

Social Assessment

in Natural Resource
Management Institutions



Editors: Allan Dale, Nick Taylor, Marcus Lane



**SOCIAL ASSESSMENT IN
NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
INSTITUTIONS**

Editors:

Allan Dale, Nick Taylor and Marcus Lane



**CSIRO
PUBLISHING**

© CSIRO 2001

All rights reserved. Except under the conditions described in the Australian Copyright Act 1968 and subsequent amendments, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, duplicating or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Contact **CSIRO PUBLISHING** for all permission requests.

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Social assessment in natural resource management institutions.

Bibliography.

ISBN 0 643 06558 X.

1. Social change. 2. Conservation of natural resources.
3. Human ecology. I. Taylor, C. N. (C. Nicholas).
- II. Lane, Marcus B. (Marcus Benjamin), 1966-.
- III. Dale, Allan Patrick.

303

Available from

CSIRO PUBLISHING

150 Oxford Street (PO Box 1139)

Collingwood VIC 3066

Australia

Telephone: +61 3 9662 7666
Freecall: 1800 645 051 (Australia only)
Fax: +61 3 9662 7555
Email: sales@publish.csiro.au
Web site: www.publish.csiro.au

Cover design by James Kelly

Printed in Australia by Shannon Books

Foreword

Dawning recognition that the Earth is a finite sphere rather than the infinite plane implied by standard economics texts, coupled with (and/or spawned by) degradation and depletion of natural resources, has led to increased focus on environmental issues and resource management over the last thirty years. However the disciplines that discovered the environment in the seventies and eighties were quick to reduce it to constituent parts – land, water, vegetation, air, wildlife – and to institutionalise this disintegration. Further, management of land, or water, or any other ‘resource’ was conceived as a technical, biophysical challenge, for which there was a ‘right’ way reflected in the application of particular technologies that merely needed to be ‘transferred’ from experts to passive, receptive practitioners. To the extent that the environment was conceived to be a system, people were assumed to be external to it. Development of resources was implicitly assumed to be a good thing.

But understanding resource management is not just about soil science or biology or hydrology or agronomy, it is fundamentally about understanding how **people** live in, interact with, and manage natural resources. Landscapes are socially constructed. Resource management is a social process, involving values, choices and trade-offs. Environmental issues are people issues.

Interventions in resource management, whether by government or industry, through a specific development project or a generic policy reform, inevitably generate costs, benefits and other social impacts. Equally inevitably, these impacts are unevenly distributed, in space and time, across different people, groups, organisations, cultures, sectors and regions.

On the face of it, one would imagine that governments in particular, but also industries and developers, would be very interested in having a better understanding of potential social impacts associated with a particular intervention, of the distribution of winners and especially losers. By now, surely, our tools and methods for bringing social impacts into planning and decision making should be as sophisticated, as accepted and as institutionalised as those for anticipating the biological impacts of, say, known pollutants or of deforestation. Surely it is common sense to “*Stop! Look! Listen!*” consistent with the slogan from the 1994 *Better Communities* document of the then New South Wales Social Policy Directorate.

This excellent compilation *Social Assessment in Natural Resource Management Institutions* demolishes such fancies. Allan Dale, Nick Taylor and Marcus Lane have brought together and added considerable value to a series of papers from the cutting edge of social assessment in the English-speaking world, and particularly in Australasia.

As Dale, Taylor and Lane put it, this is a book by those in the field, for those in the field. It should be of great value for anyone working in the field of social assessment. It is full of practical lessons and insights for practitioners, who emerge through the pages of this volume as, on the whole, somewhat demoralised and frustrated. Progress has been slow, there have been many reversals, attempts to institutionalise social assessment have rarely been durable, and real influence often appears to have precipitated political demise.

The inherently and inevitably political context within which social assessment is applied and utilised is discussed thoughtfully and frankly in this useful book. This context makes it almost inevitable that many of the attempts to institutionalise social assessment in the form of dedicated organisations or units have been ephemeral. “Shoot the messenger” will always remain firmly in the menu of responses to social assessment, which, if done well, usually means making the social outcomes of an intervention more transparent and more tractable for

those affected. This may be wholly undesirable from the perspective of proponents of that intervention, who usually have more power than the social scientists.

While it is unsurprising that dedicated organisations have not lasted, as the editors take pains to point out, there is more to institutionalising social assessment than creating dedicated structures or writing social impact assessment into statute law. Organisations may not be durable, but a body of theoretical understanding, professional expertise and skilled practice should be capable of continuous learning and development despite the ephemeral nature of organisational structures, especially in the public domain. It is the patchiness and underdevelopment of this wider sense of institutionalisation that is more worrying for the future of social assessment. The shortage of skilled practitioners in the field with quality standards, training and review processes means that social assessment has often been carried out by people with inappropriate skills, inadequate training, lacking access to supportive professional networks or corporate memory. So social assessment practice has too often been poor, reinforcing perceptions among non-social scientists of flakiness, lack of rigour and of being ‘unscientific’. The lack (within Australia at least) of even a professional body for social assessment thinkers and practitioners is indicative of the precarious status of the field.

Yet the series of diverse cases described in this volume, from the global level to the local level, in very different institutional contexts, do contain cause for some optimism. Melanie Fisher argues that, while it may not have changed the ultimate resource allocation decision, social assessment at its best has replaced anecdote and assertion with data and representative views, fomented high quality local participation, giving a stronger voice to those most affected, identified mitigation strategies, and brought social issues to the table in ways that have forced non-social scientists to be sensitive to social impacts.

The editorial hand in this volume is light but distinct. Dale, Taylor and Lane have ensured that distinct themes emerge through diverse individual contributions. These are articulated well within a coherent conceptual framework in their introductory and concluding chapters. The influence of the two workshops which brought authors together to draw out these themes and to share insights is also clear and positive.

This book deserves a wider audience than social assessment practitioners. Much of the discussion in the book revolves around the broader challenge of bringing the social sciences to the table on an equal footing with the biophysical sciences and economics in dealing with complex, contested resource management issues. This challenge is not unique to social assessment. The nub of the challenge is that the social sciences do not lend themselves to meaningful incorporation into the rational, technocratic, ‘technical decision treadmill’ as Dale et al call it. It can be argued that neither do the biophysical sciences – viz biodiversity being reduced to lists of species – or even economics, saddled with primitive, homogeneous notions of human behaviour and myopic with respect to issues of scale and distribution.

Dale, Taylor and Lane conclude that the answer for social scientists is not to try to pursue technocratic approaches so as to better fit the decision support systems into which biophysical and economic data is extruded, but rather to better understand ‘the power problem’ in order to work smarter as change agents within their institutions. Durable institutionalising of social assessment will require changes to power relations within and between resource management institutions, and a degree of opening up of governance and decision-making agencies to power sharing. Advocates of an equal voice for the social sciences are really about developing new concepts of governance and new types of institutional design. Dale, Taylor and Lane don’t suggest this is easy. But they conclude optimistically that the prevailing currents in developed countries bode well for the place of social assessment to become less marginal. Citing Friedmann, they suggest that systemic change is as likely to be stimulated

externally, through the agency of an active civil society demanding greater and better involvement in resource management decisions.

Environmental issues and natural resource management challenges will not go away. Dealing with them is among the central questions of our time. These are people issues. Any field which can assist in illuminating the social outcomes of environmental interventions, and in assisting people to be more meaningfully and constructively engaged in decisions and actions which affect them, will find a growing support base and passionate advocates, despite (or even because of) its unpopularity with development proponents.

However the range of experiences captured in this book suggest that the leaders of the nascent profession of social assessment have some work to do to establish the ‘small i’ institutions – the professional structures, standards, protocols, accreditation processes, training and reward systems – that are needed to consolidate experience and insights into professional reliability and credibility.

This readable and insightful book offers a very interesting window on the struggles of policy and management to come to grips with the sustainability challenge over the last twenty years. It deserves a wide audience among the social sciences and, equally importantly, among policy makers and managers within resource management agencies at all levels, in government and industry.

Andrew Campbell

Executive Director
Land & Water Australia



About the editors and contributors

Editors

Allan Dale is a natural resource planner at CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation) in Queensland, Australia. He has recently accepted the role of General Manager of Resource Policy in that State's Department of Natural Resources and Mines. He was the first manager of Queensland's Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Unit from 1993 to 1996.

Marcus Lane is Assistant Professor of Environmental Planning in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. His current research is concerned with the interaction of civil society and the state in environmental planning. In earlier work he has examined social impact assessment (SIA) for indigenous peoples in resource planning.

Charles Nicholas Taylor is a director of Taylor-Baines and Associates in Christchurch, New Zealand. He specialises in social assessment relating to natural resource management, including tourism development. He has been involved in the development of techniques for social assessment and conducts training courses in social assessment internationally.

Contributors

Rabel Burdge is a Professor in the Department of Sociology at Huxley College of Environmental Studies, Western Washington University in Bellingham, USA. He is also Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Paul Francis is Senior Lecturer in Social Development at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK. A social anthropologist and agricultural economist, most of his career has been spent working with development programmes in Africa and Asia.

Susan Jacobs is an independent consultant who has been a social analyst, public participation strategist, and social assessment trainer with World Bank teams on four continents and in multiple sectors. She worked full time on social development for the Bank from 1993 to 1999.

Dianne Scott is a lecturer in the School of Life and Environmental Science at the University of Natal, Durban, South Africa. Her research interests include, public participation in environmental decision-making, participatory environmental education and capacity-building, and the development of more appropriate social impact assessment methodologies.

Catherine Oelofse holds the post of the Sappi Lectureship in Sustainable Development within the School of Life and Environmental Science at the University of Natal, Durban, South Africa. Her research interests are in the fields of urban environmental risk, developing sustainability indicators, community based environmental planning and management and methodologies for social assessment.

Alex Weaver is manager of the Integration Unit in South Africa's CSIR Division of Water, Environment and Forestry Technology and co-ordinates R&D in the field of environmental assessment. He is a past president of International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA).

Ali Memon is Chair in Environmental Management and Planning in the Division of Environmental Management and Design at Lincoln University in New Zealand. He has an interest in the study of environmental issues in capitalist societies from a social science perspective.

Richard Morgan is an Associate Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Otago, New Zealand. He is particularly interested in the approaches used to conduct impact assessment and the evolution of institutional arrangements for impact assessment in New Zealand and the Pacific.

Gary Cox practices in urban planning, social policy and social research. He has been consulting for ten years and has also lectured in urban and regional planning at the University of Sydney. He is author of three New South Wales' government publications on SIA.

Tiffany Morrison is based at CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems in Brisbane, Australia. She has completed an Environmental Science degree at Griffith University and Honours within the Geographical Sciences and Planning Department at the University of Queensland.

Helen Ross is an interdisciplinary social scientist and Professor with the School of Natural and Rural Systems Management, the University of Queensland, Australia. She has worked extensively with indigenous people and environmental assessment in Australia.

Joseph Reser is a Reader in Environmental and Social Psychology at the University of Durham, United Kingdom. Until December 1999 he was Associate Professor and Head of Psychology at James Cook University, Queensland.

Joan Bentrupperbäumer is a Research Fellow with the Rainforest CRC and School of Psychology, James Cook University, Queensland. Her research interests include human-natural environment transactions using social and psychological perspectives.

Rosey Crisp is Manager of the Land and Cultural Resources Section within Queensland's Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy and Development. She has a Commerce degree with majors in economics and public policy from Griffith University.

Jennifer Duffecy works in the field of community economic development with the Department of Commerce and Trade in Western Australia. She was an original member of the Western Australian State government's Social Impact Unit from 1989 to 1993.

Lisa Pollard is a social assessment consultant with Sinclair Knight Merz in Queensland, Australia. She has extensive experience in government strategic planning and policy sectors. She completed her PhD on SIA and community consultation in 1998.

Tamsin Kerr has worked in environmental policy and social planning at all levels of Australian government. She has also lectured on public involvement and community development in planning, and is a cultural relations officer for a local government in Queensland.

Stephanie Wyeth is a senior programme officer in the Community and Economic Development Division of Brisbane City Council, working in the area of social diversity and housing policy. Stephanie was Council's social planner between 1994 and 1998, and again in 2000.

Tricia Shantz works as a Community Planner in Local Government in Lismore, NSW. She studied Journalism in Canada and has a Bachelor of Arts and a Graduate Diploma in Urban & Regional Planning from the University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

Kym Seebohm is based in Brisbane as a Principal Consultant in resource management for the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (Australia) Ltd. He has worked for ten years in environmental policy for the Commonwealth and NSW Governments.

Julie Warren is a director of the Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment in New Zealand. She has worked in research, social impact assessment and evaluation for 15

years in a wide range of areas from tourism and recreational development, regional and local economic development and youth programmes.

Melanie Fisher is the Director of the Social Sciences Centre in Australia's Commonwealth Bureau of Rural Sciences. She has a policy background and has worked as an adviser to a former Federal Minister for Primary Industries.

Gerard Fitzgerald is a Christchurch-based sociologist consulting in the social aspects of natural resource management. Prior to establishing Fitzgerald Applied Sociology, he worked as a social scientist in New Zealand's Department of Science, Industry and Research.

Sheridan Coakes is the Director of Coakes Consulting in Sydney, Australia. Until 1996, she was the Senior Social Scientist within the Social Assessment Unit within the Australian Department of Primary Industries and Energy.

Mark Fenton is Senior Lecturer in Environmental Science at James Cook University and Task Leader for the Social Assessment Programme in the Centre for Reef Research, Townsville, Australia. He has 20 years experience in social assessment in natural resource management.

Stuart Cowell is a Senior Research Scientist with CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems in Townsville, Australia. He has an extensive background in social assessment for indigenous communities and has previously worked in both the mining industry and indigenous organisations.

Bronwen Bourke is Coordinator for Sea Forum; an alliance of traditional owner groups in north eastern Australia. She has previously worked in natural resource management roles within the Commonwealth and State governments as well as indigenous organisations.

Anne Leitch and *Clare Gambley* provided significant editorial support for this book. Both work with CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems in Brisbane, Australia.

Disclaimer

The views represented by all contributors to this book are their own; they are not the views of the organisations for which they are currently or have previously been employed.



CONTENTS

Foreword	v
About the editors and contributors	ix

PART I: INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL ASSESSMENT IN NATURAL RESOURCE INSTITUTIONS

Social assessment in natural resource management: Promise, potentiality, and practice <i>Marcus Lane, Allan Dale and Nick Taylor</i>	3
---	---

PART II: INSTITUTIONALISING SOCIAL ASSESSMENT IN THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

The international institutionalisation of social impact assessment <i>Rabel Burdge</i>	15
Institutionalising social assessment at the World Bank <i>Paul Francis and Susan Jacobs</i>	24
The institutionalisation of social assessment in South Africa: The post-apartheid window of opportunity <i>Dianne Scott, Catherine Oelofse and Alex Weaver</i>	37
Assessing environmental justice: Social assessment lessons from the California Energy Commission's siting process <i>Marcus Lane</i>	51

PART III: INSTITUTIONALISING SOCIAL ASSESSMENT AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

Social assessment in New Zealand resource management <i>Ali Memon and Richard Morgan</i>	61
Limitation and opportunity: The institutional basis for social assessment in natural resource management in Australia <i>Gary Cox, Allan Dale and Tiffany Morrison</i>	74
Social assessment and resource management at the Australian federal level: Trapped in an epistemological corner? <i>Helen Ross and Marcus Lane</i>	93
Reframing the nature and scope of social impact assessment: Psychological & social (psychosocial) impacts <i>Joseph Reser and Joan Bentrupperbäumer</i>	105

PART IV: INSTITUTIONALISING SOCIAL ASSESSMENT AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL

Institutionalising social assessment in Queensland: The Social Impact Assessment Unit 1993–1996 <i>Allan Dale and Rosey Crisp</i>	125
--	-----

The Western Australian Social Impact Unit 1989–1993: Nicety or necessity? <i>Jennifer Duffecy and Lisa Pollard</i>	136
Social assessment in New South Wales and the 2000 Olympics: A great leap forward? <i>Gary Cox</i>	148

PART V: INSTITUTIONALISING SOCIAL ASSESSMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Social impact assessment in the Australian Capital Territory <i>Tamsin Kerr</i>	165
Institutionalising social impact assessment in Australian local government: A practitioner's perspective from Brisbane City Council, Queensland <i>Stephanie Wyeth</i>	176
Social impact assessment at the local government level in New South Wales, Australia: The Lismore City Council experience <i>Tricia Shantz</i>	189

PART VI: INSTITUTIONALISING SOCIAL ASSESSMENT AT THE SECTOR LEVEL

The Australian urban water industry <i>Kym Seebohm</i>	203
Social assessment in the tourism sector in New Zealand <i>C. Nicholas Taylor and Julie Warren</i>	218
Hastening the evolution of Australian rural industry policy: Social impact assessment in a broader context <i>Melanie Fisher</i>	231
Social impact assessment in New Zealand natural resource management research institutions <i>Gerard Fitzgerald</i>	242
Social assessment in the Australian Forest Sector <i>Sheridan Coakes and Mark Fenton</i>	255
Social assessment and indigenous peoples: Aboriginal versus bureaucratic agency <i>Stuart Cowell, Marcus Lane, Bronwen Burke and Rosie Crisp</i>	266

PART VII: CONCLUSIONS – THE WAY FORWARD

Conclusions: Social assessment, natural resource institutions and the future <i>Nick Taylor, Allan Dale and Marcus Lane</i>	283
--	-----

**PART I: INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL
ASSESSMENT IN NATURAL RESOURCE
INSTITUTIONS**