

# Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

## Methodology Description

### WWF-World Bank MPA Score Card

#### 1.1 Organisation

WWF-World Bank

#### 1.2 Primary methodology reference

Staub F and Hatziolos, ME (2004a) 'Calificador para Evaluar el Progreso en Alcanzar las Metas de la Efectividad de Manejo de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas.' Banco Mundial.

Staub F and Hatziolos, ME (2004b) Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas. World Bank

#### 1.3 Brief description of methodology

This is a simple scorecard system designed for marine protected areas. It consists of a data sheet to gather general information about the protected area, and an assessment sheet with a total of 68 questions. It covers all elements of the IUCN-WCPA Framework.

This type of assessment requires little or no additional data collection and focuses on the context of the MPA along with the appropriateness of planning, inputs and processes of management. It relies largely on available data through literature searches and informed opinions of site managers and/or independent assessors, takes a short period of time and costs little. Issues are broadly covered, but depth of analysis is generally low (Staub and Hatziolos 2004b).

#### 1.4 Purposes

- ✓ To improve management (adaptive management)
- ✓ For accountability / audit

#### 1.5 Objectives and application

'The purpose of the Score Card is to help marine protected area managers and local stakeholders determine their progress along the management continuum. It is a short, straightforward self-assessment tool to help managers identify where they are succeeding and where they need to address gaps. Because it is intended to be completed by the MPA staff and other stakeholders, it can be a useful team building exercise (Staub and Hatziolos 2004b).

'The MPA Score Card has many uses as an orientation tool to help managers of new protected areas scope out issues to be addressed in establishing an effective MPA, or as a Tracking Tool to provide managers with a sense of "where they are" along the management continuum. It also serves as a user-friendly reporting tool on MPA status based on information largely already collected without any additional field level research' (Staub and Hatziolos 2004b).

#### 1.6 Origins

This is a marine adaptation of the World Bank/WWF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) and from other tools (Hockings *et al.* 2000; Staub and Hatziolos 2004b; Wells and Mangubhai 2004).

# Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

## Methodology Description

### 1.7 How the methodology is implemented

‘The Score Card should be completed by marine protected area staff and, ideally, local stakeholders to validate the scoring. It is designed to be completed within a relatively short period, such as during a staff meeting or other routine meeting, by referencing available reports or datasets’ (Staub and Hatzios 2004b).

### 1.8 Elements and indicators

The questionnaire consists of a data sheet and an assessment form with a total of 68 questions as follows. There is also space for comments and respondents are encouraged to add their comments.

The indicators are arranged according to the IUCN-WCPA elements).

#### Indicators in Marine Tracking tool scorecard methodology

Context	1	Legal status – Does the marine protected area have legal status?
	2	Marine protected area regulations – Are unsustainable human activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?
	3	Law enforcement – Can staff sufficiently enforce marine protected area rules?
	3a	There are additional sources of control (e.g., volunteers, national services, local communities)
	3b	Infractions are regularly prosecuted and fines levied
	4	Marine protected area boundary demarcation – Are the boundaries known and demarcated?
	5	Integration of the MPA in a larger coastal management plan – Is the MPA part of a larger coastal management plan?
	5a	a. The MPA is part of a network of MPAs which collectively sustain larger marine ecosystem functions
	5b	b. The MPA is part of a network of MPAs which collectively represent the range of bio-geographic variation in a marine eco-region
	6	Resource inventory – Is there enough information to manage the area?
	7	Stakeholder awareness and concern – Are stakeholders aware and concerned about marine resource conditions and threats?
Planning	8	Marine protected area objectives – Have objectives been agreed?
	9	Management plan – Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?
	9a	There is also a long term master plan (at least 5 years)
	9b	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan
	9c	Stakeholder participation includes representation from the various ethnic, religious and user groups as well as representation from both genders
	9d	The socioeconomic impacts of decisions are considered in the planning process
	9e	The local culture, including traditional practices, social systems, cultural features, historic sites and monuments, is considered in the planning process
	9f	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan
	9g	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning
	9h	Management plan is tied to the development and enforcement of regulations
Input	10	Research – Is there a program of management-oriented survey and research work?
	10a	a. Carrying capacity studies have been conducted to determine sustainable use levels
	11	Staff numbers – Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?
	11a	There is additional support from volunteer programs, local communities, etc

# Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

## Methodology Description

	12	Current budget – Is the current budget sufficient?
	12a	There is a secure budget for the marine protected area and its management needs on a multi-year basis.
	12b	The budget is not entirely dependent on government funding; instead, funding also comes from NGO contributions, taxes, fees, etc.
Process	13	Education and awareness program – Is there a planned education program?
	14	Communication between stakeholders and managers – Is there communication between stakeholders and managers?
	14a	There is some communication with other MPA managers (and for example exchanges of good practices)
	15	Stakeholder involvement and participation – Do stakeholders have meaningful input to management decisions?
	15a	There are clear financial contributions / agreements between MPA and tourism operators to recover MPA resources rents for local benefits
	16	Indigenous people – Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the MPA have input to management
	17	Staff training – Is there enough training for staff?
	18	Equipment – Is the site adequately equipped?
	19a	Monitoring and evaluation – Are biophysical, socioeconomic and governance indicators monitored and evaluated?
	19a	The MPA participates as a site in national or international environmental monitoring programs such CARICOMP, CPACC, GCRMN, AGGRA or similar. (Provide the name of the program(s))
	19b	There is an Emergency Response Capability in place to mitigate impacts from non threats
Output	20a	Legal status has improved (refers to question 1. Legal status)+2
	20b	Regulations have improved (refers to question 2. MPA Regulations)+2
	20c	Law enforcement has improved (refers to question 3.
	20d	Boundary demarcation has improved (refers to question 4.
	20e	The MPA has been integrated into ICM (refers to question 5. Integration of the MPA)+2
	20f	The resource inventory has improved (refers to question 6.
	20g	Stakeholder awareness and concern has improved(refers to question 7.)+2
	21a	Signs – signs are now available, or new one have been installed
	21b	Moorings – moorings are now available, or new one have been installed
	21c	Education materials – education materials are available, or new one have been developed
	22	Mechanisms for stakeholder participation in decision-making and/or management activities (e.g. advisory council) – are mechanisms available to ensure stakeholder participation?
	23	Environmental education activities for stakeholders (e.g. public outings at the MPA) – have education activities been developed for stakeholders?
	24	Management activities – have the two critical management activities (listed in the data sheet) been improved to address threats
	25	Visitor facilities – does the MPA have sufficient visitor facilities ?
	26	Fees – If fees (entry fees - tourism, fines) are applied, do they help marine protected area management?
	27	Staff Training
	Outcome	28
29		Threats – Have threats (listed in the data sheet page) been reduced?
30		Resource conditions– Have resource conditions improved?
Outcome - Community welfare – Has community welfare improved?	31	MPA management is compatible with the local culture, including traditional practices, relationships, social systems, cultural features, historic sites and monuments linked to marine resources and uses
	31a	Resource use conflicts have been reduced
	31b	Benefits from the MPA are equitably distributed

# Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

## Methodology Description

Outcome	31c	The non-monetary benefits of the marine resources to society have been maintained or enhanced
	31d	Environmental awareness – Has community environmental awareness improved?
	32	Compliance – Are users complying with MPA regulations?
	33	Stakeholder satisfaction – Are the stakeholders satisfied with the process and outputs of the MPA?
	34	Stakeholders feel that they are able to effectively participate in management decisions
	34a	Stakeholders feel that they are adequately represented in the MPA decision-making processes
	34b	Community welfare – Has community welfare improved?

### 1.9 Scoring and analysis

For most questions, there is a choice of four responses (rating 0 to 3), where zero is equivalent to no progress or very little/ poor situation and three is an ideal situation. Scores are added for each of the six elements of evaluation and a final total score can also be calculated. If some questions are not scored (e.g., not relevant), the maximum score should be changed to an adjusted score (maximum possible score minus points for question that are not applicable). The final score is calculated as a percentage of the score obtained divided by the adjusted maximum score.

# Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

## Methodology Description