

0398-7

March 23, 1966

Report to the Commission on National Parks of IUCN  
on Park Systems Planning

Background

At the First World Conference on National Parks held in Seattle in 1962, the following Resolution was passed:

" . . . . urged IUCN to study the need to establish a Committee on Park Planning (this planning to include nature reserves, scientific areas, prehistoric, historic and cultural sites, wildlife sanctuaries, outdoor recreation areas, and other natural areas) for the purpose of assisting countries to develop programs emphasizing . . . . an advisory service , . . . and research . . . . on the development and use of parks and park systems".

Thus delegates from 62 countries endorsed a line of inquiry initiated by the International Commission on National Parks of IUCN directed at consideration of the parks of a country in a comprehensive and systematic way. By such an approach it was thought that parkland acquisition and investments in facilities would be more meaningful to national governments, national and regional planning agencies, and citizens generally.

At Seattle an informal group of fifteen or twenty persons from various countries found they had common interest in such an approach to park planning and development. This group met frequently while in Seattle for discussions which proved to be fruitful and even exciting. Throughout these discussions Harold Coolidge, Chairman of the Commission on National Parks of IUCN, gave much encouragement and support. This informal group, plus a few additions later was constituted as a Committee on Park Systems Planning and in the years since Seattle has kept in touch through correspondence and occasional visits. The group has consisted of the following: Gert Kragh (Germany), E.O.A. Asibey (Ghana), Dusit Banijbatana (Thailand), Luis A. Bolin (Spain), Gerardo Budowski (Costa Rica), R.W. Cleland (New Zealand), J.R.B. Coleman (Canada), E.P. Gee (India), Tetsumaro Senge (Japan), David P.S. Wasawo

-2-

(Uganda), Alfred B. LaGasse (USA), Charles A. DeTurk (USA), Arturo Eichler (Venezuela), Kim Jung-Up (Korea), Joyce E. Lyndon (USA), Amotz Zahavi (Israel), and Joseph L. Fisher (USA), who participated in Seattle.

To launch the work on park systems planning, IUCN presented a proposal to Resources for the Future, which was later approved, to enable the Union and its International Commission on National Parks to make a beginning on the assignment contained in the Seattle Resolution. The grant was for \$39,550 to be used over approximately a three-year period. William J. Hart, formerly head of the State Parks in Nevada and experienced in land planning and economics, was engaged to head the project.

#### Accomplishments

This project has now been completed, the money has been spent, and encouraging results are at hand. One major publication has resulted: a printed book entitled A Systems Approach to Park Planning prepared by Mr. Hart. The manuscript for this study was extensively reviewed by members of the Committee on Park Systems Planning, the Commission on National Parks, and other scholars and administrators in various parts of the world.

The book sets forth the systems approach to park planning in which a number of different types of areas (for game preserves, scientific research, scenic amenity, popular recreation use, historical and archeological features, etc.) are considered as comprehensive systems which have to be planned, financed, and justified in the same general ways that other features of national and regional development programs have to be dealt with. This kind of an approach by its nature brings together scientists, (biologists, ecologists, zoologists, etc.), social scientists (economists, public administration experts, sociologists, etc.), planners, development engineers, and others.

In addition to a general framework and an approach, the report summarizes several field case studies undertaken by Mr. Hart in Korea, Colombia, Zambia, Turkey, and shorter term experiences in still other places.

In addition, throughout the study are to be found suggestions for further research and investigation into the systems approach to park planning. In any subsequent phases these and other suggestions for further research should be considered and if possible undertaken.

In addition to the principal report, a number of other published articles have resulted from the project. These include: "A New Field: International Parks Planning", "Factors in Park Building Design", and "A Review of the Natural Resources of the African Continent", all by Mr. Hart, plus a few by others.

Extensive working reports were also prepared and distributed. Those written by Mr. Hart are: "Uludag, National Park Planning Analysis", "Parks and Open Space Management in Turkey", "Recreation Resource Planning in Territory of Northern Rhodesia", and "Recreation Resource Planning in the Republic of Korea." "A Long Term Development Plan for Uludag National Park" was prepared by Lloyd Brooks.

The second assignment under the Seattle Resolution was to work toward the creation of a technical advisory service for helping countries which might request help in park and park systems planning. Attached is a statement prepared by Mr. Hart recommending procedures for accomplishing this. Out of his experience and in consultation with members of the IUCN sponsored committees concerned with parks, he has drawn up a panel of experts in this field on whom countries might draw for assistance in their park planning. This list should be made available to UNESCO, FAO, US AID, the World Bank, the UN Development Program, plus park, forest, and related departments or agencies in the governments of the various countries, and to others. IUCN will have to decide the extent to which it wants to retain central leadership and clearing house functions to operate this kind of advisory service for parks systems planning.

#### What Next?

Good progress has been made on both assignments contained in the Seattle

Resolution: research and study on the one hand, and creation of a technical advisory service for park systems planning on the other. Several basic questions remain for consideration by the Commission on National Parks and IUCN itself. A good start has been made with this project; what are the options now for IUCN and what should its course of action be?

1. Does IUCN through its Commission on National Parks want to continue the work it has begun on park systems planning? If so, what steps should be taken?

If the answer to the first question is yes, then probably the most satisfactory action for IUCN would be to approve a continued line of work on park systems planning and accord it high priority in the over-all program of IUCN. The Commission on National Parks would be the logical sub-agency through which the program is undertaken. The Committee on Park Systems Planning might be continued and could serve a useful advisory and stimulating role; its membership undoubtedly would change from time to time. All of this would require some central capacity in IUCN for developing and carrying out further activities. Financing would have to be obtained from some source or combination of sources: possibilities include UNESCO or other UN agency grants, private foundation grants, appropriation from the regular IUCN budget, or some other source. One vigorous and imaginative person attached to IUCN plus modest office and travel support should be enough to move the whole program forward. He would have to stimulate further research, and probably undertake some himself, and would have to put in operation the advisory service activity. The most important thing is for IUCN to address the question squarely and decide whether it wants to accord the program high priority and move it forward as a significant undertaking.

2. If IUCN is not to continue the park systems planning program under its own auspices, what can it do to encourage some other agency or agencies to take on the job?

One possibility is to continue negotiation with UN agencies -- UNESCO, FAO, or some combination of these two and others -- to set up an appropriate unit through which both the research and the advisory service activities can be sustained. Or, it may be that UN agencies would be interested in only one or the other of the two functions. It is conceivable that some other agency, private as well as public or quasi-public, interested in international work on park systems planning could be convinced to undertake the work; these opportunities should be uncovered and investigated.

3. In either case -- whether directly by IUCN or through encouraging some other agency -- what is the minimum budget that would be required to sustain the

two principal elements in the park systems planning program?

One man with appropriate office and travel support would run about \$40,000 (U.S.) a year. Individual research projects involving one senior researcher plus one research assistant and office and travel support would run about \$40,000 a year also. Additional projects, or larger projects, can be estimated as multiples of this basic figure. Advisory service projects are estimated to cost about \$3,000 to \$4,000 per man-month. This figure includes compensation for one principal advisor, modest clerical assistance, travel, living expenses, incidentals, and limited consulting fees for other experts. Again the cost of larger projects can be estimated as multiples of this figure. If a number of research and advisory service projects can be undertaken with separate financing from governmental or other agencies, then it should be possible to attach an overhead charge to each project sufficient to carry a portion of the central office expense.

To conclude this report: we regard the park systems planning project as well launched, both the research and the advisory service components. We hope very much that the work can be continued, enlarged, and brought to a point where the park systems planning and development in all countries of the world will reach a new level of efficiency and accomplishment. We hope IUCN will undertake the continuing responsibility of maintaining and extending the program: if IUCN will make the commitment with its eyes open to the full nature of the opportunities and responsibilities, we would be most pleased and would feel that the modest beginning already made would then be carried on to further phases of development.

Joseph L. Fisher, Chairman  
Committee on Park Systems Planning