle. *Conservation Letters* **3**:291-303.
- 1154 Mitchell, R. C. 2011. *Social-Ecological Inventories: Building Resilience to Environmental*  
 1155 *Change within Biosphere reserves.* Climate Adaptation Workshop Report, Brock  
 1156 University, Canada.  
 1157 URL:[http://www.resalliance.org/files/raprojects/11/BESRU\\_2011\\_SEI\\_Workshop Repo](http://www.resalliance.org/files/raprojects/11/BESRU_2011_SEI_Workshop_Report.pdf)  
 1158 [rt.pdf](http://www.resalliance.org/files/raprojects/11/BESRU_2011_SEI_Workshop Repo).
- 1159 O'Rourke, E. 1999. The Causse Méjan: changing relationships between agriculture, environment  
 1160 and society within a French National Park. *Landscape Research* **24**:141-165.
- 1161 Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons.* Cambridge University Press, New York.
- 1162 Ostrom, E. 2007. A diagnostic approach for going beyond panaceas. *Proceedings of the National*  
 1163 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **104**:15181-15187.
- 1164 Ostrom, E. 2009. A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems.  
 1165 *Science* **352**:419-422.

- 1166 Ostrom, E. 2011. Reflections on "Some Unsettled Problems of Irrigation". *American Economic*  
 1167 *Review* **101**:49-63.
- 1168 Ostrom, E. and M. Cox. 2010. Moving beyond panaceas: a multi-tiered diagnostic approach for  
 1169 social-ecological analysis. *Environmental Conservation* **37**:451-463.
- 1170 Ostrom, E., R. Gardner, and J. Walker. 1994. *Rules, Games and Common-Pool Resources*. Ann  
 1171 Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- 1172 Peet, R. and M. Watts. 1993. Development Theory and Environment in an Age of Market  
 1173 Triumphalism. *Economic Geography* **69**:227-253.
- 1174 Peterson, G., C. R. Allen, and C. S. Holling. 1998. Ecological resilience, biodiversity, and scale.  
 1175 *Ecosystems* **1**:6-18.
- 1176 Pickett, S. T. A., C. Jones, and J. Kolasa. 2007. *Ecological understanding: the nature of theory*  
 1177 *and the theory of nature*. Academic Press, New York.
- 1178 Plug, I. 2000. Overview of iron age fauna from the Limpopo Valley. South Africa  
 1179 *Archaeological Society Goodwin Series* **8**:117-126.
- 1180 Plumptre, A. J., D. Kujirakwinja, A. Treves, I. Owiunji, and H. Rainer. 2007. Transboundary  
 1181 conservation in the greater Virunga landscape: Its importance for landscape species.  
 1182 *Biological Conservation* **134**:279-287.
- 1183 Poiani, K. A., B. D. Richter, M. G. Anderson, and H. E. Richter. 2000. Biodiversity conservation  
 1184 at multiple scales: functional sites, landscapes, and networks. *Bioscience* **50**:133-146.
- 1185 Poteete, A., M. Janssen, and E. Ostrom. 2009. *Multiple methods in practice: Collective action*  
 1186 *and the commons*. Princeton University Press.
- 1187 Poteete, A. R., M. Janssen, and E. Ostrom. 2010. *Working together: collective action, the*  
 1188 *commons, and multiple methods in practice*. Princeton University Press.

- 1189 Resilience Alliance. 2007a. Assessing and Managing Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems: A  
 1190 Practitioners Workbook.
- 1191 Resilience Alliance. 2007b. Assessing Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems: A Scientist's  
 1192 Workbook. Available on-line at <http://www.resalliance.org/3871.php>. The Resilience  
 1193 Alliance.
- 1194 Resilience Alliance. 2010. Assessing resilience in social-ecological systems: Workbook for  
 1195 practitioners. Version 2.0. Resilience Alliance, Online:  
 1196 <http://www.resalliance.org/3871.php>.
- 1197 Robbins, P. 2004. Political ecology: a critical introduction. Blackwell Publishers, London, UK.
- 1198 Rodwell, T. C., N. P. Kriek, R. G. Bengis, I. J. Whyte, P. C. Viljoen, V. de Vos, and W. M.  
 1199 Boyce. 2001. Prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in African buffalo at Kruger National  
 1200 Park. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* **37**:258-264.
- 1201 Rogers, D. J. and S. E. Randolph. 1993. Distribution of Tsetse and Ticks in Africa - Past, Present  
 1202 and Future. *Parasitology Today* **9**:266-271.
- 1203 Rogers, D. J. and S. E. Randolph. 2000. The global spread of malaria in a future, warmer world.  
 1204 *Science* **289**:1763-1766.
- 1205 Schlager, E. 2007. A comparison of frameworks, theories, and models of policy processes.  
 1206 Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- 1207 Scholes, R. J. and R. Biggs. 2004. Ecosystem services in southern Africa: a regional perspective.  
 1208 Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Pretoria.
- 1209 Simon, H. A. 1991. Bounded Rationality and Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*  
 1210 **2**:125-134.

- 1211 Sims-Castley, R., G. I. H. Kerley, B. Geach, and J. Langholz. 2005. Socio-economic significance  
 1212 of ecotourism-based private game reserves in South Africa's Eastern Cape Province.  
 1213 *Parks* **15**:6-18.
- 1214 Sjöstedt, B. 2013. The Role of Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Armed  
 1215 Conflict: 'Green-keeping' in Virunga Park. Applying the UNESCO World Heritage  
 1216 Convention in the Armed Conflict of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Nordic*  
 1217 *Journal of International Law* **82**:129-153.
- 1218 Slotow, R. and L. T. B. Hunter. 2009. Reintroduction decisions taken at the incorrect social scale  
 1219 devalue their conservation contribution: the African lion in South Africa. . Pages 43-71  
 1220 *The reintroduction of top-order predators*
- 1221 Strickland-Munro, J. K., H. E. Allison, and S. A. Moore. 2010. Using resilience concepts to  
 1222 investigate the impacts of protected area tourism on communities. *Annals of Tourism*  
 1223 *Research* **37**:499-519.
- 1224 Thompson, J., R. Mathevet, O. Delanoë, M. Cheylan, C. Gil-Fourrier, and M. Bonnin. 2011.  
 1225 Ecological solidarity as a conceptual tool for rethinking ecological and social  
 1226 interdependence in conservation policy for protected areas and their surrounding  
 1227 landscape. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, serie Biologies* **334**:412-419.
- 1228 TNC. 2003. *The Five-S Framework for Site Conservation: A Practitioner's Handbook for Site*  
 1229 *Conservation Planning and Measuring Conservation Success*. The Nature Conservancy,  
 1230 Washington, D.C.
- 1231 Turner, B. L. I., R. E. Kasperson, P. A. Matson, J. J. McCarthy, R. W. Corell, L. Christensen, N.  
 1232 Eckley, J. X. Kasperson, A. Luers, M. L. Martello, C. Polsky, A. Pulsipher, and A.



- 1233 Schiller. 2003. A Framework for Vulnerability Analysis in Sustainability Science.  
 1234 Proceedings of the National Academy of Science **100**:8074-8079.
- 1235 United Nations. 1992. Convention on Biological Diversity. Page 30 in U. Nations, editor.
- 1236 Vimal, R., R. Mathevet, and J. D. Thompson. 2012. The Changing Landscape of Ecological  
 1237 Networks. *Journal for Nature Conservation* **20**:49-55.
- 1238 Walker, B., L. Gunderson, A. Kinzig, C. Folke, S. Carpenter, and L. Schultz. 2006. A handful of  
 1239 heuristics and some propositions for understanding resilience in social-ecological  
 1240 systems. *Ecology and Society* **11**:13.
- 1241 Walker, B. H., N. Abel, J. M. Anderies, and P. Ryan. 2009. Resilience, adaptability, and  
 1242 transformability in the Goulburn-Broken Catchment, Australia. *Ecology and Society*  
 1243 **14**:12 [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss11/art12/>.
- 1244 Waltner-Toews, D., J. J. Kay, and N.-M. E. Lister. 2008. *The Ecosystem Approach: Uncertainty*  
 1245 *and Managing for Sustainability*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- 1246 Westley, F., S. R. Carpenter, W. A. Brock, C. S. Holling, and L. H. Gunderson. 2002. Why  
 1247 systems of people and nature are not just social and ecological systems. Pages 103-119 in  
 1248 L. H. Gunderson and C. S. Holling, editors. *Panarchy: understanding transformations in*  
 1249 *human and natural systems*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- 1250
- 1251
- 1252

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A.,  
 Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).  
 Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological*  
*Applications*. 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

1253 **Tables**

1254

1255 **Table 1:** IUCN protected area categories.

esa

preprint

<b>IUCN Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Ia Strict Nature Reserve</b>	<p>Category Ia are strictly protected areas set aside to protect biodiversity and also possibly geological/geomorphical features, where human visitation, use and impacts are strictly controlled and limited to ensure protection of the conservation values.</p> <p>Such protected areas can serve as indispensable reference areas for scientific research and monitoring.</p>
<b>Ib Wilderness Area</b>	<p>Category Ib protected areas are usually large unmodified or slightly modified areas, retaining their natural character and influence, without permanent or significant human habitation, which are protected and managed so as to preserve their natural condition.</p>
<b>II National Park</b>	<p>Category II protected areas are large natural or near natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes, along with the complement of species and ecosystems characteristic of the area, which also provide a foundation for environmentally and culturally compatible, spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational, and visitor opportunities.</p>

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A., Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015).

Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. Ecological

Applications, 25 (2). 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

---

<b>III Natural Monument or Feature</b>	<p>Category III protected areas are set aside to protect a specific natural monument, which can be a landform, sea mount, submarine cavern, geological feature, such as a cave, or even a living feature such as an ancient grove. They are generally quite small protected areas and often have high visitor value.</p>
<b>IV Habitat/Species Management Area</b>	<p>Category IV protected areas aim to protect particular species or habitats and management reflects this priority. Many Category IV protected areas will need regular, active interventions to address the requirements of particular species or to maintain habitats, but this is not a requirement of the category.</p>
<b>V Protected Landscape/ Seascape</b>	<p>A protected area where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant ecological, biological, cultural and scenic value: and where safeguarding the integrity of this interaction is vital to protecting and sustaining the area and its associated nature conservation and other values.</p>
<b>VI Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources</b>	<p>Category VI protected areas conserve ecosystems and habitats together with associated cultural values and traditional natural resource management systems. They are generally large, with most of the area in a natural condition, where a proportion is</p>

---

Comment citer ce document :

Cumming, G. S., Allen, C., Ban, N., Biggs, D., Biggs, H. C., Cumming, D. H., de Vos, A., Epstein, G., Etienne, M., Maciejewski, K., Mathevet, R., Moore, C., Nenadovic, M., Schoon, M. (2015). Understanding protected area resilience: a multi-scale socio-ecological approach. *Ecological Applications*, 25 (2), 299-319. DOI : 10.1890/13-2113.1

under sustainable natural resource management and where low-level non-industrial use of natural resources compatible with nature conservation is seen as one of the main aims of the area.

(Source: [http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/gpap\\_home/gpap\\_quality/gpap\\_categories/](http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/gpap_home/gpap_quality/gpap_categories/))



**Figure captions**

Figure 1: A summary depiction of Ostrom's SES framework. Different components of social-ecological systems (characterized as resource units, resource systems, governance systems, and actors) interact to produce outcomes. Each component is composed of numerous different elements. Although the framework indicates a role for cross-scale dynamics, this aspect of it has not been well developed in most applications. We note also that interactions --> outcomes includes interactions among (i) the ecological components of the system (e.g., predator-prey dynamics), (ii) the social components of the system (e.g., rulemaking), and (iii) the social and ecological components of the system (e.g., harvesting).

Figure 2: A multi-scale perspective of PAs as social-ecological systems, showing the relationships between the sizes, response times, and persistence times of different system elements. Note that individual elements in this figure are nested within each other. At each scale, Ostrom's SES framework captures some of the complexity of interactions between and across different subsystems.

Figure 3: Protected areas in the Western Cape, South Africa, showing the proximate, national, and international institutional context of each different area in geographic space. These different institutional levels interact with ecological and social processes at different geographic scales, as described in the text.

Figure 4: The depiction by Poiani et al. (2002) of the components of an ecologically functional landscape. Different species have different habitat requirements and if a full range of ecological function is to be retained, habitat conservation must be undertaken in a nested manner, with wide-ranging, regional species having access to high quality patches at local scales. Note that despite its emphasis on functional landscapes, this figure does not directly include people and the scales at which they modify landscapes.

Figure 5: Summary of social-ecological patterns and processes at different scales. Pattern-process interactions across and between these different scales must be reconciled if effective, sustainable conservation is to occur. In addition, different actors and processes operating at the same scale may interact in important ways. This figure extends the depiction of Poiani et al. (2002) of the ecological components of a functional landscape.

Figure 6: Timeline showing changes in and tenure/land use and wildlife and livestock populations in the GLTFCA between about 1830 and 2010. The 1890 decline in wildlife and livestock was due to the rinderpest pandemic. The early period was characterised by increasing ecological and social fragmentation, followed by TFCA formation and moves to reconnect landscape elements for conservation.

Figure 7: Overview showing examples of issues identified as particularly important in each of the three case studies at different spatial scales in ecological, socio-political, and economic categories respectively. The case studies are indicated on the left of the


diagram (EC, Eastern Cape; CM, Causse Méjan; GLTFCA, Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area). Note that (1) this list is not intended to be exhaustive; and (2) many of the issues that are indicated for individual case studies are also relevant to other case studies in the same compartment. For example, tourism & community upliftment are important in all three areas.

Figure 8: Diagrams presenting a dynamic perspective for each case study system: (a) Eastern Cape; (b) Causse Méjan; (c) Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. As indicated in the legend, the different colours for each box represent different kinds of system element (social, economic, and ecological) and arrows indicate interactions and feedbacks within and between scales. These elements are plotted on the notional spatial (on the x-axis) and temporal (on the y-axis) scales at which they exist. The lengths of the boxes are not drawn to scale.



Fig 1

# Cross-Scale Social-Ecological Interactions



# Cross-Scale Social-Ecological Interactions

Fig 2




Fig 3




Fig 4




Fig 5





Fig 6







Fig 8(a) Eastern Cape






**Fig 8(b) Causse Méjan**

Time

Size



- Ecological elements
- Social elements
- Economic elements
- Within-scale interactions
- Cross-scale interactions
- Cross-scale feedbacks

**Fig 8(c) Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area**

