

**PRELIMINARY SESSION REPORT\***  
**September 11, 2003 – 1400-1800 Room 4-2**  
**Workshop Stream V (Evaluating management Effectiveness) - Session 2c:**  
**“Economic, Social and Institutional (ESI) Indicators of Management Effectiveness”**

**A: Session Chairs and Rapporteurs:**

Ian Dutton and Jim Rieger (The Nature Conservancy)

**B: Contents**

10 presentations – contributions from global (World Bank) to regional multi-site programs (Parks in Peril) to national system (Cambodian PAs) to site (Norfolk and Suffolk Broads) and sectoral (oil industry – BP) levels.

One Hour Workshop Discussion on Issues and Needs

Subsequent breakfast meeting to review recommendations

**C: Observations**

1. Participation - well attended – with some 50 pax during presentations and 20 pax in workshop
2. Logistics – venue was a problem – noisy and not conducive to group discussion

**D: Emerging Issues**

During workshop, the following emerging issues were observed:

- (i) Problems of multiple reporting – there is a plethora of frameworks and reporting needs now in use (and often imposed by donors or regulatory agencies) that have little meaning in the day-to-day operations of PA/conservation agencies and which further diminish resources available for conservation activity – there is a need to reduce duplication and harmonize frameworks
- (ii) Oversimplification - the growing emphasis on simple, easy-to-use tools may be valuable for broader evaluation purposes but may not be helpful in context of specific sites and systems – we need to find ways to accommodate multiple levels of detail in ESI monitoring and evaluation
- (iii) Standards – in order to facilitate cross-program learning, improve efficiency of data collection and improve evaluation practice, more attention needs to be given to the question of standards – this could be done in a non-threatening manner by initially drawing together common ESI indicators and details of their range of variability in differing contexts

**E: Summary Recommendations**

The workshop proposed four principal recommendations relating to ESI indicators used in PAs:

- (a) ESI (economic, social and institutional) indicators are typically not as well developed and not as commonly utilized as biological and physical indicators in protected area management and need to be given more prominence in WCPA toolkits
- (b) ESI monitoring and evaluation in protected areas is inadequately linked with ESI monitoring and evaluation “beyond the borders” – i.e. there is a need to better link protected area indicators with broader land/seascape level indicators – closer linkage with State of Environment and other sustainability frameworks is needed
- (c) There is a lack of institutional capacity to properly utilize ESI indicators in protected area management and we need to engage more social science in both protected areas and land/seascape scale management
- (d) We urgently need to better integrate indicators and methods for measuring ESI aspects of effectiveness across programs (conservation and development) so as to better understand protected area impacts and to gain insights into broader (regional/global trends/changes)

\* Final report to be submitted after breakfast meeting on Saturday 13<sup>th</sup>