

**9 Am Session Saturday 13 September
Room 3c**

Using evaluation results

Co-ordinators: Caroline Stem, Fiona Leverington, Jose Courrau

Chair: Caroline Stem, Foundations of Success

Audience attendance

30 - 50

Objective of session: To strengthen the conservation of protected areas by identifying lessons and recommending strategies for ensuring that evaluation results are used for protected area management, policy, planning, and general decision-making.

This session investigated the application of results from management effectiveness evaluation at the park/local level, as well as at national scales. It examined four main uses of evaluation and the synergies among these uses.

Speaker Summary

José Courrau, Consultant, Costa Rica

Overview of the use of evaluation results – moving from knowledge to action

More efforts put into the development and implementation of management effectiveness evaluation - more emphasis on the application of results. How does the manager in the field make use of the data?

A decision-making process was presented and a brief summary of the use of evaluation for four main purposes:

- a. Transparency and accountability
- b. Resource allocation
- c. Public support
- d. Adaptive management

Other possibilities for using management effectiveness evaluation: at the system level – reinvention of the PA systems; prioritisation of PAs; redesign of system; Segregation of PAs.

Rodolfo Denorio, Director of Braulio Carillo National Park, Costa Rica

Use of evaluation results for transparency and accountability

To be checked by Jose

In Costa Rica there has been a long development of evaluation processes – processes built on trust between community and agency. There are four elements in the system – regulating system for environment, legal framework, information must be available to all interested parties, and the institutional framework. System has become part of the culture with annual evaluation of implementation process (since 1997?).

National park Braulio Carillo – established 1978 – has extremely high biodiversity. Monitoring systems are matched to capacity. University partnership – indicators set rigorously. Partnerships with indigenous people, consultants and staff have been established. Proactive participation is vital.

There must be a balance in funding allocation between management and evaluation. Positive experiences so far are: effective systems and methods for management; participation of communities; quality interventions and participation

Need actions: info must be available and accessible – need to have a community which understands – social evaluation.

Moses Mapesa, Uganda Wildlife Authority

Using evaluation for resource allocation

In Ugandan National Parks, at the end of every year, the Authority staff review the strategic plan; look into resources and think about reallocation. At park level, the annual plan is reviewed quarterly. Resources might be reallocated or further resources sought.

Bwindi as example – since 2001 there has been a partnership with the EOH project – a comprehensive evaluation process working with stakeholders, external researchers etc.

Apart from other benefits of evaluation, allocation and effective use of three categories of resources have changed as a result of evaluation:

- *staff* (resulted in increase in lower level and decrease in senior staff numbers; focussed retraining of staff; redeployment; enhanced staff motivation; more funds and time for staff training)
- *patrols* (more focussed patrols aimed at specific threats using data; improved intelligence system – budgeted – savings on fuel, travel costs through better planning.) Patrols now report on their GIS coordinates and reporting has increased both in effectiveness and efficiency;
- *equipment and facilities* – justification for extra vehicles through evaluation; planning and fund-raising for visitor centre.

Other benefits are

- Implementation of activities – eg inventory and monitoring of NTFP – monitoring impacts; pooling of resources from donors – avoiding duplication and obtaining a better impact.
- More visitors to gorillas have been permitted while the impacts of this are carefully monitored
- More land has been surrendered by communities (with fair compensation) for gorilla conservation – as the tourism benefits understood.

Use of the evaluation results have been understood by both the community and the staff as well as donors. Staff have better confidence in the resource allocation. Excellence in staff performance is rewarded.

Rosa Lemos de sa WWF Brazil

Evaluation for public advocacy - Brazil

Designed campaign ‘protect our parks’, Partnership with p.a. management agency to evaluate park system. Seminar to design evaluation system – with park managers. Measured 86 sites – standard of protection, vulnerability. Results showed very low protection. A risk matrix was developed – vulnerability vs implementation –rating risk from normal to extreme.

High level of press coverage and other advocacy – resulted in bill being passed – a major positive result from the evaluation.

Issues to be aware of included partnership problems – lack of formal agreement between WWF and govt. Difficulties in communication, problems with media, lack of perception of benefits of evaluation, govt is threatened.

Alfereti Tawake, WWF and FL MMA, Fiji

Use of evaluation results for adaptive management case study – Veratavou, Fiji

The presentation discussed a locally managed marine area with active participation of community and stakeholders in evaluation and adaptive management – has restrictions on take in area or by species. Adaptive management cycle has been and is still being used.

The area is under customary tenure: people have tabu areas – temporary a part of mourning for chiefs. Communities themselves requested areas – first response was interest /awareness-raising. Interest was in their livelihood.

Group identified threats and interventions eg banned outside commercial fishing, banned mangrove and coral extractions, revived some no-take area for some species.

Communities helped to monitor their own management plan, eg biological and socio-economic surveys – collecting, analysing, presenting, socialising results. Monitoring showed great improvement in clam stocks – both in no-take areas and in harvest area. Approach also adapted by other villages. Results compared permanent and rotational closures, and found permanent more effective. Fish stocks tripled after banning of commercial fishing for 5 years, now allowing one commercial licence again and monitoring the impacts.

The monitoring was conducted by the community but was scientifically sound due to partnership with university, so good objective information. Using results to make decisions.

Increasing scale reflects awareness of the benefits, - now 70LMMA – covering 11% of Fiji inshore area- scaling up to national level

Challenges – require training investment, must keep objectivity;

Recommendations from Management Effectiveness Stream

“Using Evaluation for Better Management” Session

5.1 Considerations:

These recommendations are provided recognizing that their application will be context specific and also that the use of evaluation results should respect intellectual property rights of relevant stakeholders.

5.2 Prioritized recommendations from the session:

- A) Make monitoring and evaluation systems relevant and understandable to the key audiences involved in protected area management.
- B) Integrate evaluation into the management cycle so it becomes a regular part of protected area management and receives appropriate resources.
- C) Involve relevant stakeholders in all steps of the management effectiveness process; provide ongoing training and capacity building for stakeholders where needed. This collaboration should involve two-way communication.

All of these recommendations are relevant for the CBD/COP 7, IUCN, and WPC. The only thing that would change are the actors and the scale. These recommendations are offered with the specification that their application will need to consider cultural and other contextual aspects.