



The
World
Bank



Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

Reporting Progress at Protected
Area Sites: *Second Edition*



July 2007

Revised Edition published by WWF International
July 2007

For further information please contact:

Alexander Belokurov
WWF International
Avenue du Mont Blanc
CH-1196
Gland
Switzerland

Tel: +41-22-364-9092
E-mail: abelokurov@wwfint.org

The material and the geographical designations in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WWF concerning the legal status of any country, territory or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) has been developed by Sue Stolton, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon, Tony Whitten and Fiona Leverington.

Our thanks also go to those people who commented on drafts, including Rod Atkins, Alexander Belokurov, Neil Burgess, David Cassells, Archana Chatterjee, Peter Cochrane, Finn Danielsen, Jamison Ervin, Jack Hurd, Glenys Jones, Leonardo Lacerda, Rosa Lemos de Sá, Mariana Montoya, Marianne Meijboom, Sheila O'Connor, Christian Peter, Jamie Pittock, Jeff Sayer and Liza Higgins-Zogib. The revised version follows the experiences and lessons learned from hundreds of applications of the METT and regional training workshops on using the METT. The original development of the Tracking Tool also benefited considerably from a consultant's report written by Antoine Leclerc, who interviewed many people in WWF's Indochina Programme about the Tracking Tool and their experience is reflected here.

Front cover photograph by Nigel Dudley

Contents

Background: Tracking Targets	3
The WCPA Framework	4
Purpose of the World Bank/WWF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	5
Guidance Notes for using the Tracking Tool	6
Data Sheets and Questionnaire	8

Background: Tracking Targets

There is a growing concern amongst protected area professionals that many protected areas around the world are not achieving the objectives for which they were established. One response to this concern has been an emphasis on the need to increase the effectiveness of protected area management, and to help this process a number of assessment tools have been developed to assess management practices. It is clear that the existence of a wide range of situations and needs require different methods of assessment. The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has therefore developed a 'framework' for assessment¹. The WCPA Framework aims to provide overall guidance in the development of assessment systems and to encourage standards for assessment and reporting. The WCPA Framework is based on the idea that good protected area management follows a process that has six distinct stages, or elements: it begins with understanding the **context** of existing values and threats, progresses through **planning**, and allocation of resources (**inputs**), and as a result of management actions (**processes**), eventually produces products and services (**outputs**), that result in impacts or **outcomes**.

The World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use ('the Alliance') was formed in April 1998, in response to the depletion of the world's forest biodiversity and of forest-based goods and services essential for sustainable development. As part of its work programme the Alliance set a target relating to management effectiveness of forest protected areas: *75 million hectares of existing forest protected areas under improved management to achieve conservation and development outcomes by 2010*. To evaluate progress towards this target the Alliance published in 2003 a simple site-level Tracking Tool to facilitate reporting on management effectiveness of protected areas within WWF and World Bank projects.

In addition, the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Synthesis Report concluded that: "... *important gaps in the distribution of protected areas remain, particularly in marine and freshwater systems*", and "*The biodiversity of inland waters appears to be in worse condition than that of any other system, driven by declines in the area of wetlands and the quality of water in inland waters*". The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (<http://www.ramsar.org>) has adopted a target for 250 million hectares of wetlands to be well managed in designated sites, and the Convention on Biological Diversity has adopted a target of 275 million hectares of inland waters habitats to be conserved in protected areas by 2010. In the case of inland water ecosystems within protected areas, these are often less well conserved than terrestrial habitats due to poor management of water, especially water flowing in from catchments outside the protected area. This version of the Tracking Tool has thus been revised to better assess management of wetland ecosystems within protected areas and the integration of terrestrial and wetlands conservation.

The Tracking Tool is one of a series of management effectiveness assessment tools built around the WCPA Framework, which range from the *WWF RAPPAM – Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management* – methodology used to identify key protected areas at threat within a protected area system to detailed monitoring systems such as that developed by the *Enhancing our Heritage* project for UNESCO natural World Heritage sites. Having this range of tools in place will aid the many countries who are signatories to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in fulfilling their commitments. In particular at the 7th CBD Conference of the Parties in 2004, 188 member countries agreed a *Programme of Work on Protected Areas*², one of the most ambitious environmental strategies in history. As part of the programme Nations have committed to develop assessment systems and report on the effectiveness of 30 per cent of their protected areas by 2010³.

¹ Hockings, M, S Stolton, F Leverington, N Dudley and J Courrau (2006); *Assessing Effectiveness – A Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas*; 2nd Ed. IUCN, Switzerland, <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/guidelines.htm#effect2>

² Decision VII/28 of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, <http://www.biodiv.org/decisions/default.asp?m=COP07&id=7765&lg=0>

³ Dudley, N, K J Mulongoy, S Stolton, S Cohen, C V Barber and S B Gidda (2005); *Towards Effective Protected Area Systems: An action guide to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work on Protected Areas*, CBD Technical Series number 18, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/cbd-ts-18.pdf>

The WCPA Framework

To maximise the potential of protected areas, and to improve management processes, we need to understand the strengths and weaknesses of their management and the threats that they face. The World Commission on Protected Areas provides an overarching framework for assessing management effectiveness of both protected areas and protected area systems, to give guidance to managers and others and to help harmonise assessment around the world.

Table 1 contains a very brief summary of the elements of the WCPA Framework and the criteria that can be assessed⁴. The World Bank/WWF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool has been designed to fulfil the elements of evaluation included in the Framework.

Questions in the Tracking Tool have been ordered to make completion as easy as possible; however the element(s) that each refers to are indicated in italics in the left hand column of the assessment form (see page 12 onwards) for reference.

Table 1: Summary of the WCPA Framework

Elements of evaluation	Explanation	Criteria that are assessed	Focus of evaluation
Context	<i>Where are we now?</i> Assessment of importance, threats and policy environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significance - Threats - Vulnerability - National context - Partners 	Status
Planning	<i>Where do we want to be?</i> Assessment of protected area design and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected area legislation and policy - Protected area system design - Reserve design - Management planning 	Appropriateness
Inputs	<i>What do we need?</i> Assessment of resources needed to carry out management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resourcing of agency - Resourcing of site 	Resources
Processes	<i>How do we go about it?</i> Assessment of the way in which management is conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suitability of management processes 	Efficiency and appropriateness
Outputs	<i>What were the results?</i> Assessment of the implementation of management programmes and actions; delivery of products and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results of management actions - Services and products 	Effectiveness
Outcomes	<i>What did we achieve?</i> Assessment of the outcomes and the extent to which they achieved objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts: effects of management in relation to objectives 	Effectiveness and appropriateness

⁴ For a copy of the WCPA Framework or a more detailed summary please visit the WCPA web-site at: <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/guidelines.htm#effect2> or contact WCPA at wcpa@hq.iucn.org

Purpose of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT or Tracking Tool) has been developed to help track and monitor progress in the achievement of the World Bank/WWF Alliance worldwide protected area management effectiveness target. It is also hoped that the Tracking Tool will be used more generally where it can help monitor progress towards improving management effectiveness; for example it is now obligatory for all Global Environment Facility protected area projects to use the Tracking Tool three times during the projects lifespan and the tool has been modified for use in several national protected area systems. In addition, use of the Tracking Tool can help managers track progress in implementing protected areas commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.

The purposes of the Tracking Tool were that it needed to be:

- Capable of providing a harmonised reporting system for protected area assessment
- Suitable for replication
- Able to supply consistent data to allow tracking of progress over time
- Relatively quick and easy to complete by protected area staff, so as not to be reliant on high levels of funding or other resources
- Capable of providing a “score” if required
- Based around a system that provides four alternative text answers to each question, strengthening the scoring system
- Easily understood by non-specialists
- Nested within existing reporting systems to avoid duplication of effort

This version has been revised, and the original purposes expanded, to allow the Tracking Tool be more readily applied to all terrestrial protected areas through, in particular, more reference to wetland protected areas. (Note: a variation of the Tracking Tool has also been developed by the World Bank for use in Marine Protected Areas⁵).

Aims of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

The Tracking Tool aims to **report progress** on management effectiveness and should not replace more thorough methods of assessment for the purposes of adaptive management. The Tracking Tool has been developed to provide a quick overview of progress in improving the effectiveness of management in individual protected areas, to be filled in by the protected area manager or other relevant site staff. As such it is clear that there are limitations on what it can achieve: it should not for example be regarded as an independent assessment, or as the sole basis for adaptive management.

Because of the great differences between expectations, resources and needs around the world, the Tracking Tool also has strict limitations in terms of allowing comparison between sites: the scoring system, if applied at all, will be most useful for tracking progress over time in one site or a closely related group of sites. The Tracking Tool has however been used to identify trends and patterns in management of protected areas across a number of sites⁶.

Lastly, the Tracking Tool is too limited to allow a detailed evaluation of *outcomes* and is really aimed at providing a quick overview of the management steps identified in the WCPA Framework up to and including *outputs*. Clearly, however good management is, if biodiversity continues to decline, the protected area objectives are not being met. Therefore the questions on condition assessment have disproportionate importance in the overall Tracking Tool.

⁵ World Bank (2004); *Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas*, Adapted by F Staub and M E Hatzios, World Bank, Washington DC

⁶ Dudley, N, A Belokurov, O Borodin, L Higgins-Zogib, M Hockings, L Lacerda and S Stolton (2004); *Are protected areas working? An analysis of forest protected areas by WWF*, WWF International, Gland

Guidance Notes for using the Tracking Tool

The Tracking Tool has been designed to be a simple and rapid site assessment system. We recognise that there will be some variation in the way that it is completed depending on the circumstances and time available for any particular assessment. However the tool is beginning to provide a useful dataset on protected areas globally and thus we would encourage people to add additional questions to suit local circumstances rather than modify the core questions of the Tracking Tool.

The following guidance on process should assist in making an assessment of Management Effectiveness as rigorous, reliable and useful as possible. National or regionally specific guidance can be prepared to provide more context for the completion of the Tracking Tool across a protected network or system. More general guidance on undertaking management effectiveness assessments can be found in the WCPA Framework.

Process for completing the Tracking Tool

The Tracking Tool contains a set of questions that have been designed to be easily answered by those managing the protected area without any additional research. However, it is useful to review the results of existing monitoring and to spend sufficient time discussing each aspect of management being assessed to arrive at a considered judgement. In most cases, a group of protected area staff from the reserve, project staff or other agency staff should be involved in answering the questions in the Tracking Tool; where possible additional external experts, local community leaders or others with knowledge and interest in the area and its management should also be involved.

When repeat assessments are undertaken it is advisable to use at least some of the same team members who undertook previous assessments. Where this is not possible the information provided by previous assessors in the text fields of the Tracking Tool will be particularly valuable in guiding the assessment and ensuring consistency in the evaluation being made.

Structure and content of the Tracking Tool

The Tracking Tool has two main sections: datasheets and assessment form. Both sections should be completed.

1. **Datasheets:** the data sheet comprises of two separate sections:
 - ✓ **Data sheet 1:** records details of the assessment and some basic information about the site, such as name, size and location etc. Where possible the unique site code given to the protected area in the World Database on Protected Area (WDPA) should also be provided. The WDPA can be accessed via the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre website at: www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa. Other contextual information such as local designation, i.e. national park, national reserve etc, along with the IUCN protected area management category⁷, ownership, staff numbers and budget are also recorded on this first sheet plus information on who was involved in the assessment. A second sheet records information on international designations: i.e. UNESCO World Heritage, Man and Biosphere sites and Ramsar wetland sites.
 - ✓ **Data sheet 2:** provides a generic list of threats which protected areas can face. On this data sheet the assessors are asked to identify threats and rank their impact on the protected area⁸.
2. **Assessment Form:** the assessment is structured around 30 questions presented in table format which includes three columns for recording details of the assessment, **all of which should be completed.**

⁷ IUCN, CNPPA and WCMC (1994); *Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories*, Gland, Switzerland, www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/guidelines.htm#categories

⁸ The list of threats has been adapted from the Conservation Measures Partnership Taxonomy of Direct Threats (see <http://fosonline.org/CMP/IUCN/browse.cfm?TaxID=DirectThreats>) and uses the same numbering system

- ✓ **Questions and scores:** the assessment is made by **assigning a simple score ranging between 0 (poor) to 3 (excellent)**. A series of four alternative answers are provided against each question to help assessors to make judgements as to the level of score given. In addition, there are supplementary questions which elaborate on key themes in the previous questions and provide additional information and points.

This is, inevitably, an approximate process and there will be situations in which none of the four alternative answers appear to fit conditions in the protected area very precisely. We suggest that you choose the answer that is nearest and use the comment/explanation section to elaborate. **Questions that are not relevant to a particular protected area should be omitted**, with a reason given in the comment/explanation section (for example questions about use and visitors will not be relevant to a protected area managed according to the IUCN protected area management Category Ia).

The maximum score of the 30 questions and supplementary questions is 102. A final total of the score from completing the assessment form can be **calculated as a percentage of 102 or of the total score from those questions that were relevant to a particular protected area**. (As noted above if questions are believed to be irrelevant, this should be noted in the comment/explanation column). Thus if a protected area scores 65 out of a maximum score of 87 the percentage can be calculated by dividing 65 by 87 and multiplying by 100 (i.e. $65 \div 87 \times 100 = 75\%$).

The whole concept of “scoring” progress is however fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion. The current system assumes, for example, that all the questions cover issues of equal weight, whereas this is not necessarily the case. Scores will therefore provide a better assessment of effectiveness if calculated as a percentage for each of the six elements of the WCPA Framework (i.e. context, planning, inputs, process, outputs and outcomes).

- ✓ **Comment/explanation:** a box next to each question allows for **qualitative judgements to be explained** in more detail. This could range from local staff knowledge (in many cases, staff knowledge will be the most informed and reliable source of knowledge), a reference document, monitoring results or external studies and assessments – the point being to give anyone reading the report an idea of why the assessment was made.

It is **very important** that that the ‘*comments/explanation*’ box be completed as it can provide greater confidence in the results of the assessment by making the basis of decision-making more transparent. More importantly, it provides a reference point and information for local staff in the future. This column also allows for **comments**, such as why a particular question was not answered, to be included when completing the questionnaire.

- ✓ **Next Steps:** for each question respondents are also asked to identify any intended actions that will improve management performance.

Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet 1

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)					
Date assessment carried out					
Name of protected area					
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)					
Designations	National	IUCN Category		International (please also complete sheet overleaf)	
Country					
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)					
Date of establishment (dd/mm/yyyy)					
Ownership details (please tick)	State	Private	Community	Other	
Management Authority					
Size of protected area (ha)					
Number of staff	Permanent		Temporary		
Annual budget (US\$) – excluding staff salary costs		Recurrent (operational) funds		Project or other supplementary funds	
What are the main values for which the area is designated					
List the two primary protected area management objectives					
Management objective 1					
Management objective 2					
No. of people involved in completing assessment					
Including: (tick boxes)	PA manager <input type="checkbox"/>	PA staff <input type="checkbox"/>	Other PA agency staff <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Local community <input type="checkbox"/>	Donors <input type="checkbox"/>	External experts <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	
Please note if assessment was carried out in association with a particular project, on behalf of an organisation or donor.					

Information on International Designations (where applicable)		
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)		
Date listed	Site name	Site area
Criteria for designation (i.e. criteria i to x)		
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)		
Date listed	Site name and number	Site area
Criteria for Designation & ecological character (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)		
Date listed	Site name	Site area Total: Core: Buffer: Transition:
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB (conservation, development and logistic support.)		
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below		
Name:	Detail:	
Name:	Detail:	
Name:	Detail:	
Name:	Detail:	
Name:	Detail:	
Name:	Detail:	

Protected Area Threats: Data Sheet 2

Please tick all relevant existing threats as either of high, medium or low significance. Threats ranked as of **high** significance are those which are seriously degrading values; **medium** are those threats having some negative impact and those characterised as **low** are threats which are present but not seriously impacting values or **N/A** where the threat is not present or not applicable in the protected area.

1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area

Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				1.1 Housing and settlement
				1.2 Commercial and industrial areas
				1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure

2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area

Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation
				2.1a Drug cultivation
				2.2 Wood and pulp plantations
				2.3 Livestock farming and grazing
				2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture

3. Energy production and mining within a protected area

Threats from production of non-biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				3.1 Oil and gas drilling
				3.2 Mining and quarrying
				3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams

4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)
				4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)
				4.3 Shipping lanes and canals
				4.4 Flight paths

5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)
				5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)
				5.3 Logging and wood harvesting
				5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources

6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area

Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				6.1 Recreational activities and tourism
				6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises
				6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas
				6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)
				6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors

7. Natural system modifications

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)
				7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use
				7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area
				7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)
				7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values
				7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)

8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes

Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)
				8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals
				8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)
				8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)

9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area

Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water
				9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)
				9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)
				9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)
				9.4 Garbage and solid waste
				9.5 Air-borne pollutants
				9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)

10. Geological events

Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				10.1 Volcanoes
				10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis
				10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides
				10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)

11. Climate change and severe weather

Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration
				11.2 Droughts
				11.3 Temperature extremes
				11.4 Storms and flooding

12. Specific cultural and social threats

High	Medium	Low	N/A	
				12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices
				12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values
				12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc

Assessment Form

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted	0			
	There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun	1			
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted/covenanted but the process is still incomplete (includes sites designated under international conventions, such as Ramsar, or local/traditional law such as community conserved areas, which do not yet have national legal status or covenant)	2			
	The protected area has been formally gazetted/covenanted	3			
2. Protected area regulations Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)? <i>Planning</i>	There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area	0			
	Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses	1			
	Regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some weaknesses or gaps	2			
	Regulations for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and provide an excellent basis for management	3			
3. Law enforcement Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Input</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0			
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget, lack of institutional support)	1			
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2			
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0			
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1			
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these objectives	2			
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3			
5. Protected area design Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult	0			
	Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being taken (e.g. agreements with adjacent land owners for wildlife corridors or introduction of appropriate catchment management)	1			
	Protected area design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved (e.g. with respect to larger scale ecological processes)	2			
	Protected area design helps achievement of objectives; it is appropriate for species and habitat conservation; and maintains ecological processes such as surface and groundwater flows at a catchment scale, natural disturbance patterns etc	3			
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Process</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users but is not appropriately demarcated	2			
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users and is appropriately demarcated	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0			
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1			
	A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2			
	A management plan exists and is being implemented	3			
	<i>Additional points: Planning</i>				
7a. Planning process	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1			
7b. Planning process	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1			
7c. Planning process	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1			
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0			
Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented	1			
	A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented	2			
	A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented	3			
	<i>Additional points: Planning</i>				
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0			
Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Input</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1			
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making	2			
	Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	3			
	<i>Additional points: Planning</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
10. Protection systems Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area? <i>Process/Outcome</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use	0			
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use	1			
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use	2			
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/resource use	3			
11. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Process</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0			
	There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	1			
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2			
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3			
12. Resource management Is active resource management being undertaken? <i>Process</i>	Active resource management is not being undertaken	0			
	Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes, cultural values and sustainable resource production (where relevant) are being implemented	1			
	Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes, cultural values and sustainable resource production (where relevant) are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed	2			
	Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes, cultural values and sustainable resource production (where relevant) are being substantially or fully implemented	3			
13. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0			
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1			
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2			
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
14. Staff training Are staff adequately trained to fulfil management objectives? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management	0	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	3	<input type="checkbox"/>		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for management of the protected area	0	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3	<input type="checkbox"/>		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding	0	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	3	<input type="checkbox"/>		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year)	0	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	3	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
18. Equipment Is equipment sufficient for management needs? <i>Input</i>	There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs	0			
	There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs	1			
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management	2			
	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3			
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0			
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1			
	There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities	2			
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3			
20. Education and awareness Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0			
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme	1			
	There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved	2			
	There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	3			
21. Planning for land and water use Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area	0			
	Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area	1			
	Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	2			
	Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question	Comment/Explanation	Next steps
Additional points: Land and water planning				
21a: Land and water planning for habitat conservation	Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats	+1		
21b: Land and water planning for connectivity	Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration)	+1		
21c: Land and water planning for ecosystem services & species conservation	Planning addresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)	+1		
22. State and commercial neighbours	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users	0		
Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users? <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation	1		
	There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
23. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
24. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0			
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management	1			
	Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved	2			
	Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	3			
Additional points <i>Local communities/indigenous people</i>					
24 a. Impact on communities	There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	+1			
24b. Impact on communities	Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1			
24c. Impact on communities	Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	+1			
25. Economic benefit Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services? <i>Outcomes</i>	The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities	0			
	Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed	1			
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities	2			
	There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	3			
26. Monitoring and evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0			
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1			
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management	2			
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
27. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities adequate? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need	0			
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation	1			
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2			
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3			
28. Commercial tourism operators Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0			
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1			
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2			
	There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	3			
29. Fees If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0			
	Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs	1			
	Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs	2			
	Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	3			
30. Condition of values What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated? <i>Outcomes</i>	Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	0			
	Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded	1			
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2			
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3			

Issue	Criteria	Score: Tick only one box per question		Comment/Explanation	Next steps
<i>Additional Points: Condition of values</i>					
30a: Condition of values	The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	+1			
30b: Condition of values	Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	+1			
30c: Condition of values	Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	+1			
TOTAL SCORE					