



# **INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO NACIONAL**

---

---

**CENTRO INTERDISCIPLINARIO DE INVESTIGACIÓN PARA EL  
DESARROLLO INTEGRAL REGIONAL  
UNIDAD OAXACA**

**Maestría en Ciencias en Conservación y  
Aprovechamiento de Recursos Naturales.  
Especialidad en Biodiversidad del Neotrópico**

**Análisis Multicriterio para la identificación  
de áreas prioritarias de  
restauración del paisaje forestal  
en la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaqueña.**

**T E S I S**  
QUE PARA OBTENER EL GRADO DE:  
**MAESTRO EN CIENCIAS**

**P R E S E N T A:**

**BIÓL. DAVID URIBE VILLAVICENCIO**


Directores de Tesis:

Dr. Rafael F. Del Castillo Sánchez

Dr. Davide Geneletti

SANTA CRUZ XOXOCOTLÁN, OAXACA,

JUNIO 2011



# INSTITUTO POLITECNICO NACIONAL SECRETARIA DE INVESTIGACION Y POSGRADO

## ACTA DE REVISION DE TESIS

En la Ciudad de Oaxaca de Juárez siendo las 13:00 horas del día 30 del mes de Mayo del 2011 se reunieron los miembros de la Comisión Revisora de Tesis designada por el Colegio de Profesores de Estudios de Posgrado e Investigación del **Centro Interdisciplinario de Investigación para el Desarrollo Integral Regional, Unidad Oaxaca (CIIDIR-OAXACA)** para examinar la tesis de grado titulada: **“Análisis multicriterio para la identificación de áreas prioritarias de restauración del paisaje forestal en la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaqueña”**  
Presentada por el alumno:

**Uribe**

Apellido paterno

**Villavicencio**

materno

**David**

nombre(s)

Con registro: 

A	0	9	0	5	3	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---


aspirante al grado de: **MAESTRÍA EN CIENCIAS EN CONSERVACIÓN Y APROVECHAMIENTO DE RECURSOS NATURALES**


Después de intercambiar opiniones los miembros de la Comisión manifestaron **SU APROBACION DE LA TESIS**, en virtud de que satisface los requisitos señalados por las disposiciones reglamentarias vigentes.


LA COMISION REVISORA  
Directores de tesis:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Rafael Felipe del Castillo Sanchez


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Davide Geneletti

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Gabriel Ramos Fernández

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dra. Elvira Duran Medina

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
M. en C. Carlos Raúl Bonilla Ruz

EL PRESIDENTE DEL COLEGIO

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Juan Rodríguez Ramírez



CENTRO INTERDISCIPLINARIO  
DE INVESTIGACION PARA EL  
DESARROLLO INTEGRAL REGIONAL  
C.I.I.D.I.R.  
UNIDAD OAXACA  
I.P.N.



**INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO NACIONAL**  
**SECRETARÍA DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y POSGRADO**

*CARTA CESION DE DERECHOS*

En la Ciudad de Oaxaca de Juárez el día 30 del mes mayo del año 2011, el (la) que suscribe **David Uribe Villavicencio** alumno (a) del Programa de **MAESTRÍA EN CIENCIAS EN CONSERVACIÓN Y APROVECHAMIENTO DE RECURSOS NATURALES** con número de registro **A090535**, adscrito (a) al Centro Interdisciplinario de Investigación para el Desarrollo Integral Regional, Unidad Oaxaca, manifiesta que es autor (a) intelectual del presente trabajo de Tesis bajo la dirección de los Dres. Rafael Felipe del Castillo Sánchez y Davide Geneletti y cede los derechos del trabajo titulado: **“Análisis multicriterio para la identificación de áreas prioritarias de restauración del paisaje forestal en la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaqueña”** al Instituto Politécnico Nacional para su difusión, con fines académicos y de investigación.

Los usuarios de la información no deben reproducir el contenido textual, gráficas o datos del trabajo sin el permiso expreso del autor y/o director del trabajo. Este puede ser obtenido escribiendo a la siguiente dirección **Calle Hornos 1003, Santa Cruz Xoxocotlán, Oaxaca**, e-mail: [posgradoax@ipn.mx](mailto:posgradoax@ipn.mx) ó [d\\_uribev8@yahoo.com.mx](mailto:d_uribev8@yahoo.com.mx) Si el permiso se otorga, el usuario deberá dar el agradecimiento correspondiente y citar la fuente del mismo.

**David Uribe Villavicencio**



CENTRO INTERDISCIPLINARIO  
DE INVESTIGACION PARA EL  
DESARROLLO INTEGRAL REGIONAL  
C.I.I.D.I.R.  
UNIDAD OAXACA  
I.P.N.

## AGRADECIMIENTOS

A mis directores de tesis, Dr. Rafael F. Del Castillo Sánchez y Dr. Davide Geneleti; así como a mi comité revisor, M. en C. Carlos Bonilla Ruz, Dr. Gabriel Ramos Fernández y Dra. Elvira Duran Medina; que aportaron su visión y comentarios para enriquecer este trabajo.

Al Biol. Raúl Rivera García por su apoyo incondicional y amistad, fue y sigue siendo un gran apoyo en la fase de SIG y en todo el proceso de diseño e implementación de la metodología.  
Al Dr. Francesco Orsi, por su apoyo y asesoría en el método de análisis multicriterio.

Al Dr. Mario González Espinoza por recibirme en Ecosur-San Cristobal de las Casas como su estudiante de residencia.

A todas las personas que me permitieron entrevistarlas para echar a andar esta propuesta, tanto los expertos como la gente de la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca.

A todas las demás personas que estuvieron alrededor del proyecto ReForLan. Las personas que me hicieron agradable mi estancia en Italia y en Ecosur.

Al I.P.N por la formación personal y académica que gane al ser parte de ella.

A mi familia por todo su apoyo a distancia.

A mi esposa Biol. Celina Gpe. Solís Becerra por compartir y hacer posible este sueño.

A la Goya por llegar y refrescar mis ideas con sus travesuras.

## DEDICATORIA

Este trabajo está dedicado al esfuerzo y buen humor diario de mis padres Carlos L. Uribe y Griselda Villavicencio. A mis Hermanos Osvaldo, Claudia y Angelica. A los "Nipus"; Alex (Nepu), Karla (Kirul), Atziray (Chariz), Bruno (Peque) y Karen. A los "Chines"; Zuky, Pilly, Chin, Camilo y el otro.

A Maka y Don Manuel Jiménez que desde allá arriba me echaron porras.

A mi familia política, Don Alex Solís, Celina Becerra, Carlos "el Gordo" y Karen. Y pues a la Lika también.

A mi familia Oaxaqueña, Doña Ermi, Don Rocardo, las muchachas, Richi y a la Vaca por adoptarnos.

A la familia Chiapaneca, la tía Ana, Mila, los Chacón-Solís.

Familia Coleta, Los Olivera, Silvia, Fer, Mariana, Daisy y Mia.

A mi familia chiquiita; a "Coy coy" y Goyis. Mi gran equipo.

**¡SI SE PUDO!**

# ÍNDICE

Resumen/Abstract

## I. INTRODUCCIÓN

I.I	Planeamiento del problema.....	iv
I.II	Justificación.....	iv
I.III	Objetivo General.....	v
I.IV	Objetivos particulares.....	v
I.V	Hipótesis.....	v
I.VI	Bibliografía.....	vi

## II. GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis to prioritize areas for landscape forest restoration in Upper Mixtec region, Oaxaca (Mexico).

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Study area.....	2
3.	Methods and materials.....	4
4.	Results.....	10
5.	Discussion.....	15
6.	Conclusions and recommendations.....	18
	Literature cited.....	19

## III CONCLUSIÓN GENERAL

---

## ÍNDICE DE FIGURAS

- Figura 1. Área de estudio, región de la Mixteca Alta en el estado de Oaxaca, México
- Figura 2. Funciones de valor que representan el intervalo de valor deseable para aplicar la estandarización de los factores: a) Beneficio, b) Costo y c) Intermedio.
- Figura 3. Tipo de factor (Costo, Beneficio o Intermedio) seleccionado por los actores de involucrados de cuatro sectores de la población, para maximizar el intervalo de valor deseado de cada uno de los criterios a través del proceso de estandarización.
- Figura 4. Porcentaje de opiniones por categoría de importancia dado a los criterios socioeconómicos y medioambientales por cada sector de población.
- Figura 5. Muestra de las capas de criterios generados a través de procesos operacionales en el SIG de información temática: 1) capa de restricción, 2) factor de riesgo de erosión, 3) factor de índice de marginación y 4) factor de distancia a zonas urbanas.
- Figura 6. Muestra de mapas de aptitud del terreno para reforestación del primer miembro del sector de ONGs (N1a) y gente local (P1a). Y los mapas de los sitios más aptos extraídos de los mismos actores (N1b y P1b respectivamente).
- Figura 7. Mapas de los sitios como opciones de reforestación por cada sector de la población basado en las preferencias de sus miembros.
- Figura 8. Mapa de áreas prioritarias para restauración del paisaje forestal en la región de la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca (México). Se muestran las áreas en orden de prioridad para implementar acciones de reforestación.

## ÍNDICE DE TABLAS

- Tabla 1. Marco de análisis espacial multicriterio seguido en este estudio. Secuencia de pasos y actividades realizadas.
- Tabla 2. Ranking de criterios, en función del porcentaje del número de menciones dadas por parte de los expertos.
- Tabla 3. Criterios medioambientales y socioeconómicos relevantes seleccionados por medio de la consulta a expertos.
- Tabla 4. Valores máximos y mínimos de los atributos de cada factor-criterio.
- Tabla 5. Muestra del umbral de área establecida por los primeros tres miembros del sector académico (A), gubernamental (G), ONG (N) y público (P).
- Tabla 6. Promedio de pesos asignados a los criterios medioambientales y socioeconómico tomando en cuenta la opinión del total de los actores involucrados.

## RESUMEN

Una pregunta urgente que surge durante la planeación de una intervención de restauración es: ¿En qué sitio comenzamos? Encontrar una respuesta satisfactoria, bajo un enfoque multidimensional que incluya las preferencias de diferentes actores involucrados, es una tarea muy compleja. El Análisis de Decisión Multicriterio (MCDA) es un conjunto de técnicas desarrolladas en un ambiente SIG, orientadas a la toma de decisiones espaciales. Esta propuesta se basa en la definición y ponderación de múltiples criterios para la evaluación de aptitud del territorio tomando en cuenta diversas opiniones. Utilizamos la metodología MCDA para la identificación de áreas prioritarias para la restauración del paisaje forestal de la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca (México). Criterios medioambientales y socioeconómicos fueron seleccionados y evaluados. Se tomó en cuenta la opinión de gente local y expertos de cuatro sectores de la población: habitantes, académicos, ONG y servidores públicos. Se modelaron espacialmente las preferencias de estos grupos e identificaron las áreas de mayor prioridad. El resultado final se representó en un mapa de alternativas que nos permitió localizar con precisión los sitios donde, de acuerdo a los actores involucrados, es prioritario enfocar los recursos y esfuerzos de restauración. El MCDA fue una herramienta muy útil dentro de la planeación colectiva que generó y priorizó diversas alternativas de sitios para encauzar los trabajos de restauración.

## ABSTRACT

A pressing question that arises during the planning of a restoration intervention is: Where to restore first? Find a satisfactory answer, under a multidimensional approach that includes the preferences of different stakeholders is a complex task. Multicriteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) is a set of techniques developed in a GIS environment, oriented to the spatial decision making. This proposal is based on the definition and weighting of multiple criteria for evaluating land suitability, taking into account various point of views. MCDA methodology used to identify priority areas for forest landscape restoration of the Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca (Mexico). Socioeconomic and environmental criteria were selected and evaluated. We took into account the opinion of local people and experts in four sectors of the population: public, academic, NGOs and governmental. We modeled spatially the preferences of these groups and were identified the most priority areas. The final result is represented on a map of options that allowed us to pinpoint the sites where, according to stakeholders, we should focus the resources and restoration efforts. The MCDA was a very useful tool in collective planning in which were generated and prioritized several alternatives sites to guide restoration work.

## INTRODUCCIÓN

La deforestación es uno de los problemas ambientales más graves en México. La Organización de Agricultura y Alimentación (FAO) colocó a nuestro país como la quinta nación que pierde más superficie vegetal a nivel mundial, esto es 1.07% anualmente (Agee, 1993). Las consecuencias de la pérdida de la cubierta vegetal por disturbios severos suelen ser negativas para los ecosistemas y tienden a sufrir una degradación ecológica difícilmente reversible de forma natural (Dorado y Arias, 1998).

La degradación o transformación de un ecosistema tiene orígenes múltiples, complejos y prolongados de forma que desaparecen los constituyentes históricos del ecosistema después de una fuerte perturbación o una serie de disturbios a través del tiempo. No se debe perder de vista que los ecosistemas actuales son producto de las interacciones en permanente cambio entre diferentes elementos físicos, bióticos y humanos. Así los aspectos antropogénicos son una variable fundamental que se debe tomar en cuenta para el desarrollo de un plan exitoso de restauración (Pinilla y Ceccon, 2008).

La restauración ecológica es una actividad deliberada que inicia o acelera la recuperación de un ecosistema perturbado imitando el proceso de sucesión ecológica para recuperar, en cierta medida, las condiciones ambientales originales (SER, 2004). La restauración ecológica trata de retornar un ecosistema a su trayectoria natural por lo que las condiciones históricas del ecosistema son el punto de partida ideal para diseñar un plan de restauración. No obstante, determinar con exactitud la trayectoria natural de un ecosistema gravemente impactado no es tarea fácil. La Society for Ecological Restoration International (SER) sugiere actuar desde tres áreas fundamentales: a) La estructura, composición funcionamiento e interacción de los componentes de los ecosistemas, incluyendo al ser humano, b) La naturaleza y magnitud de los efectos antropogénicos sobre los ecosistemas, c) El desarrollo de estrategias efectivas para la conservación, restauración, uso y manejo racional de los ecosistemas tomando en cuenta el aspecto socio-económico.

La investigación convencional ha tenido grandes dificultades para diseñar planes de restauración que integren el aspecto biológico, físico y humano. Eso se debe a la complejidad de las relaciones y reacciones que se generan entre los fenómenos naturales y sociales cuando se presenta un disturbio que desencadena en una degradación socio-ambiental. Además, el enfoque unidimensional con que se aborda normalmente este tipo de problemática y la falta de integración



de diferentes disciplinas en la planeación deriva en el poco éxito de en la implementación de programas de restauración (Cardona, 2005). Ante este panorama, Moran (2004) afirma que la ciencia occidental clasifica la realidad, a través del aislamiento, la vivisección y el análisis fragmentado concibiéndola en una sola dimensión que favorece la especialización disciplinar. Asimismo, Moran (2004) subraya la necesidad de un nuevo enfoque científico, más práctico, con una visión holística, integradora y multidimensional que genere soluciones y alternativas para la resolución de problemas complejos. Un ejemplo de problema complejo es la degradación ambiental cuyo proceso inverso, la restauración ecológica, tiene que tomar en cuenta factores sociales, económicos y ambientales para recuperar la integridad ecológica sin dejar de lado el bienestar social.

La incapacidad de abordar y solucionar problemas complejos, donde era necesario la participación de diferentes disciplinas, la toma de diversos criterios y el diálogo con la sociedad han ido acorralando a la ciencia normal dentro de su propia rigidez. La explicación del problema - complejo- se aleja ante la impotencia del modelo científico (Toledo, 2005).

Desde mediados del siglo XX germinó la semilla de la “revolución conceptual” (Naredo, 2006). Creció y se multiplicó un nuevo enfoque en busca de la integración de las ciencias de la naturaleza con las ciencias sociales y humanas (Toledo y Solís, 2001). El diálogo entre científicos y saberes distintos ha tenido que procurarse para el entendimiento de los fenómenos globales (Leff, 2002; Toledo, 2005) y evitar en mayor medida el reduccionismo de los problemas actuales. En muchos países latinoamericanos las preocupaciones ambientales han comenzado a ser incorporadas en las agendas gubernamentales orientadas al diseño de políticas públicas para solucionar problemas socio-ambientales. Sin embargo, los instrumentos convencionales no han logrado solventar estos conflictos (Funtowicz y Ravetz, 2000; Falconi y Burbano, 2004).

Así, han surgido propuestas que señalan la necesidad de abordar los problemas complejos desde un marco multidimensional (Toledo 2005). La búsqueda de una explicación multidimensional e integradora ha motivado, a su vez, la aparición de nuevas propuestas metodológicas. Uno de los enfoques alternativos que encaja dentro de la perspectiva descrita anteriormente recibe el nombre de análisis multicriterio (Falconi y Burbano, 2004). El cual es una herramienta apta para

tomar decisiones que incluyan conflictos sociales, económicos, ambientales (Falconi y Burbano, 2004, Gómez y Barredo, 2006), lo que facilita el estudio integral de distintos fenómenos así analizados.

El análisis multicriterio busca integrar las diferentes dimensiones de una realidad en un solo marco de análisis para dar una visión integral y de esta manera tener un mejor acercamiento a la realidad (Falconi y Burbano, 2004). Este análisis pondera diferentes criterios y selecciona la alternativa con mayor puntaje (Barredo, 1996). Además, los efectos intangibles, como los sociales pueden ser considerados cabalmente junto a sus efectos ambientales (Nijkamp y Van Delft, 1977 en Caloni, 2003). Sin embargo, el análisis multicriterio no es un método perfecto, sino simplemente un instrumento para propiciar un nuevo acercamiento a la realidad que reúne a diferentes actores para evaluar diversas alternativas y alcanzar una solución satisfactoria, adecuada para los problemas complejos. Bien lo dice Naredo (2006), “La realidad es compleja y multidimensional, es un error intentar simplificarla en abstracciones científicas”. Así, el análisis multicriterio ha sido una alternativa interesante para evitar el reduccionismo y abordar más acertadamente los problemas complejos: Manejo hídrico (Sánchez *et al.* 2004), diseño de redes carreteras (Caloni, 2003), planificación de cuencas fluviales (Escobar y Moreno, 1994) y proyectos turísticos (Ocaña y Galacho, 2002), entre otras.

Actualmente han surgido diferentes proyectos multidisciplinarios dirigidos a la investigación sobre la degradación y restauración ecológica (Dorado y Arias, 1998). Tal es el caso del proyecto ReForLan “*Restoration of Forest Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Development in the Drylands of Latin America*” (Anonimo, 2005), cuyo objetivo es identificar y promover enfoques de manejo sustentable en ecosistemas áridos y semiáridos de Latinoamérica dirigiendo su investigación a la innovación de técnicas de restauración utilizando especies nativas de valor económico. El presente documento se inserta dentro del grupo de trabajo Reforlan-Oaxaca, el cual forma parte del mencionado proyecto a gran escala. El enfoque de restauración a escala paisaje es manejado como marco espacial dirigido a la planeación de las intervenciones relacionadas con la integridad ecológica y mejorar el bienestar humano (Bekele-Tesemma and Ababa, 2002).

El estudio propuesto se centra en la región de la Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca, zona montañosa enclavada al Noreste del estado que tiene una rica historia humana de más de 10 mil años (García-Mendoza *et al.* 1994; Toledo y Solís, 2001). Registros en códices prehispánicos demuestran que la región de la Mixteca fue muy prospera y densamente poblada a pesar de las condiciones naturales tan adversas (Toledo, 1992). Se ha documentado un amplio conocimiento tradicional por parte de los antiguos pobladores sobre su medio ambiente, lo que les permitía hacer un excelente manejo hídrico (recurso limitante) e implementar diferentes tipos de técnicas de producción como las terrazas agrícolas para evitar la pérdida de suelo (Altieri *et al* 2006).

## **I.I Planteamiento del problema**

La Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca está severamente afectada por la deforestación que ha agravado en las últimas décadas fundamentalmente por la expansión de la ganadería bovina y prácticas de aprovechamiento inadecuadas. Se ha visto reducida su cubierta forestal original en probablemente un 90% (Toledo, 1992), con pérdida de suelo de hasta 50 toneladas ha/año, bajando considerablemente la producción interna generando pobreza y marginación (Altieri *et al* 2006). Diferentes proyectos (gubernamentales y no gubernamentales) se han dirigido a la restauración de la Mixteca. La Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT) ha generado por medio de sus dos comisiones (Conafor y Conanp) diferentes programas de restauración. Sin embargo su éxito ha sido limitado por los pocos recursos con que cuenta, el poco personal técnico, la poca coordinación entre los involucrados, la toma de decisiones verticales y las políticas centralizadas (Toledo y Solís, 2001). Con tales limitantes se tiene la necesidad de dirigir los pocos recursos económicos y técnicos a zonas de mayor prioridad para la restauración dentro de la Mixteca Alta. Si el recurso es limitado y sólo se puede restaurar una parte de la Mixteca Alta (1.3%), ¿Dónde restauramos? y ¿Cómo identificamos las áreas de mayor prioridad para la restauración? son las preguntas eje de esta propuesta tomando en cuenta tanto aspectos físico-biológicos como aspectos socio-económicos bajo un esquema de evaluación de criterios combinado con el análisis espacial dentro del enfoque de restauración del paisaje forestal.

## **I.II Justificación**

La Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca es una de las regiones más degradadas de América Latina (Altieri *et al* 2006). La pobreza extrema de sus pobladores contrasta con la riqueza cultural que poseen (Toledo

y Solís 2001). A pesar de ser un área, antropológicamente muy estudiada, no puede decirse lo mismo de la parte ambiental. Ante este panorama, la Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca, es ya un foco rojo para las autoridades de gobierno y esfuerzos ambientalistas (Altieri *et al*, 2006).

La heterogeneidad ambiental y cultural de la Mixteca Alta, sumada a la necesidad de soluciones al problema de degradación, hacen de esta zona el lugar ideal para la implementación de proyectos piloto de planes de restauración integrales (Toledo y Solís, 2001).

El diseño de métodos de priorización de áreas para restauración en la Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca es necesario para la canalización eficiente de los pocos recursos técnicos y económicos con que los programas y proyectos gubernamentales y no gubernamentales cuentan para revertir la degradación socio-ambiental de la región.

### **I.III Objetivo General**

Proponer un método de identificación de áreas prioritarias para la restauración del paisaje forestal de la Mixteca Alta de Oaxaca mediante la integración de los Sistemas de Información Geográfica (SIG's), Percepción Remota (PR) y el uso del análisis multicriterio (AMC).

### **I.IV Objetivos particulares**

- 1- Identificar las prioridades de restauración, tanto medioambientales como socioeconómicas, para la Mixteca Alta.
- 2.- Analizar y ponderar los criterios considerados relevantes para la Mixteca Alta.
- 3.- Representar espacialmente los diferentes escenarios de áreas prioritarias para restauración en la Mixteca Alta.
- 4.- Generar un mapa que represente las áreas prioritarias para la restauración ecológica para la Mixteca Alta tomando en cuenta los diferentes escenarios generados.

### **I.V Hipótesis**

Las herramientas tecnológicas como la percepción remota (PR) y sistemas de información geográfica (SIG), integradas con una herramienta metodológica, el análisis multicriterio (AMC); permiten el diseño de un procedimiento factible para la identificación de áreas de mayor prioridad para la restauración ecológica en la Mixteca Alta considerando tanto aspectos medioambientales como socioeconómicos.

## I.VI Bibliografía

- Agee, J., 1993. Fire ecology of Pacific Northwest Forest. Island Press, Washington, D.C. USA.
- Altieri, M, S. Anta, J.J. Caballero y J. Hernández. 2006. Manejo de agua y restauración productiva en la región indígena Mixteca de Puebla y Oaxaca. Resultados de los estudios y recomendaciones para los tomadores de decisiones de las comunidades y organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Editor: Manuel Noriega. BNWPP.
- Anonimo, 2005. Restoration of forest landscapes for biodiversity conservation and rural development in the drylands of Latino America (REFORLAN). Specific targeted Research Project. 80 pp.
- Barredo, J.I.1996. Evaluación Multicriterio y Sistemas de Información Geográfica en la Ordenación del Territorio. Editorial RA-MA. Madrid.
- Bekele-Tesemma, A., Ababa, A. 2002. Forest landscape restoration: initiatives in Ethiopia. Available from: <http://assets.panda.org/downloads/ethiopiaflr.pdf> (Accessed 05 January 2011). IUCN/WWF, Gland, Switzerland.
- Caloni, N. 2003. Tesis de Licenciatura: Análisis espacial de Evaluación Multicriterio en la generación de alternativas viales para el trazado de la autopista Luján-Mercedes (Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina). Universidad Nacional de Luján, Argentina.
- Cardona, N., 2005. Consideraciones socioeconómicas en el diseño de proyectos sustentables de restauración ecológica. 45-56pp. En: Temas sobre Restauración Ecológica. INE-SEMARNAT.
- Dorado, O. y D. Arias, 1998. Reforestar o restaurar para la recuperación ambiental. Inventio pp39-43, consultado en línea el 28 sep 2009 en: [www.dialnet.unirioja.es](http://www.dialnet.unirioja.es)
- Escobar, M y J.M. Moreno, 1994. Técnicas multicriterio discretas en la planificación de cuencas fluviales. Departamento de métodos estadísticos, facultad de ciencias económicas y empresariales. Universidad de Zaragoza, España. Pp 7-29.
- Falconi, F. y R. Burbano, 2004. Instrumentos económicos para la gestión ambiental: decisiones monocriteriales versus decisiones multicriteriales. Revista Iberoamericana de Economía Ecológica. 1:11-20.
- Funtowicz, S. y J. Ravetz, 2000. "El Valor de un ruiseñor: La economía ecológica como parte de la ciencia posnormal" en Ciencia Posnormal, Centro editor de América Latina, Argentina, pp. 57-79.
- García-Mendoza, A., P. Tenorio y J. Reyes, (1994). El endemismo en la flora fanerogámica de la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca-Puebla, México, Acta Botánica Mexicana 27:53-73.
- Gómez, M. y Barredo, J. 2006. Sistemas de información geográfica y evaluación Multicriterio en la ordenación del territorio. Ed. RA-MA 2da Edición. Madrid, España.
- Leff, E. 2002. Saber ambiental. Sustentabilidad, racionalidad, complejidad y poder, Siglo XXI editores, México. 414pp.
- Moran, H. 1999. "Ciencia económica: economía ecológica y crisis del paradigma Cartesiano" En: Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Lima, Perú. Año IV, No. 14. 159-174pp.
- Naredo, J. M. 2006. Raíces económicas del deterioro ecológico y social. Más allá de los dogmas, Siglo XXI, México, pp. 3-46, 47-64, 65-106.
- Ocaña, C. y F. Galacho, 2002. Un modelo de aplicación de SIG y Evaluación Multicriterio al análisis de capacidad del territorio en relación a funciones turísticas. IV congreso "turismo y tecnologías de la información y las telecomunicaciones". Turitec, Universidad de Malaga, España. 235-253pp.
- Pinilla, C. y E. Ceccon, 2008. Un nuevo paradigma en restauración ecológica: conservación y sociedad. Ciencia, 49-55pp.
- Sánchez K., F. Jiménez, S. Velázquez, M. Piedra y E. Romero; 2004. Metodología de análisis multicriterio para la identificación de áreas prioritarias de manejo de recurso hídrico en la cuenca del río Sarapiquí. Recursos Naturales y Ambiente, 88 – 95pp. Costa Rica.
- SER, 2004. Society for Ecological Restoration International (SER) Grupo de trabajo sobre ciencia y políticas. Principios de SER Internacional sobre la restauración ecológica. [www.ser.org](http://www.ser.org).
- Toledo, V. 1992. Los procesos de ganaderización y la destrucción biológica y ecológica de México. En: Leff, E. (Ed.). Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo en México. CIIH-UNAM/ Edit. Porrúa Vol. I: 191-228.
- Toledo, V. 2005. Repensar la conservación: ¿áreas naturales protegidas o estrategia bioregional?. Gaceta ecológica 77: 67-82.
- Toledo, V. y L. Solís, 2001. Ciencia para los pobres, el programa "agua para siempre" de la región mixteca. Ciencias 64:33-39.

# GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis to prioritize areas for landscape forest restoration in Upper Mixtec region, Oaxaca (Mexico).

David Uribe Villavicencio<sup>1</sup>, Davide Geneletti<sup>2</sup>, Rafael del Castillo Sánchez<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Maestría en Ciencias de la Conservación y Aprovechamiento de los Recursos Naturales, Ciidir-Oaxaca, IPN, Mexico*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Trento, Italy*

*Email: d\_uribev8@yahoo.com.mx*

---

## Abstract

A pressing question that arises during the planning of a restoration intervention is: Where to restore first? Find a satisfactory answer, under a multidimensional approach that includes the preferences of different stakeholders is a complex task. Multicriteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) is a set of techniques developed in a GIS environment, oriented to the spatial decision making. This proposal is based on the definition and weighting of multiple criteria for evaluating land suitability, taking into account various point of views. MCDA methodology used to identify priority areas for forest landscape restoration of the Upper Mixtec, Oaxaca (Mexico). Socioeconomic and environmental criteria were selected and evaluated. We took into account the opinion of local people and experts in four sectors of the population: public, academic, NGOs and governmental. We modeled spatially the preferences of these groups and were identified the most priority areas. The final result is represented on a map of options that allowed us to pinpoint the sites where, according to stakeholders, we should focus the resources and restoration efforts. The MCDA was a very useful tool in collective planning in which were generated and prioritized several alternatives sites to guide restoration work.

---

Keywords: Multicriteria decision analysis, Forest Landscape Restoration, GIS, priority areas.

## 1. Introduction

Deforestation is one of the most serious environmental problems. The scale of forest loss of is alarming. During 2000-2010 approximately 130 000 Km<sup>2</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> of forest have been lost around the world (FAO, 2010). In response, the efforts to support and promote the recovery of forest ecosystems have increased (Berger, 1990; Hobbs and Harris, 2001). One of the most comprehensive approaches of forest restoration is the Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) (WWF and IUCN, 2000). The term was defined as a process of restoration of goods, services and ecological processes that forests can provide at a broader

landscape level. It fosters a forest restoration based on the better assets for both people and environmental, focusing in regain of ecological integrity and enhancing human well-being at landscape scale (UICN, 2008)

The landscape is not a geographical unit but a human concept. The ecological, political, socioeconomic, and cultural dimensions influence its size and shape. The FLR provides a perspective to implement large-scale and long-term restoration attempts with the incorporation of diverse dimensions within them. It is a collaborative process that involves a wide range of stakeholders since the planning

stage through decision making process (Bekele-Tesemma and Ababa, 2002).

Multicriteria Analysis (MCA) is a set of techniques oriented to aid in a process of decision making (Moore, 1975). It provides a single analysis framework to integrate contradictory opinions and multiple criteria to weigh them and select the alternative with the highest score (Nijkamp y Van Delft, 1977; Carver, 1991). Malczewski (2006) documented the increase of use of MCA in synergy with the capabilities of the geographical information systems (GIS) in the last two decades. The spatial multicriteria decision analysis (MCDA), used for territorial decisions, has a broad range of applications, such as water management (Wang *et al* 2004; Sánchez *et al* 2004), land use planning (Geneletti, 2007a), transportation infrastructure (Jha *et al* 2001; Caloni, 2003), waste disposal (MacDonald, 1996; Leaño *et al* 2004), urban planning (Gomes and Lins, 2002; Zucca, *et al* 2008), environmental planning (Pereira and Duckstein, 1993; Bojórquez-Tapia *et al* 2001) and restoration (Cipollini *et al.* 2005; Orsi and Geneletti, 2010).

One important question that arises in restoration planning is Where to restore first? or Where should we focus the available resources and efforts? The decision should come from collective consensus between stakeholders and select the best option sites,

or, at least, the most suitable for restoration. But individual opinions are often in conflict between each other, and economical and technical restrictions limit the total surface to consider in a restoration plan (Maginnis *et al.*, 2007). MCDA should be a useful tool to deal such problems by allowing the incorporation of related systematic procedures that reveal the stakeholders preferences and incorporate such preferences into a GIS-based decision making (Malczewski, 1999; Gómez y Barredo, 2006).

We applied MCDA on the Upper Mixtec region, in southern Mexico, one of the highly degraded regions of Latin America, where the lack of environmental data and resources go together with the urgency of implementing of a regional plan for restoration. Our study illustrates step-by-step a sequence of methods of priority-setting performed in a GIS environment. It was based on the preferences of stakeholders from different population sectors and on the evaluation of both environmental and socioeconomic criteria, to ultimately, represent spatially the results as a map of priority areas for forest landscape restoration.

## 2. Study area

The Upper Mixtec region was the focus of our study. This region lies on northwest side of the state of Oaxaca, in south-eastern Mexico. It covers 8,100 Km<sup>2</sup>, corresponding to 13% of the state area (Ferrusquía-Villafranca, 1976). Most

of the information that we needed for our study were available at municipal level. However, some municipalities belonged to more than one region. As a result, we have to arbitrarily set the limits of our study area by including only those municipalities in which at least 50% of their area belonged to this region following the municipal and regional division available for the state (INEGI, 2005b). In this way, we incorporated 124 municipalities in our study and a total of 11,633 Km<sup>2</sup> (Fig. 1).

The region is characterized by high topographic diversity with canyons, hills, intermountain plateaus, and valleys. The elevation ranges from 550 to 3,300 m a.s.l. Tropical dry forest, pine-oak forest and xerophyte scrubs area comprise the native vegetation (García-Mendoza et al. 1994). However, crops and eroded areas are common throughout the entire area. Mean annual precipitation is 692 mm with rainfall concentrates during July and

August with intense showers.

The Upper Mixtec is a region with severe socio-economic and environmental problems derived, in part, from wrongful strategies of land management. There is a critic problem of water supply, degraded areas and bare soils. The human population is highly impoverished and dispersed (García-Mendoza et al. 1994; Toledo and Solís, 2001). Approximately 50% of the original forest cover was lost with a deforestation rate of 52.7 km<sup>2</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (Rivera et al. 2011). Although some governmental and non-governmental efforts against deforestation have been successful, resources available to combat reforestation cannot include all the areas that require reforestation (Carabias et al. 2007; Altieri et al. 2006). In 2005, only 26 km<sup>2</sup> were reforested in the whole Oaxaca State (Céspedes-Flores and Moreno-Sánchez). Clearly, there is an urgent need to optimize the resources available for reforestation in this




Figure 1. The study area, Upper Mixtec region in the State of Oaxaca, Mexico.



area. Selecting the best areas for reforestation is complicated on the bases of the many factors that should be taken into account and the particular points of view of different stakeholders that participate in the process. The use decision-making tools performed in a GIS environment to generate a map of priority areas for forest landscape restoration is an option that can minimize the subjectivity in the selection process, but this has not been tried yet in this region.

### 3. Methods and materials

A decision-making process was performed in a GIS environment to generate a map of priority areas for forest landscape restoration. For this end, we implemented a sequence of methods to identify the priorities for reforestation, to design sites as options, and to select the better ones. Judgment of stakeholders, expert and local people, were integrated with thematic spatial data through a multicriteria decision analysis (MCE) technique for land suitability evaluation (Bojórquez-Tapia, 2001 and 2003; Cipollini *et al.* 2005; Pereira and Duckstein, 1997). Prioritization was based on values of suitability of land (Store and Kangas, 2001) and the fulfillment of rules of exclusion related to surface demand, that is, the maximum area able to be prioritized (Eastman *et al.* 1995). Our study was situated in the temporal dimension of the year 2005. It integrated tools and techniques within a methodological framework

of three main stages: intelligence, design and choice (Table 1, see annex 1).

Table 1. Framework for spatial multicriteria analysis followed in this study. Sequence of steps and activities performed.

Stage	Steps and Activities	Tool
Intelligence	a. Define and evaluate relevant criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defining relevant criteria.</li> <li>• Assign interval values of desirability.</li> <li>• Assign values of importance</li> </ul>	Interview
	b. Create criteria layers set: factors and constraint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acquire, compile and process availability thematic data.</li> </ul>	GIS
	c. Modeling preferences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deriving commensurate criteria layers.</li> <li>• Weight assignment.</li> <li>• Aggregation</li> </ul>	MCE
Design	d. Design restoration options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define threshold based on forest loss rate.</li> <li>• Identify and eliminate unsuitability area.</li> <li>• Create reforestation options maps for each stakeholder.</li> </ul>	MCE-GIS
	e. Development of priority maps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority maps by population sectors.</li> <li>• Map of priority areas for landscape forest restoration.</li> </ul>	GIS
Choice		

Based on: Barba-Romero & Pomerol (1997) and Zucca *et al.* (2008).

At the intelligence stage, we sought the opinion of experts to identify and rank both socioeconomic and environmental criteria (Bojórquez-Tapia *et al.* 2003). These criteria were evaluated through value judgment of experts and local people about the desirable

condition and relative importance of each criterion (Bojórquez-Tapia *et al.* 2001). Following Eastman *et al.* (1995), a thematic raster layer for each of the criteria were developed based on the available data for the study region to generate criteria factor layers and the constraint layer that represent the areas in which restoration activities are not feasible: urban, existing forest and water zones. Finally, we normalized and assigned weights for each criterion through a MCE fashion to generate composite index maps of suitability land (Pereira and Duckstein, 1993). We generated a suitability map for each stakeholder.

In the design stage, we established a threshold to extract group of cells that fulfill definition rules on the minimum area possible to be reforested. Defined maps displayed landscape-scale reforestation sites options by stakeholder (Orsi and Geneletti, 2010). At the final choice stage, we grouped and integrated the stakeholders' maps of reforestation site options by sectors: academic, governmental, non-governmental and public. Based on a definition process, we created the maps of priority areas for each population sector. Finally, a map of priority areas for forest landscape restoration was developed by an integration of the four sector maps.

### 3.1. Identify and evaluate relevant criteria

We carried out interviews to seek the opinion about forest restoration priorities (Cipollini *et al.* 2005). Following Bojórquez-Tapia *et al.* (2001 and 2003), the consultation was conducted with expert people with widely known work on environmental issues or professional experience in the study region and with local people. Both, experts and public were treated as stakeholders. The selection of experts was made following the method described by Geneletti (2008). We elaborated a preliminary list of experts and sought advice from them to include additional suitable people. The final list included members of governmental (G), non-governmental (NGO) and academic institutions (A). Local people (P), with knowledge about governmental programs for restoration and inhabitants from the region, were also included on criteria evaluation.

The goals of the consultation were to define and evaluate criteria, based on the judgment of stakeholders about forest restoration priorities, in a regional context. The process was carried out in two stages. First, we identified environmental and socio-economic criteria through the experts' consultation; and defined the criteria to be used in the study. At second stage, the selected criteria were evaluated according with the experts and public preferences. The interviews were conducted individually to avoid bias in judgment

influenced by dissimilar opinions (Bojórquez-Tapía *et al.* 2003). We interviewed the stakeholders in a direct (face to face) and/or indirect (internet, telephone) way, on more than one personal session.

### 3.1.1 Defining the relevant criteria

Following the method applied for Orsi *et al.* (2010), we aimed to experts the question: Which variables should be considered to select a site for forest restoration? The answers were compiled by similarity within a criterion. A preview list was created of socioeconomic and environmental criteria with the frequency of cite or number of times that experts suggest one criterion. The criteria were ordered by the number of citations. Finally, relevant criteria were defined as the ten most cited criteria that fulfilled the following requirements: spatiality, that is, capable to be displayed in a map; availability of the data; and significant variability of this character over the study area.

### 3.1.2 Interval values of desirability

We sought the expert and local people opinion about which are the optimal conditions for each relevant criterion (Geneletti, 2005a). The central question was what would be the suitable condition of -criterion- for a restoration site? The question was made for each one of the criteria expecting answers into three key options: (1) lower, (2) intermediate and (3) higher ranges. For example, in a criterion of

distance to forest, a person could chose: short distances, intermediate distances, or long distances to forest as desirable conditions to select a site for reforestation. The answers gave us three way to maximize the desirable values of each criterion, corresponding with a type of factor: 1, *cost factor* (the lower values the higher the desirability); 2 *intermediate factor* (the more intermediate values the higher the desirability); and 3 *benefit factor* (the higher values the higher the desirability).

### 3.1.3 Value of importance

The occurrence of different levels of importance between criteria is often in multicriteria decision making problems. So, prioritization of criteria must be performed (Geneletti, 2005b; Gómez and Barredo, 2006). For this purpose, it was essential the generation of information about the relative importance of the criteria according to the value judgment of the stakeholders (Belton and Gear, 1997). In order to know their preferences, we asked them to assign a value of importance for each criterion. The formulated question was *How important is the – criterion- in the selection of a restoration site?* The answers were ranked from low to high level of importance using a five-point scale from not relevant (key 1), to very important (key 5).

### 3.2. Criteria layers set: factors and constraint

A criteria raster layer set was generated according with the relevant criteria selected by experts. Two types of criteria layers were constructed: factors and constraint. For this end, we acquired, compiled and processed a set of available spatial thematic data from the study area. Tabular, vector and raster data were acquired from governmental sources. In addition, we acquired a supervised-classified spot'05 satellite image (30 m resolution) analyzed by personnel of the GIS Laboratory of CIIDIR Oaxaca, Instituto Politécnico Nacional (Rivera *et al.*, 2011). We generated raster-base layers using ArcGis 9.2 software (ESRI, 2006). A resample of 30m pixel resolution and WGS84-UTM-14N system re-projection were applied for each layer output. A pixel represents the spatial unit or evaluation alternative, which would be valued by criteria in terms of suitability.

The index of marginalization and the human density factor layers were processed from tabular data to raster format at municipal scale area. For the marginalization index (taken as an indicator of poverty) layer we adopted the four-point range of marginalization used by National Population Commission (CONAPO, 2005): from 1 (little marginalization) to 4 (very high marginalization). The human density layer was generated using data from the 2005 population census (INEGI, 2005a) and feature data of municipal area extent (INEGI, 2005b) to

calculate the human density values (people/Km<sup>2</sup>).

The distance factor layers were developed applying the Euclidian distance algorithm with 30 meter of pixel resolution. Euclidian distance was calculated (meters) from the center of the source pixel to the center of each of surrounding pixels. The solar insolation (Watt-Hour m<sup>-2</sup>) and slope (%) layers were obtained processing a digital elevation model (DEM) 30 m resolution from Upper Mixtec region. The risk of erosion layer was modeled following the methodology of The Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation –RUSLE- (Renard *et al.* 1997, Lewis *et al.* 2005). We generated the factor layers with available data. R factor (rainfall erosivity) with precipitation tabular data (Serrano-Altamirano *et al.* 2005). K factor (soil erodability) with edaphology vector data (INIFAP and CONABIO, 1995). LS factor (length and steepness slope), calculated using a DEM input with C++ executable free-software (Van Remortel *et al.* 2004). C factor (land cover) generated with the supervised-classified *spot* satellite image.

The constraint layer was constructed with the land cover layers of urban zones, water and forest to indicate the sites that won't be considerate in a reforestation process.

### 3.3 Modeling preferences

In this stage we integrated preferences and criteria layers and generated individual

suitability maps, one for each stakeholder. For this purpose, we assembled a criteria tree, which is a framework wherein we introduce the preferences of the stakeholders and noted a sequence of procedures of the multicriteria analysis technique (Barba-Romero and Pomerol, 1997; Zucca *et al* 2005). The criteria tree was generated by naming the outcome raster map and criteria (branches), and uploading the criteria raster layers for their proper branch. Completing the previous steps allow us to generate the suitability maps for each stakeholder by following the basic steps multicriteria decision analysis (Carver, 1991): 1) transformation of the original attribute values of criteria layers into comparable units (standardization), 2) prioritization of the criterion based on its relative importance (weight assignment), and 3) calculating and assigning suitability scores to each pixel (evaluation alternative) by using a decision rule (aggregation).

We used the Spatial Multicriteria Evaluation Module (SMC), of ILWIS 3.6®, to build a *criteria tree* and to develop multicriteria procedures (ITC, 2009)

### 3.3.1 Deriving commensurate criteria layers

For a multicriteria decision analysis process, in which we combine criteria and preferences, it is essential to combine criteria in the same scale


of values. Therefore, original values of criteria must be transformed into comparable units (Malczewski, 1999). For this end, a standardization process was performed by generating a value function according the type of factor (Geneletti, 2005a). The standardization process was conducted using the SMCE module and the interval method of linear scale standardization following the formulas 1, 2 and 3. The procedure generated a linear relationship between the raw values of original attributes and the desirability values, in which they were, transformed (Figure 2). The standardized values of each criterion were distributed in a 0 to 1 scale being the maximum desirable value equal to 1 (Geneletti, 2004).

$$(1) \text{ Benefit} = (v - \text{minv}) / (\text{maxv} - \text{minv})$$

$$(2) \text{ Cost} = 1 - (v - \text{minv}) / (\text{maxv} - \text{minv})$$

$$(3) \text{ Intermediate} = -av^2 + bv + c$$

Where *minv* is the minimum input value, *maxv* is the maximum input value; *a*, *b* and *c* are constants, and *v* is the original input value.



**Figure 2.** Value functions that represent the interval value of desirability to make the standardization of: a) *Benefit* factor, b) *Cost* factor and c) *Intermediate* factor.

### 3.3.2 Weight assignment

The relative importance value assigned to each criterion, known as *weight*, was used for criteria prioritization (Belton and Gear, 1997; Geneletti, 2005b). We followed the rule: the higher the importance value, the higher the weight (Belton and Gear, 1997). We applied the rank order method for translating the stakeholders' preferences into quantitative values of importance that they were normalized to sum 1 (Malczewski, 1999, Gómez and Barredo, 2006). The procedure was set up in SMCE module using the information of the interviews. At first, the criteria were put in order of importance, from the most important to the irrelevant criterion (Zucca *et al.* 2005). Then, the expected value algorithm (formula 4) was applied to calculate the weight ( $W_k$ ) for criterion ( $k$ ), where  $n$  is the number of criteria and  $i$  is the position of criterion within the ranking.

$$(4) \quad W_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1-k} \frac{1}{n(n+1-i)}$$

### 3.3.4 Aggregation

The aggregation brings together the results of previous steps, combining normalized criteria values and weights for each alternative (Pereira and Duckstein, 1993). This is done by applying a decision rule that dictates the basis of aggregation and decides which alternatives are preferred to another, based on the overall

assessment of the alternatives (Malczewski, 1999; Geneletti, 2005b).

The aggregation was performed using the weighted linear summation method from the SMCE module. This method calculated the overall score for each alternative multiplying their standardized criterion value by the weight of the criterion. This product is added with the calculated products for each criterion for the same alternative (Geneletti, 2005b). The outcome must be a composite index map with normalized values. Consequently, we were able to rank alternatives according to the overall performance score, being the alternatives with higher scores the most suitable sites (Pereira and Duckstein, 1993). The decision rule evaluated each alternative,  $A_i$ , by the following formula:

$$(5) \quad A_i = \sum w_j x_{ij}$$

Where  $x_{ij}$  is the score of  $i^{th}$  alternative with respect to the  $j^{th}$  standardized criterion value, and  $w_j$  is a normalized weight, so that  $\sum w_j = 1$ . The most preferred alternative was the maximum value of  $A_i$ .

### 3.4 Design of option sites for reforestation

The design of suitable sites, as options for reforestation, was done by a definition process of the suitability maps through an exclusion threshold that discriminates suitable areas from unsuitable areas. Definition maps were

generated, one for each interviewed people, displaying only the better sites for reforestation according to the individual judgment of the stakeholders. Logical-based commands were applied to dictate the instructions on command line module of ILWIS 3.6 (ITC, 2009).

The definition process began with the establishment of the definition rules: Total area able to be prioritized  $\leq 15,000$  ha (1.3% of total study area), minimal area of suitable patch  $\geq 0.54$ ha (6 contiguous suitable cells). These rules were agreed on the basis of the required area to be reforested to overcome the deforestation process according to the forest loss rates calculated by the National Forestry Commission (CONAPO, 2003). The twofold percentage of deforested area per year was adopted as the amount of area to be prioritized.

Following Orsi and Geneletti (2010), we set a threshold to extract the most suitable pixels from suitability maps. The threshold was defined on the basis of the fulfillment of definition rules. The identification, selection and extraction of suitable pixels were done by the study of the histogram of suitability map data. We filtered the selected pixel to eliminate isolate pixels and groups with 5 or least pixels. Finally, we generated the defined maps for each stakeholder that display only the qualified area (group of cells) considered as reforestation options, being the representation of individual preferences of priority areas for reforestation.

### 3.5 Development of priority areas maps

After generating the maps of reforestation option by each stakeholder, we integrated them by the sector to which they belonged. Sector-maps were generated to meet the scenario for academic, governmental, NGO and public population sector. Then we performed a definition process to select the sites that fulfilled the definition rules of area. After that, we integrated those sector-maps to obtain a map that should contain the areas considered as the highest important. We took into account the four priority scenarios and, in essence, the overall judgment and preferences of the participants. To make the spatial model, we used the command line module to perform the map sum calculation (Formula 6 and 7); where  $d, e, f$  to  $n$  were the input maps of the stakeholders;  $A, G, N$  and  $P$  were the input maps of each population sector. Definition process was applied to fulfill the area requirements. We selected the sites with overlap among two, three and four sectors and they were designed as the 3<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> priority sites, respectively.

$$(6) \quad \text{Sector-map} = d + e + f + \dots + n$$

$$(7) \quad \text{Priority Areas-map} = A + G + N + P$$

## 4. Results

A total of 54 interviews were fully completed from four different sectors of the society involved in the decision making of reforestation

planning: academic (9), governmental (10), NGO (9) and local people (26), here defined as the public sector.

We identified 34 different criteria through expert consultation, 21 environmental criteria and 13 socioeconomic. The table 2 shows the most cited criteria by the experts. The higher number of cites was given for the criterion “distance from forest”, with the consensus of 18 experts. On the other hand, the 41% of the listed criteria were mentioned only one time by experts (3.6% of citation). The ten most cited criteria were considered as relevant, of this, five were environmental and five were socioeconomic (table 3). The criteria without available data as rate of land use change, soil depth, land tenure, forest fragmentation, among others; were discarded in the selection.

The overall trends in opinion of the

stakeholders with respect to maximization of a desirability interval value (type of factor) and the relative importance (weight) for each criterion classified by population sector are shown in Figure 3 and 4 respectively. In general, the opinions regarded the desirable type of factor and weights of criteria were divided among population sectors.

In the selection of the type of factor to maximize the desirability interval value (figure 3), the criteria “distance from rivers” and “risk of erosion” were the most divided, in both, between criteria and sector approaches. Also, the overall opinion was divided from the public sector about the entire environmental criteria. On the other hand, there were similar opinions among the four sectors considering the “marginalization index” criterion as a benefit factor (maximize higher input values), with the

**Table 2.** Criteria ranking, based on the percentage of citation by experts.

Rank	Criteria	Citation (%)
1	Distance from forest	64.3
2	*Rate of land use change	57.1
3	Risk of Erosion	53.6
4	*Biodiversity index, *natural corridors	46.4
5	Slope of terrain (%), *rate of deforestation.	42.9
6	Distance from crops	39.3
7	Human density, Insolation, distance from roads, distance from rivers.	35.7
8	Distance from urban settlements, marginalization index, *social capital	32.1
9	*Soil Depth	28.6
10	*Land tenure	17.9
11	Distance from ANPs, distance from reforested sites	10.7
12	*Soil fertility	7.1
13	Distance from greenhouses, migration rate, *forest fragmentation, humidity, *biotype, *presence of pest, *social stability, precipitation, *forest fires, *seed dispersion, *presence of cattle, *biodiversity use, temperature, elevation above sea level.	3.6

\* Criteria without available data for the entire region


**Table 3.** Relevant environmental and socioeconomic criteria selected by consultation of experts.

Dimension	Decision Criteria	Description
Socio-economic	Distance from Crops	Euclidian distance (meters) from existing areas used for agriculture
	Human density	Number of people per Km <sup>2</sup> . Based on extent of municipal area.
	Distance from roads	Euclidian distance (meters) from highways, roads and trails.
	Distance from urban	Euclidian distance (meters) from the existing urban zones.
	Marginalization index	Summary of nine socio-economic indicators of social exclusion (CONAPO, 2005).
Environmental	Distance from forest	Euclidian distance (meters) from the existing forest.
	Risk of erosion	Index of risk for soil erosion per water action.
	Slope of terrain	Percentage of maximum change in z-value of the surface from each pixel.
	Insolation	Units of hour-watt per m <sup>2</sup> of sun insolation. Calculated for the, summer and winter, solstice and equinox.
	Distance from rivers	Euclidian distance (meters) from the not intermittent rivers.




90% of opinions. The “distance from forest”, with the 82.5% of the total opinions, got the second most unanimous response in considering as cost factor (maximize lower input values) that criterion. There was an absolute consensus between the experts (academic, governmental and NGO) with the 100% of opinions regarding to maximize the lower distances from existing forest.


The selection of the importance category is shown in Figure 4. The 66% of opinions included the environmental criteria in categories of important and very important, while only the 46% of opinions included socioeconomic criteria in the same categories. The criterion “distance from forest” had the highest frequency of qualifications of “very important” category, with 31 of 54 opinions, of




**Figure 3.** Type of factor (Cost, Benefit or Intermediate) selected by stakeholders by four population sector, to maximize the desirability interval value of each one of the criterion through standardization process.



**Figure 4.** Percentage of opinions for category of importance given to the socioeconomic and environmental criteria by each sector.



**Figure 5.** Sample of criteria layers generated through GIS operational process of thematic data: 1) constraint layer, 2) risk of erosion factor, 3) marginalization index factor and 4) distance from urban zones factor.



**Figure 6.** Sample of maps of suitability land for reforestation by the first member of NGO (N1a) and public sector (P1a). And maps of the most suitable sites extracted from the first ones (N1b and P1b respectively).

which the 100% of experts supported this designation. In the public sector, the higher frequency of the category “very important” was given for the criterion “index of marginalization” with 18 opinions of 26.

The set of criteria layers was constituted for eleven layers (Figure 5, see annex 2). Ten of them were the factors that represent spatially the relevant criteria. The minimum and maximum attribute values presented by factor layer is shown for the study area in table 4. The constraint layer was generated to represent an area extent of 6,891km<sup>2</sup> of restricted sites for a reforestation plan, representing the 59% from the total study area. The non- restricted sites comprise the 41% of the study area, and were

the only ones which were evaluated by the multicriteria analysis.

We generated a total of 54 composite index layers, one for each stakeholder (figure 6a) that represent the suitability value of each pixel in a gradient color palette. The range of suitability values for reforestation was between 0.16 and 0.94. We defined the thresholds of area for each individual map of stakeholder. The lower limits of the thresholds between maps had different values of land suitability between 0.42 and 0.86, with an average of 0.70. The percentage of area selected for reforestation option sites was an average of 1.35% of the total area, varying between stakeholder maps in a range of ± 0.5 %. (table 5). The maps by stakeholder of reforestation option sites

represented the individual opinion about the best area for reforestation (figure 6b).

**Table 4.** Maximum and minimum values of attributes by criteria factor.


Criteria	Unit	Upper Mixtec	Priority areas	1 <sup>st</sup> priority areas
		min & max values		
Dist. from crops	m	0 – 1706	0 - 29	0 – 28
Human Density	people/km <sup>2</sup>	3 - 186	8 – 38	12 – 38
Dist. from roads	m	0 – 9421	86 – 4107	810 – 3526
Dist. from urban	m	0 – 14671	2995 - 8038	4060– 7672
Marginalization	Index	1 – 4	3 – 4	4
Dist. from forest	m	0 – 2010	13 – 102	21 – 87
Risk of erosion	T ha <sup>-1</sup> year <sup>-1</sup>	0 – 105	0.5 – 15	1 – 14
Slope	%	0 – 403	25 – 74	29 – 65
Insolation	Watt hour/m	4030– 7591	6111 – 6759	5969– 6752
Dist. from rivers	m	0 – 7198.2	107.3 – 2627	371 – 1979

**Table 5.** Sample of the area threshold established for the first three members of the academic (A), governmental (G), NGO (N) and Public (P) sectors.

Stakeholder map	Threshold of area (%)	Value of suitability
A_1	1.21	0.64
A_2	1.54	0.55
A_3	1.34	0.61
G_1	1.14	0.68
G_2	1.03	0.63
G_3	1.42	0.63
N_1	1.33	0.68
N_2	1.1	0.74
N_3	1.09	0.78
P_1	1.76	0.76
P_2	1.34	0.42
P_3	1.35	0.71

Four maps of reforestation option sites, one by each sector, resulted from the aggregation of the individual stakeholder reforestation option maps. These maps showed the sites considered by each population sector as the most suitable areas for reforestation as restoration intervention (Figure 7). A high

concentration of suitable sites were in the souther portion of the Upper Mixtec region in the four sector maps . For the map of public sector, 97% of its priority sites fell on the south of the study area. While for the maps of experts, 87% (NGO), 85%(governmental) and 80% (academic) of its priority sites were also in the south.



**Figure 7.** Maps of optional sites for reforestation by each population sector based on the preferences of its members.

The map of priority areas for landscape forest restoration showed an extension of 216.3 km<sup>2</sup> of reforestation sites, 1.8% of total study area. That map represents the areas with high priority for restoration considering the opinion of all the members from the four population sectors. Both, ponderation of assigned weights and maximized interval values, as well as, restrictions of area amount able to take into

consideration; determined the final selection of suitable sites.

**Table 6.** Average of assigned weight to socioeconomic and environmental criteria taking into account the overall opinion of stakeholders.


Dimension	W	Factor	W
Socio-economic	0.40	Distance from Crops	0.05
		Human density	0.05
		Distance from roads	0.10
		Distance from urban	0.08
		Marginalization index	0.12
Environmental	0.60	Distance from forest	0.15
		Risk of erosion	0.13
		Slope of terrain	0.14
		Insolation	0.09
		Distance from rivers	0.09

The weights given to environmental criteria were more determinant for the selection of the priority sites, with 60% of importance (Table 6). The greater weight was given for the criterion “Distance from forest”, 0.15 over other criteria. The criterion “marginalization index” was the most important among socioeconomical criteria with a weight of 0.12. In other hand, the priority areas were located on sites with low attribute values in 7 of 10 criteria. On the contrary, these , high levels of insolation and marginalization characterized the areas for restoration (table 4).

The priority areas were displayed in three colour-level to represent the type of priority (Figure 8). Most of the priority sites, the 87.8

With the continuous call for restoring

%, fell on the southeastern part of the Upper Mixtec region. The sites with third priority (blue) covers an area of 131.5 km<sup>2</sup>, the sites with second priority (yellow) a total of 74.9 Km<sup>2</sup> and the sites with first priority (red) covers an extension of 9.87 Km<sup>2</sup>, with 97.7 % of these sites located on the southern. The 50% of the 1<sup>st</sup> priority sites, 4. 9 km<sup>2</sup>, was concentrated within the territory of two municipalities, San Mateo Sinduhi and San Pablo Tijaltepecthe.



**Figure 8.** Map of priority areas for Forest Landscape Restoration in the High Mixtec region, Oaxaca (Mexico). It shows the areas in order of priority to implement actions of reforestation.

### 5. Discussion

ecological functions and services it is urgent to implement innovative tools and methods to

assist in the decision making process. Our focus in identifying the most suitable sites for restoration responds to the need of optimizing efforts and resources. In addition, the selection of areas under a forest landscape restoration approach implies the involvement of stakeholders' opinion from the planning stage. The end result of our study is a spatial representation of the most consensual preferences among experts and local people at the Upper Mixtec region. Spatial multicriteria decision analysis allowed us assessment the land suitability under environmental and social criteria based on value judgment of stakeholders. This was achieved through the integration of interviews, MCA and GIS techniques into a systematic and transparent procedure (Annex 1). Barba-Romero and Pomerol (1997) pointed out that the sequence of steps within multicriteria analysis methodology depends on the problem situation because there are many ways in which such steps can be organized. The main obstacle in our study was the availability of data, since a lack of ready-to-use list of criteria, until outdated or non-existent thematic data from the study area. Successful decision making process depends on the quality and quantity of information. For this reason, a great amount of effort should be invested in the acquisition, generation, and updating of the information needed for the study.

The expert consultation is a helpful and widely practices to fill gaps of information (Keeney ad Raiffa, 1976, Store and Kangas, 2001; Bojórquez-Tapia *et al* 2003, Geneletti, D. 2007; Orsi *et al* 2010). Our results reveal that there is a poor agreement among experts about which criteria should be used for a land assessment to select restoration sites. Only three criteria: Distance from forest, rate of land use change and risk of erosion were mentioned by more than the 50% of the experts we consulted (Table 2). A poor agreement amongst the consulted experts was also reported in other studies seeking for similar objectives as ours (e.g., Orsi *et al* 2010) Identifying relevant criteria by mean of expert opinion should be taken with caution because the expert knowledge can be incomplete, imprecise and value-biased (Bojórquez-Tapia *et al* 2003). However, expert consultation is not necessarily bad source of advice (Malczewski, 1999). The availability of information was determinant in criteria selection because less than half of the cited criteria had insufficient data to be considered.

The number of criteria to be used is another controversial question. We decided to use the ten more relevant criteria based on a balance between computational load and the need of considering the widest possible range of criteria. However, there are no rules that specify how many criteria should be included in a MCA study. Barredo (1996) suggested the use

of not more than seven criteria, but in other studies the set of criteria ranges from 3 (Caloni, 2003) to 13 (Zucca *et al* 2008). Another option is presented by Orsi and Geneletti (2010), who used fourteen criteria divided in two analysis stages.

The relationship established between value judgments and value functions gave us the benefit to complement the opinion about the relative importance of each criterion with the desirable way to maximize the values of attributes. The use of value functions has the advantage of providing a clear recording of the judgments and the choices that make up the final scores of suitability (Geneletti, 2005a). Both types of judgments, desirability value and importance relative, were independent to each other and influenced a marked differentiation between plots (pixels) in land assessment.

The integration of GIS capabilities (acquire, store, manipulate, analyze and represent spatial data) and multicriteria decision analysis (MCDA) techniques gave us a user-friendly and powerful tool for handling conflicting interests and find points of agreement. GIS-based MDCA had the advantage to deal with multiple criteria, which represents the real state of nature of our study area; and can include conflicting opinions that describe the decision problem from different angles. Another feature of the proposed methodology is its flexibility to incorporate new or updated data. Basic or

fundamental GIS operations provide the tools for generating data inputs to spatial multicriteria decision analysis (Annex 2). In addition, concrete and easy-understood outcomes (spatially represented) are generated step by step until the final map is generated. Malczewski (1999) and Gómez and Barredo (2006) argued that the incorporation of GIS in decision making process help in minimizing conflicts among competing parties by providing useful outcomes (digital or printed maps) to continuing the negotiation. However, Obermeyer and Pinto (1994), remind us that an important assumption of the GIS use in decision making; is the assumption of a lack of disagreement among stakeholders over the validity and acceptance of spatial model results. In the practice this is usually untrue.

The approach of forest landscape restoration (FLR) is pragmatic (UICN, 2008). It was developed in response to the unclear results of traditional efforts of forest restoration, which have been focused mainly on ecological theory, leaving aside the social domain (Dudley and Aldrich, 2007). Reforestation has been the restoration intervention more used during the last decades (Dorado and Arias, 1998) and there is a tendency to focus on developing decision-making authority to the stakeholders, an important element of FLR (Bekele-Tesemma and Ababa, 2002; Carabias *et al* 2003). The involvement of stakeholders within decision making process and building consensus among

them should promote a balance between the focus of ecological integrity and human well-being. Spatial MCDA tools emerge as a methodological option to promote the active participation since the modeling of preferences until the negotiation with the alternatives resulted through the process.

An important drawback of the application of MCDA methodology is the inherent presence of uncertainty. Uncertainty exists in many decision situations and varies greatly (Malczewski, 1999). Broadly speaking, there are two main sources of uncertainty involved in making decisions: the people judgments and available information (Keeney and Raiffa, 1976). In the first case, might be present the inability of the stakeholders for providing accurate and unchangeable judgments regarding the evaluation of relevant criteria because of measurement and conceptual errors (Malczewski, 1999). Delphi surveys have been applied in MCDA studies to reveal the change-in-opinion index of stakeholders (Bojórquez *et al* 2003, Geneletti, 2007). This forecasting method involves an iterative process of opinion and argument interchanges among participants, who then had to support with new arguments or judgments (Taylor, 1984). The status of information is the second source of uncertainty because available data to the decision makers is often uncertain and imprecise. Thus, even when uncertainty is recognized, it may have to be ignored because of insufficient data for

evaluation; the evaluation would require too much computer cost due to software limitations. The performance of sensitivity analysis is suggested to test the model robustness, different methodologies of spatial uncertainty analysis are recommended in Malczewski (1999), Lowell and Jaton (1999) and Gómez and Barredo (2006). Broadly, the analysis consists in examining the change that occurs in the results when conducting controlled variations in the range of interest or input parameters. The result of the analysis indicates that parts of the model should be improved to prevent error propagation.

In spite of its limitations, MCDA arises as a practical, flexible, adaptable and perfectible methodology for spatial decision making. Its practical applications are not confined to a planning stage, but also could be a management tool through its ability to incorporate new data, updated data and new criteria. The potential step should be the creation of a spatial decision support system to serve as manager tool in the implement of adaptive policies for restoration at regional or local scales and to seek strategies and solutions more consistent with the complex socio-environmental problems.

## 6. Conclusions and recommendations

The search for rapid solutions to complex socio-environmental problems, as forest loss, is not an easy task since decision making processes

involve dealing with different points of view and limited information of the environment. Our study clearly shows that it is possible the integration of different methods and technological tools, namely interviews, GIS and MCA within a systematic framework to select the most suitable sites for reforestation based on spatial analysis considering multiple criteria and conflicting preferences. The following sequence of steps, led us through a logical, transparent and repeatable process, starting with the incorporating of available data, followed by the generation of essential inputs for the creation of the outcomes for the different stages of methodology. This methodology allowed us to identify the priorities of stakeholders from different population sectors and to meet the possible scenarios to be considered as reforestation option sites. At the end, a tangible result, the map of priority areas, represents the most consensual sites to implement a reforestation in Upper Mixtec at regional scale based on the stakeholder's judgment. Multicriteria decision analysis within a GIS environment is a helpful tool in restoration planning for its capabilities to deal with multiple criteria, to model spatially conflicting preferences of stakeholders, and to generate tangible outcome maps. Also, it fulfills the objectives of FLR involving value judgment by experts and local people related with ecological integrity and social needs. However, uncertainty and limited number of criteria to

evaluate have some drawbacks. Uncertainty is inherent in any model. The implementation of sensitivity analysis to assess uncertainty on the decision making process is a viable option to this task. On the other hand, the high computational load required could force to decrease the number of criteria per target. Finally, it is important to note that the final map is not meant to be an optimal solution, but only the most suitable according to the stakeholders' value judgments. This map is a useful tool to continuing the negotiations between stakeholders and it is susceptible to be improved with their feedback. Future researches lines and practical applications could point to the implementation of MCDA techniques on the management of adaptive policies for regional and local scale restoration

### *Acknowledgments*

This work has been carried out within the framework of the ReForLan project (<http://reforlan.bournemouth.ac.uk>). The project has received research funding from the European Community's Sixth Framework Programme (FP6), contract number 032132. The views presented do not necessarily represent the opinion of the European Community, and the Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. We would like to thank to Raúl Rivera (National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico) for advices on GIS and Francesco Orsi (University of Trento, Italy) for advices on MCDA.

### *Literature cited*

Altieri, M, S. Anta, J.J. Caballero y J. Hernandez. 2006. Manejo de agua y restauración productiva en la región indígena Mixteca de Puebla y Oaxaca. Resultados de los estudios y recomendaciones para los tomadores de decisiones de las comunidades y organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Editor: Manuel Noriega. BNWPP.



- Barba-Romero, S. and Pomerol, J. 1997. Decisiones multicriterio. Fundamentos teóricos y utilización práctica. Alcalá de Henares, Servicio de publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá. España.
- Barredo, J. 1996. Sistemas de información geográfica y evaluación multicriterio en la ordenación del territorio. Madrid, RA-MA.
- Bekele-Tesemma, A., Ababa, A. 2002. Forest landscape restoration: initiatives in Ethiopia. Available from: <http://assets.panda.org/downloads/ethiopiaflr.pdf> (Accessed 05 January 2011). IUCN/WWF, Gland, Switzerland.
- Belton, V., Gear, T. 1997. On the meaning of relative importance. *Journal of Multi-criteria Decision Analysis* 6(6): 335-338.
- Berger, J. J., 1990. *Environmental Restoration. Science and Strategies for Restoring the Earth*, Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Bojórquez-Tapia, L., Díaz-Mondragón, S., Ezcurra, E. 2001. GIS-based approach for participatory decision making and land suitability assessment. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, Vol. 15: 129-151.
- Bojórquez-Tapia, L., Brower, L., Castilleja, G., Sánchez-Colón, S., Hernández, M., Calvert, W., Díaz, S., Gómez-Priego, P., Alcantar, G., Melgarejo, E., Solares, M. J., Gutiérrez, L., Juárez, M. L. 2003. Mapping expert knowledge: Redesigning the Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve. *Conservation Biology* Vol.170: 367-379.
- Carabias, J., Arriaga, V., and Cervantes, V. 2007. Las políticas públicas de la restauración ambiental en México: Limitantes, avances, rezagos y retos. *Bol. Soc. Bot. Mex.* 80: 85-100.
- Caloni, N. 2003. Análisis especial de evaluación multicriterio en la generación de alternativas viales para el trazado de la autopista Luján-Mercedes, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Tesis de licenciatura, Universidad Nacional de Luján. Argentina pp. 161.
- Carver, S. (1991). Integrating multi-criteria evaluation with geographical information systems. *International Journal of Geographical Information Systems*, 5(3): 321-339.
- Cipollini, K., Maruyama, A.L., Zimmerman, C.L. 2005. Planning for restoration: a decision analysis approach to prioritization. *Restor. Ecol.* 13, 460-470.
- CONAFOR, 2003. Cambios de uso de suelo a nivel nacional de 1993- 2002. Series II y III. Gerencia de Geomática. Comisión Nacional Forestal, México.
- CONAPO, 2005. Índice de marginación a nivel localidad 2005. *Marginalization Index at village level*. Consejo Nacional de Población, México
- Dudley, N., Aldrich, M. (eds.). 2007. *Five years of implementing forest landscape restoration lessons to date*. WWF International, Gland, Switzerland.
- Eastman, J. R., Jin, W., Kyem, P. A. K., Toledano, J., 1995. Raster procedures for multicriteria/multiobjective decisions. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 61, 539 – 547.
- FAO. 2010. *Global Forest Resources Assessment 2010*. Main report. FAO, Rome.
- Ferrusquía-Villafranca, I. 1976. Estudios geológico paleontológicos en la región Mixteca. I. Geología del área Tamazulapan-Teposcolula-Yanhuitlán, Mixteca Alta, estado de Oaxaca, México. *Bol. Inst. Geol.* 97: 1-160.
- ESRI, 2006. *ArcGIS 9.2 and extensions*. Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc. (ESRI). Redlands, CA, USA. <http://www.esri.com>
- García-Mendoza, A., P. Tenorio y J. Reyes., 1994. El endemismo en la flora fanerogámica de la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca-Puebla, México, *Acta Botánica Mexicana*. 27:53-73.
- Geneletti, D., 2007a. An approach based on spatial multicriteria analysis to map the nature conservation value of agricultural land. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 83: 228-235.
- Geneletti, D. 2005a. Formalising expert opinion through multi-attribute value functions: An application in landscape ecology. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 76: 255-262.
- Geneletti, D. 2005b. Multicriteria analysis to compare the impact of alternative road corridors: a case of study in northern Italy. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. Vol. 23, 2: 135-146.
- Geneletti, D. 2007. Expert panel-based assessment of Forest Landscapes for Land Use planning. *Mountain Research and Development*, 27 (3): 220-223.
- Geneletti, D. 2008. Incorporating biodiversity assets in spatial planning: methodological proposal and development of a planning support system. *Landscape and urban planning*, 84: 252-265.
- Gomes, E.G. and Lins, M.P.E., 2002, Integrating geographical information systems and multi-criteria methods: a case study. *Annals of Operations Research*, 116, pp. 243-269.
- Gómez, M., Barredo, J. 2006. *Sistemas de información geográfica y evaluación multicriterio en la ordenación del territorio*. Ed RA-MA, 2nd Edition, Spain.
- Hobbs, R.J. and Harris, J. A. 2001. Restoration ecology: repairing the earth's ecosystems in the new millennium. *Restoration Ecology*, 9: 239-246.
- IUCN. 2008a. *About Forest Landscape Restoration*. Available from: [http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/forest/fp\\_our\\_work/fp\\_our\\_work\\_thematic/fp\\_our\\_work\\_flr/fp\\_forest\\_landscape\\_about/](http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/forest/fp_our_work/fp_our_work_thematic/fp_our_work_flr/fp_forest_landscape_about/) (Accessed 15 December 2010). IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- INIFAP and CONABIO, 1995. *Mapa edafológico*. Escala 1:250,000. México.
- INEGI, 2005a. *II Censo de Población y Vivienda 2005*. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. México.
- INEGI, 2005b. *Marco Geoestadístico Municipal 2005 Versión 3.1*. Conjunto de datos vectoriales el Marco Geoestadístico Nacional. Available on: [http://www.inegi.org.mx/geo/contenidos/geoestadistica/Marco\\_Geoestadistico.aspx](http://www.inegi.org.mx/geo/contenidos/geoestadistica/Marco_Geoestadistico.aspx)
- ITC, 2009. *ILWIS 3.6 Academic User Guide*. International Institute for Aerospace Survey and Earth Sciences (ITC), Enschede, Netherlands.
- Jha, M.K., McCall, C. and Schonfeld, P., 2001, Using GIS, genetic algorithms, and visualization in highway development. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 16, pp. 399-414.

- Keeney, R. and Raiffa, H. 1976. Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value trade offs. New York, Wiley and Sons.
- Leaño, S., Bishop, I. and Evans, D., 2004, Spatial-temporal model for demand and allocation of waste landfills in growing urban regions. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 28, pp. 353–385.
- Lewis, L., Verstraeten, G., Honglei, Z. 2005. RUSLE applied in a GIS framework: Calculating the LS factor and deriving homogeneous patches for estimating soil loss, *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 19: 7, 809 – 829.
- Lowell, K. and Jaton, A. 1999. Spatial accuracy assessment: land information uncertainty in natural resources. Sleeping Bears press Inc. USA
- MacDonald, M.L., 1996, A multi-attribute spatial decision support system for solid waste planning. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 20, pp. 1–17.
- Maginnis, S., Rietbergen-McCracken, J., Jackson, W. 2007. Introduction, In: Rietbergen-McCracken, J., Maginnis, S., Sarre, A. (eds.), *The forest landscape restoration handbook*. Earthscan, London, UK: pp. 1–4.
- Mansourian, S. 2005. Overview of forest restoration strategies and terms. In: Mansourian, S., Vallauri, D., Dudley, N. (eds.), *Forest restoration in landscapes: beyond planting trees*. Springer, New York, USA: pp. 8–13.
- Malczewski, J. 1999. *GIS and Multicriteria Decision Analysis*. Wiley, New York.
- Malczewski, J. 2006. GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis: a survey of literature. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 20: 703-726.
- Moore, P. 1975. Public Decision Making and Resource Management. Discussion paper, 17. Department of Geography, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Nijkamp, P. and Van Delf, A., 1977. Multi-criteria Analysis and regional Decision Making. Martinus Nijhoff, Leiden.
- Obermeyer, N. and Pinto, J. 1994. *Managing geographical information systems*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ocaña, C. y F. Galacho (2002). Un Modelo de Aplicación de SIG y Evaluación Multicriterio al Análisis de las Capacidad del Territorio en Relación a Funciones Turísticas IV Congreso “Turismo y Tecnologías de la Información y las Comunicaciones” TuriTec 2002. Departamento de Geografía, Universidad de Málaga, España.
- Orsi, F., Geneletti, D. 2010. Identifying priority areas for Forest Landscape Restoration in Chiapas (Mexico): An operational approach combining ecological and socioeconomic criteria. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 94:20-30.
- Orsi, F., Geneletti, D., Newton, A.C. 2010. Towards a common set of criteria and indicators to identify forest restoration priorities: An expert panel-based approach. *Ecological Indicators*. In press
- Pereira, J. M., Duckstein, L. 1993. A multiple criteria decision-making approach to GIS-based land suitability evaluations. *International Journal of Geographical Information Systems* 7: 407-424.
- Renard, K. G., Foster, G. R., Weesies, G. A., McCool, D. K., Yoder, D. C. 1997. Predicting soil erosion by water. A guide to conservation planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) Handbook no. 703. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, DC. 404pp.
- Rivera, R., Del Castillo, R. Rey-Benayas, J. M. 2011. Patterns of deforestation in the Upper Mixtec Region, Oaxaca, México. *Avances del proyecto ReForlan-Oaxaca*. In press.
- Sánchez K., F. Jiménez, S. Velázquez, M. Piedra y E. Romero; 2004. Metodología de análisis multicriterio para la identificación de áreas prioritarias de manejo de recurso hídrico en la cuenca del río Sarapiquí. *Recursos Naturales y Ambiente*, 88 – 95. Costa Rica.
- SER, 2004. The SER, International Primer on Ecological Restoration. Science & Policy Working Group. Society for Ecological Restoration International. www.ser.org.
- Serrano-Altamirano, V., Silva-Serna, M., Cano-García, M., Medina-García, G., Ruiz-Corral, A. 2005. Estadísticas climatológicas básicas del estado de Oaxaca (Periodo 1961-2003). INIFAP-SAGARPA. Libro Técnico No. 4. Oaxaca, México. 272pp.
- Store, R., Kangas, J. 2001. Integrating spatial multi-criteria evaluation and expert knowledge for GIS-based habitat suitability modeling. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 55: 79-93.
- Taylor, R. 1984. *Behavioral decision making*. Glenview, IL: SccForesman.
- Van Remortel, R. D., Maichle, R. W., Hickey, R. J. 2004. Computing the LS factor for the revised universal soil loss equation through array-based sloped processing of digital elevation data using C++ executable. *Computers & Geosciences Vol. 30: 1043-1053*.
- Wang, X., Yu, S. and Huang, G.H., 2004, Land allocation based on integrated GIS optimization modeling at a watershed level. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 66, pp. 61–74.
- WWF, IUCN. 2000. Forests reborn: A workshop on forest restoration. In: WWF/IUCN International Workshop on Forest Restoration: July 3–5, Segovia, Spain. IUCN, Segovia, Spain.
- Zucca, A., Sharifi, A., Fabbri, A. 2008. Application of spatial multi-criteria analysis to site selection for a local park: A case of study in the Bergamo Province, Italy. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88: 752-769.

## CONCLUSIÓN GENERAL

A lo largo de la investigación se evidencio la enorme complejidad que envuelve la identificación y localización de sitios prioritarios para la implementación de acciones de restauración tomando en cuenta la opinión de diversos actores. La necesidad de incorporar criterios, tanto medioambientales como socioeconómicos, condujo a la implementación de la consulta a expertos para su definición e identificación, así como la evaluación de estos criterios tanto por expertos como por gente local. La tarea ha resultado ciertamente compleja; la carencia de información disponible detallada y completa junto con la dificultad del trabajo para entrevistar a personas de diferentes sectores de la población, han ralentizado el desarrollo de nuestro trabajo. Sin embargo, a pesar de los diversos obstáculos ha sido posible corroborar la eficacia de la metodología que integra modernas tecnologías como los Sistemas de Información Geográfica (SIG) y Percepción Remota (PR) con una herramienta de toma de decisiones como el Análisis Multicriterio (AMC).

El aporte más significativo de nuestro estudio es, sin lugar a dudas, el desarrollo de una elaborada metodología que permite valorar el territorio desde diferentes puntos de vista y múltiples criterios. La diferenciación de los sitios mediante valores de aptitud nos proporciona la posibilidad de discriminar entre aéreas para hacer una priorización de las mismas. Esto permite seleccionar las áreas mínimas de mayor aptitud para dirigir los esfuerzos y recursos, siempre limitados, para implementar acciones de restauración. Una ventaja de la aplicación de esta metodología es la obtención de productos tangibles, como lo son los mapas digitales o impresos de áreas prioritarias, que tiene un gran potencial para continuar la negociación y toma de decisiones junto con los actores involucrados. Un inconveniente en nuestra propuesta es la presencia de la incertidumbre en el modelo. Esto se puede sobrellevar conociendo el grado de incertidumbre presente desde nuestra información de entrada hasta el resultado final. La implementación de un análisis de sensibilidad es recomendable para conocer el grado de robustez de nuestro modelo mediante pequeñas variaciones controladas en los pesos de los criterios para identificar las variaciones resultantes en nuestro mapa final y tomar la decisión si cumple o no con nuestras expectativas.


Es conveniente subrayar que el resultado final (mapa de áreas prioritarias) no se debe de tomar como la mejor solución, sino como la solución más satisfactoria a la luz de los juicios de valor expresados por los actores involucrados. El análisis espacial de decisión multicriterio funciona con la opinión de la gente y para la gente. Así que su pertinencia estará ligada con el involucramiento de las partes interesadas. La metodología aporta un marco flexible, perfectible y adaptable para la resolución de problemas complejos de carácter espacial involucrando la visión de las comunidades locales dentro de él proceso de planeación y toma de decisiones de su territorio. Esto la convierte en una herramienta con un gran potencial de uso práctico para la planeación y gestión de los recursos naturales, siendo capaz de representar las preferencias de la gente en mapas de fácil comprensión.

---


## **ANEXOS**

---

**Anexo 1.-** Diagrama de flujo de la metodología de análisis de decisión multicriterio aplicada en un ambiente SIG para la generación del mapa de áreas prioritarias de restauración del paisaje forestal para la Mixteca Alta, Oaxaca.



Anexo 2.- Capas de criterios, diez factores y una restricción.



Anexo 3.- Mapa de áreas prioritarias para restauración de paisaje forestal en la Mixteca Alta.

