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Background

• More than 120,000 protected areas worldwide
• Designation does not always translate into effective conservation (“paper parks”)
• Management effectiveness evaluation:

The assessment of how well the PA is being managed – primarily the extent to which it is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives. [It] reflects three main themes:

• **Design** issues relating to both individual sites and PA systems
• **Adequacy** and appropriateness of **management** systems and processes
• **Delivery** of protected area objectives including conservation of values
Evaluation for whom and what for

Who wants to know?
- Funding Agencies (GEF, World Bank)
- NGOs (WWF, TNC, CI)
- Conventions (WHS, CBD)
- National PA Agencies
- Managers of Individual PAs

Why do they want to know?
- Promote adaptive management
- Resource allocation and priority setting
- Promote accountability and transparency
- Facilitate advocacy
Goal 4.2: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected areas management

Target: By 2010, frameworks for monitoring, evaluating and reporting protected areas management effectiveness at sites, national and regional systems, and transboundary protected area levels adopted and implemented by Parties.

Suggested activities of the Parties

4.2.1 Develop and adopt, by 2006, appropriate methods, standards, criteria and indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of protected area management and governance, and set up a related database, taking into account the IUCN-WCPA framework for evaluating management effectiveness, and other relevant methodologies, which should be adapted to local conditions.

4.2.2 Implement management effectiveness evaluations of at least 30 percent of each Party's protected areas by 2010 and of national protected area systems and, as appropriate, ecological networks.

4.2.3 Include information resulting from evaluation of protected areas management effectiveness in national reports under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

4.2.4 Implement key recommendations arising from site- and system-level management effectiveness evaluations, as an integral part of adaptive management strategies.
Global Study and European Study

Effort to compile worldwide experiences

- University of Queensland (Hockings, Leverington), IUCN-WCPA, UNEP-WCMC, WWF, TNC, 2010 Biodiv. Indicator Partnership
- 2005-2009, 8000 assessments, 129 countries
- Statistical correlations, recommendations

PAME Information Module on WDPA

European Regional Study
UN Region “Europe” (as in Global Study)
- Russia, Turkey & Caucasus

“Management Effectiveness Evaluation”
- Any systematic assessment of several sites which goes beyond merely assessing conservation status

BfN: Letters to ministries, EUROPARC: to its members

Follow-up on a country-by-country basis
- Environmental ministries, CBD Focal Points, NGOs

Follow-up on individual contacts
Guiding questions of the study

A:
• In how many protected areas and countries of Europe have evaluations of protected area management effectiveness been conducted?
• Is the 30 % target reached?
• In how many countries have such evaluations been institutionalised?
• Which methods have been applied?

B:
• How effective are Europe’s protected areas?
• What are the main threats to Europe’s PAs?
• Which aspects of management is in particular need of improvement?

C:
• Recommendations for best practise for the evaluation of PA management effectiveness in Europe
Who has carried out evaluations? Is the 30 % target of the CBD reached?

- Majority of countries has conducted evaluations
- 1846 Evaluations
- 30 % target with respect to both area and number has been reached in ca. 25 % of the countries of Europe
- Marine PAs hardly assessed
- PA systems hardly assessed
In how many countries are such evaluations institutionalised?

Institutionalization at national level

- Institutionalized
  at least one national / regional system
- One-off
  at least one national / regional study
- No nation-wide evaluation
  no response / negative response
- Isolated pilot studies
  less than 5 sites

Institutionalisation comprises:
- Regularly binding repeats
- Lead institution
- Adapted evaluation system
- Human and financial resources assigned and existing for the conduct of the evaluation

In Eastern Europe hardly any institutionalisation
### Methods and structures applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Agency</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Main Purpose(s)</th>
<th>Participat.</th>
<th>Use of Results (ex.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Agency <em>with authority over sites</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assure that management by subordinate entities is effective and efficient, that central policies and guidelines are well-designed and/or that funding is appropriately allocated.</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Formal agreements (action plans, improvement plans) between superior and subordinate entities, which are the basis for follow-ups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO / Advisor <em>no authority over sites</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assist in identifying strengths and weaknesses, guide in prioritization and/or create awareness and build support</td>
<td>Voluntary or mandatory</td>
<td>Reports which are disseminated to policy makers and the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Mgmt Body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-assessment for adaptive management</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Closely integrated into PA management cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Verify whether projects have generated improvements in recipient parks</td>
<td>Mandatory for recipients</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>To aware or maintain label or status</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To identify broad patterns and interdependencies</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Scientific publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Methods and structures applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Agency</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Examples of Approaches (selection)</th>
<th>Geographical Coverage (selection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Agency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MEE Finland, NPAPA England, Natuurmonumenten Test, Staatsbosbeheer Audit, MEE Swedish Counties</td>
<td>Finland, France, Netherlands, Sweden, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO / Advisor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>RAPPAM, Calatonia MEE, German National Parks, CPAMETT, Birdlife IBA</td>
<td>RAPPAM: 17 CEE countries, IBA: 5 countries, CPAMETT: Carpathian countries, Germany, Catalonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Mgmt Body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Italian Quality Parks, French Regional Nature Parks, Tenerife MEE, IPAM Toolbox</td>
<td>Italy, France, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tracking Tool, Marine Tracking Tool</td>
<td>Tracking Tool: 14 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PANParks, European Diploma, German Nature Parks, UNESCO-MAB</td>
<td>Europe, individual sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GoBi Survey, Stockholm Survey</td>
<td>Europe, biosphere reserves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How effective are Europe’s protected areas?

For the study available
- N = 504 (of 1846)
- RAPPAM
- Tracking Tool
- Birdlife IBA
- Mainly Eastern Europe

Transformation of indicators and scores
- Common reporting format (45 indicators)

European average: 0.56
- Better than global mean (0.53)
- Differences between regions, also dependent on HDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th># Sites</th>
<th>Perc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33-.5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5-.67</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.67</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths:
PA designation and demarcation, design, conservation status of valuable features, clear tenure situation, law enforcement, positive political environment

Weaknesses:
Funding, human resources, infrastructure, benefits for local communities, visitor management, monitoring and evaluation

Figure 11: Average management effectiveness scores (zero to one scale) from “most recent” European studies (top line) with international averages below for comparison (black: context, turquoise: planning, red: input, pink: processes, yellow: output, green: outcomes).
What are the main threats to Europe’s PAs?

1. Recreation and tourism development and activities
2. Pollution
3. Dam construction and hydrological infrastructure development
4. Logging (legal and illegal)
5. Hunting and poaching
6. Unsustainable agriculture and grazing

Generally speaking, the European evaluations have not put much emphasis on how PAs could counteract the identified threats better.
Which aspects of the management are in particular need of improvement?

- Better institutional cooperation
- Better integration of the PA into the surroundings
- Better participation of local people and stakeholders
- Clarification of land rights
- Funding and personnel
- Better communication of values and benefits of PAs
- Better elaboration and implementation of management plans

Background
Application of management effectiveness evaluation throughout Europe
Effectiveness of Europe’s Protected Areas
Recommendations
Recommendations towards best practise (1)

Conduct management effectiveness evaluations in countries where CBD target has not been met yet

Institutionalise evaluation systems
- Tailor made evaluation systems are better accepted and more meaningful
- Mandatory repetitions → able to track changes

Evaluate, whether and to what extent conservation and other objectives had been achieved
- Need of clear and measurable objectives, also for political discussion („value for money“)

Make it cost-effective
- Priority setting necessary (e.g.. Only large PAs, high value PAs, highly threatened PAs, etc.)
- Explore synergies of different reporting requirements
  - Natura 2000, Europadiplom, European Charter for Sustainable Tourism, etc.
Recommendations towards best practise (2)

Make it transparent: biodiversity is a global good
- Disclosure of (non-critical) evaluation data to the ultimate provider of funds: the public (Århus Convention)
- Streamlining of data (translatability and comparability)
- Active accompanying communication

Make it valid: remove major bias
- Triangulation, stakeholder dialogue, external experts.

Integrate results into the management cycle:
- Implement results

More instruction needed for
- Transboundary PAs
- Evaluation of national PA systems
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