

## **Stream 5      FINAL WORKSHOP PLENARY   13/09/2003 2 PM**

**Marc Hockings** introduced the session and thanked all participants in the workshops for their attendance and tolerance of the difficult conditions in the breakout rooms.

**Geoff Vincent** also thanked the stream leaders and rapporteurs and summarised the outcomes of the workshop. The workshop stream included 13 workshops in 20 sessions and involved 1200 participants from a wide range of backgrounds and countries.

### **Panel discussion**

This was then followed by a panel discussion of the issues raised in the rapporteur's report. The panellists were

Mavuso Msimang, *CEO South African National Parks, South Africa*

Marija Zupanjić-Vicar, *Senior Advisor, WCPA*

Leonardo Lacerda, *WWF International*

Nik Lopoukhine, *Director-General, National Parks Directorate, Parks Canada*

Pedro Rosabel, *Protected Areas Program, IUCN*

**Mavuso Msimang** Need to acknowledge that all objects of value are subject to some level of monitoring and evaluation. For example, with the issue of public health we are willing to pay a high premium for monitoring etc. An abiding transgression of human-kind is that we take nature for granted – sins of commission and omission.

Protected areas –

recommendations from Caracas in relation to management effectiveness evaluation – pilot studies and case studies are in place. The next step is to update our understanding of what constitutes a threat to a protected area. Need to update our understanding of threats. E.g. in Southern Africa

- Alien plants
- Unsustainable harvesting

We must agree on how to address these. Some individuals and organisations pander too much to the dictates of powerful governments; these people should also be recognised as threats to protected areas.

Another threat to protected areas is people that think with their hearts rather than use good science to manage protected areas.

If we used appropriate evaluation tools, it would be easier to resist these pressures.

In South Africa, embarking on commercialisation program - still have to focus on core duties. When asked for the benchmarks of excellence, none are there – how then can we go forward? We have to agree that standards should be set – flexible approaches but not rigid methodologies. Can have appropriate criteria for local conditions.

We can use legislation, conventions, and provide financing allocation that is linked to M&E for support. Must share information and learn from each other's experiences, both positive and negative.

Communities as part of the equation of evaluating ME. Key performance indicators for staff and administrative units should include management effectiveness and incorporate incentives and bonuses.

**Marija Zupanjc-Vicar**

PA category certification – prepared by working group of WCPA Europe. Aim was to fill the gap as there is no verification of the category system and the WCPA approach has been reactive. WCPA Europe is often asked to provide experts to verify/ evaluate categories. We need to shift from reactive to proactive, and to help governments get the classification right in the first place. In addition, need

- Training for staff in charge in country;
- Improved and more specific guidelines;
- Trained experts; and
- Certification.

There are no problems with trialing certification if it is voluntary.

Scale can of application of certification can range from national, to entire protected area systems to site specific. This initiative should help to promote efficient use of the category system

**Leonardo Lacerda, *WWF International***

Past 100 years critical in increasing area of protected area coverage although there are still gaps in the system especially marine. Management effectiveness evaluation will be a key way of consolidating the protected area system.

We need to recognise the diversity of assessments; listen to what the current assessments are telling us and think about where we should put our efforts.

Over 30 methodologies have been developed which reflect the variety of needs; different scopes and scales from site to international portfolio-wide. Appreciation for development of the evaluation framework developed by Marc Hockings and his colleagues.

So, what are the current assessments telling us?

Evaluation is being implemented more – hope to see increase. The relatively few evaluations so far are already telling us about threats – different from pressures – these have sometimes very strong impacts as for example, invasive alien species. Sometimes minimal threats may indeed be imposing the greatest pressure. From 600 assessments, hunting and poaching, logging, and invasive species are the biggest threats– can we deal with these with common approaches?

Other threats are beyond the reach of managers –eg road-building, fragmentation and climate change.

Correlations with effectiveness – what are the returns of evaluation? There seems to be a strong correlation between effective management and budgets/funding, education and law enforcement. Community relations, funding, law enforcement and training

are the key inadequacies for evaluating management effectiveness and where we need to concentrate future effort.

Future efforts: international community is committed to reducing biodiversity loss by 2010 – need to translate this into sharper and clearer milestones, Assessments can play a key role to track this but need to institutionalise systems i.e need to develop evaluation culture and integrate into management.

WWF supports the WCPA and would like to promote and build the capacity for evaluating management effectiveness at all levels. Support the option of a global review.

### **Nik Lopoukhine Parks Canada**

Evaluation is a critical concept with ecological integrity as a cornerstone of the process. M and E framework is essential for moving away from quantitative decade into qualitative decade. Underpinning of good science (including traditional knowledge) is essential for better decisions. Sets us up to transmit to future generations a context for making decisions; a framework to help understand what has happened in the past. How do we manage this information and store this information for the future is a key issue for evaluating management effectiveness? For example, the half-life of data in Parks Canada is ten years – this is not acceptable as we should be stewards of information for the future and have an obligation to those that have paid for this information i.e. the taxpayer.

Goals and objectives are fundamental and we need to concentrate on defining, testing and displaying them. Maybe the solution is by modelling. How do we conceptualise or model our systems and their drivers? How do you measure the key points?

Emerging issues include the human dimension – we need to capture implications of their needs and perceptions. Parks are essentially created for people, managed by people and threatened by people.

Reporting – who is the client? Managers and the public (for support). Therefore we need an open and transparent system. This may sometimes be difficult as bureaucratic systems are often closed but this needs to change. Example was described of Banff National Park where as a result of evaluation, infrastructure was removed to allow wolves to move across a corridor. Now \$25 million extra has been allocated by the government to use for management and evaluation of ecological integrity.

Monitoring – measuring for perpetuity? Needs to be ongoing, regular part of responsibilities for maintenance of protected areas. Also data needs to be linked to fiscal decision-making.

### **Pedro Rosabal**

Thanks for workshop input. Ten years ago at Caracas, few people have recognised the importance of management effectiveness evaluation – now there is widespread recognition of the tool. This is great progress in ten years. The next ten years we need to build institutional memory and further incorporate management effectiveness evaluation in to the international conventions such as World Heritage so we can see how well we are managing what we have.

Importance of social and economic indicators, and in bringing in indigenous and local people. How can they participate? Co-assessment of how we are doing.

The importance of restoration as task for the future – eg after flood, fire, rains in Europe. Management effectiveness evaluation can help us to understand what to do.

What indicators can be applied – simple methodologies and indicators should not be lost – involve rangers etc. Should help them to participate actively in the process.

Important issue in the future – how we are going to report on what we are assessing? World Conservation Monitoring Centre database is working to enhance this – over 10 years might include management effectiveness evaluation.

Challenge for the future is how to expand this tool to the new large initiatives that are happening eg transboundary PAs – how effective these large initiatives are – really will have to demonstrate this is working. We need to continue to apply science. Need to invest science and research to protect sites.

Another future issue will be how to report on management effectiveness assessments. For example, within the global protected area database and how do we expand this to the wider community.

It is recognised that there are still gaps and we need to continue to apply science and convey to the international community that we need further science and research.

**Mark Hockings** then thanked to the panellists and invited comments from the floor

*Speaker from Pakistan* – commitment from all sectors – need to remember that there is a varying degree of rules of engagement given different social and political environments – how to encourage managers to include local communities and stakeholders

Who is ‘we’ that needs the information – managers or communities? *Leonardo* – agrees that we need to be careful about who ‘we’ is

*Glenys Jones* – suggested that at next WPC there is a series of awards at the congress for management effectiveness evaluation.

*Pedro* – IUCN is thinking about that – linked with ideas of verification and certification

*Next speaker* agrees. Clarify that the only way we can do this is to have reports about effectiveness. After 10 years, still talking about how this should be carried out. The use of the assessment and methodologies is not to the extent we would like to see. Should make it part of the duties of all countries to report to the CBD about the management of their protected areas.

*Bruce Jeffries from NZ.* – We are not emphasising enough the urgency of the current situation – we need management presence – getting the vehicles, staff, signs, compliance and enforcement out there – not seen in the management effectiveness evaluation report. *Geoff Vincent* – will be in more detailed report. *Nik L* – loss of

wildlife should be in report; also as output of evaluation. Communication of the results is essential. Ecological integrity system and funding came about from reports presenting negatives.

*Marella* from Greece – paper parks issue needs to be addressed through evaluation and verification/certification progress; should remove paper parks from area lists of protected areas so that in ten years the figure of PA s reflects effectively managed protected areas.

*Pedro* emphasises the urgency of the situation. He supports certification and verification. Really need to use evaluation to improve management and this is still often not the case. If assessment does not improve management, there is no value.

Did study and found that the ‘paper parks’ are often very useful because they stop development, then can transform into real parks as everything else is degraded – more useful than people realise.

*Mavuso* – the challenge is not to identify them and then relegate them to nothing. Developed countries put many effort into protected areas but the lack of resources is what produces paper parks – biodiversity belongs to the world – should all help to maintain it. Should be addressing how we assist people to maintain protected areas in a healthy state especially those in countries with limited resources.

*Next speaker:* discussions from francophone Africa – they have had little opportunity to take part in discussions at the workshop. All workshops conducted in English.

The message that Parks are heritage given by generations – but setting has changed so much so we need to strengthen another idea – to find a new vision of protected areas. CBD is a benchmark but today is common agreement that biodiversity should also contribute to poverty alleviation – new vision of protected areas is needed. Assessing is assuming that one is starting in one position and moving to another. Have to have criteria about what is efficiency. But what do we do from the assessment – so we change. Issue of poverty – link between funding and protected areas. Poverty means there are much more pressing funding priorities than protected areas. Investments are based on priorities – are there corrective measures? Is the international community ready to support developing countries?

*Leonardo* – agree that we have to put in place minimum standards to see the progress being made as time passes to improve management. Equity is a major problem – one can see that African countries are spending more resources for conservation of their protected areas than developed countries. When we look at biodiversity in the tropics we see that climate change comes from the countries of the north – but who is paying the cost? This is a real problem to be discussed – especially for countries with greatest biodiversity.

*Speaker from Congo* – agrees with the panel that research is suffering. Those people who have this idea – do they have a concrete proposal about research? Research is an integral part of conservation and this needs to be conveyed continuously.

*Pedro* international donors trying to emphasise that research is a big priority – require to communicate that this is needed to see how well we are doing in protected areas.

*Nik* – research is a way to add value to evaluating management effectiveness systems.  
– if we can put in place the system that we have in mind, the content requires research/ science; there should always be a link between the objectives – must have research

*Ecuador*- How do we effectively manage protected area certification?

*Leonardo* – certification may be very useful but always implies cost. Although if it functions well there can be direct financial benefit from certification. The process should not be obligatory.

*Mexico* need to always include human resources in management effectiveness evaluations. All people are involved in protected areas. We need to empower people especially where governments are weak.

*Central Africa* – Research is important but we really need to focus on using results and implement to improve management.