

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Comparative analysis of four international
methodologies used to evaluate protected area
management effectiveness

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Environmental Management at Massey University,
New Zealand

Dorianne Sofía Anzueto-Pellecer

15006013

2016

Abstract

Around the world, protected areas have been created with the objective of conserving natural and cultural heritage. To monitor how effectively this objective is being achieved, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) proposed that periodical evaluations of the management of protected areas should be conducted. These evaluations have the objective of monitoring improvements or deteriorations of the management of the PAs and their conservation outputs and outcomes. They can be carried out using different methodologies, widely referred to as protected area management effectiveness evaluations (PAMEs). In 2000, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) established a framework to guide the creation of PAME methodologies. Based on this framework several methodologies have been developed around the world. However, they all focus on evaluating different aspects of management, producing different types of results. Previous studies describing these methodologies have been conducted, but an in depth comparative analysis has not yet been published.

This thesis seeks to conduct a comprehensive analysis to compare the fundamental characteristics of four of the most commonly used PAME methodologies: the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), the Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM), the Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit (EoH), and the Site Consolidation Scorecard (SCS). Content analysis was used to compare and contrast these four PAME methodologies. Categories based on the IUCN's framework for the creation of PAMEs were used to organise and compare the indicators used by each

methodology. The quantities and characteristics of the indicators were assessed to identify their viability, similarities and differences. The aim was to build upon the current literature to inform potential users about the different approaches these methodologies take, and to help them make an informed decision about which one to use.

It was found that the four methodologies evaluate different themes, elements and criteria thereby generating different types of information regarding protected area management. They also use different levels of detail in their indicators and need different sources of information to be completed. It was also found that all four methodologies are weak in assessing the delivery of protected area objectives, they predominately use ordinal approaches to assess indicators, and lack comprehensive weighted scoring systems. It is argued that these shared shortcomings provide scope for potential improvements in future versions of these methodologies or new PAMEs. These results add new information to existing knowledge about the similarities and differences between methodologies and their individual strengths and weaknesses. It is argued that developing a better understanding of the unique characteristics of individual PAMEs may contribute to a better realisation of their full potential.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Karen Hytten for her inputs, patience, understanding, dedication and time. Without her this could have never been possible. Thanks for being such a lovely person and an amazing guide through this process! I really appreciate all the hard work you put in this project.

Thanks to Massey University and its professors who thought me lessons for life. Thanks to my family and friends for their support during this process.

At last but not least, I would like to thank the Government of New Zealand and the lovely people in this country for giving me the opportunity of studying my Master degree in such beautiful and interesting place. I will always remember my time in New Zealand as an amazing adventure.



Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xiv
List of acronyms	xvi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem statement.....	2
1.3 Aim of the research	2
1.4 Objectives.....	3
1.5 Contribution to knowledge.....	3
1.6 Thesis outline	4
Chapter 2: Concepts and background of the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Evaluations	6
2.1 Protected Area Management Effectiveness Evaluations	6
2.1.1 Typology of approaches to evaluate the effectiveness of protected areas	7
2.2 The emergence of protected area management effectiveness evaluations.....	9
2.3 Conceptualising management effectiveness evaluations.....	12
2.3.1 Basic concepts	12
2.3.2 Definition of protected area management effectiveness evaluations.....	13
2.3.3 IUCN’s framework for the creation of protected area management effectiveness evaluations	16
2.4 Reasons to evaluate the effective management of protected areas.....	25
2.4.1 Requirement of PAMEs in the Convention of Biological Diversity	25
2.4.2 Variety of protected areas and management objectives.....	29

2.4.3 Expansion of the global system of protected areas	33
2.4.4 Challenges facing protected areas	36

Chapter 3: Perspectives from the literature on protected area management

effectiveness evaluations..... 41

3.1 Global results of the protected area management effectiveness evaluations	41
3.1.1 First global study on protected area management effectiveness.....	41
3.1.2 Global trends on protected area management effectiveness evaluations	44
3.2 International methodologies for protected area management effectiveness evaluation (PAME)	49
3.2.1 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)	50
3.2.2 Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM)	51
3.2.3 Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit (EoH)	51
3.2.4 Site Consolidation Scorecard (SCS)	52
3.3 Benefits of protected area management effectiveness evaluations	53
3.4 Challenges for protected area management effectiveness evaluations	57
3.4.1 Use of inappropriate methodologies, criteria or indicators	57
3.4.2 Balance between qualitative and quantitative indicators	58
3.4.3 Indicators with limited scoring systems	59
3.4.4 Lack of weighted scoring systems	59
3.4.5 Limitations on the implementation processes	60
3.4.6 Reliability of the data	60
3.4.7 Inconsistency in interpretation of the methodologies.....	62
3.4.8 Lack of use of the results.....	62
3.4.9 Difficulty in comparing results among methodologies.....	63

Chapter 4: Research design 65

4.1 Problem statement.....	65
4.1.1 Aim of the research	66
4.1.2 Objectives	67
4.2 Research method	67
4.3 Data collection.....	68

4.3.1	Selection of methodologies	68
4.3.2	Sources of data	69
4.4	Data analysis	70
4.4.1	Definition of category system	70
4.4.2	Development of analytical matrix.....	72
4.4.3	Comparisons, evaluation of ratings and general analysis	76
4.4.4	Limitations	79
Chapter 5: Results		81
5.1	Theme 1: Design and planning.....	81
5.2	Theme 2: Adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes.....	88
5.3	Theme 3: Delivery of protected area objectives.....	97
5.4	Summary of results	103
5.4.1	General comparisons of level of detail among methodologies.....	107
5.4.2	General comparison of sources of information among methodologies	108
5.4.3	Comparison of types of approaches used to assess the indicators.....	109
Chapter 6: Discussion		110
6.1	Similarities among methodologies.....	110
6.1.1	Criteria evaluated by all four methodologies.....	110
6.1.2	Weak of evaluation of the third theme: “delivery of protected area objectives”	112
6.1.3	Use of ordinal approaches for the evaluation of the indicators.....	113
6.1.4	Lack of aggregated scoring systems.....	114
6.2	Differences between the methodologies	115
6.2.1	Evaluation of different themes, elements and criteria.....	115
6.2.2	Methodologies showed different levels of detail in their indicators .	117
6.2.3	Variation of sources of information among methodologies	118
6.3	Strengths and weaknesses.....	120
6.3.1	Strengths and weaknesses of METT	120
6.3.2	Strengths and weaknesses of RAPPAM	122
6.3.3	Strengths and weaknesses of EoH	124

6.3.4 Strengths and weaknesses of SCS	126
6.4 General recommendations for selecting PAME methodologies	128
Chapter 7: Conclusion	130
References.....	135
Appendices.....	153

List of Figures

Figure 1: Themes and elements of IUCN’s framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas.....	18
Figure 2: Description of elements included in the IUCN framework	19
Figure 3: List of themes, elements and criteria that protected area management effectiveness evaluations should include	21
Figure 4: Example of levels of hierarchy assessed by PAME methodologies	22
Figure 5: Levels of assessments and their respective elements of focus	23
Figure 6: Brief description of IUCN’s protected area categories and their objectives	31
Figure 7: Growth of number and size of PAs in the world from 1962 to 2014.....	33
Figure 8: Levels of percentages (represented with shades of green) of protected areas per country	34
Figure 9: Percentage of land covered by terrestrial and marine protected areas from 1990 to 2014 in reference to the Aichi Target No.11	35
Figure 10: Global progress towards the implementation of PAME assessments in 2015.	45
Figure 11: Global percentages of PAME assessments per IUCN’s protected area category	46
Figure 12: Application of PAME assessments from 1990 to 2014 according to implementing organisation.....	47
Figure 13: Methodologies of PAME assessments recorded by regions.....	48
Figure 14: Working scheme for this research.....	70

Figure 15: The number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the four criteria relating to the "Context" element	83
Figure 16: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the four criteria in the "Context" element	84
Figure 17: The sources of information required for assessing the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to evaluate the four criteria in the "Context" element ..	85
Figure 18: The number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the five criteria relating to the "Planning" element	86
Figure 19: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the five criteria in the "Planning" element	87
Figure 20: The sources of information required for assessing the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to evaluate the five criteria in the "Planning" element .	88
Figure 21: The numbers of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCSC to assess the four criteria included in the "Inputs" element.....	90
Figure 22: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the four criteria in the "Inputs" element.....	91
Figure 23: The number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the thirteen criteria relating to the "Processes" element	92
Figure 24: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the thirteen criteria in the "Processes" element	94
Figure 25: The sources of information required for assessing the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to evaluate the thirteen criteria in the "Processes" element.....	96

Figure 26: The number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the two criteria relating to the "Outputs" element	98
Figure 27: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the two criteria in the "Outputs" element	99
Figure 28: The sources of information required for assessing the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to evaluate the two criteria in the "Outputs" element	100
Figure 29: The number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the two criteria relating to the "Outcomes" element	101
Figure 30: The level of detail of the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the two criteria in the "Outcomes" element	102
Figure 31: The sources of information required for assessing the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to evaluate the two criteria in the "Outcomes" element	103
Figure 32: Percentages of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS to assess the six elements of the PAMEs suggested by IUCN's framework	105
Figure 33: Comparison of percentages of levels of detail in the indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS	107
Figure 34: Comparison of percentages of sources of information required to complete the methodologies compared.....	108
Figure 35: Comparison of percentages of approaches used by the indicators of METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS	109

List of Tables

Table 1: Approaches for the evaluation of the effectiveness of protected areas	8
Table 2: Example of part of the matrix for data analysis.....	73
Table 3: Descriptions of types of approaches used by the indicators in METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS.....	74
Table 4: Rating system for the types of sources of information required to complete the methodologies	75
Table 5: Rating system for the level of detail of the indicators.....	76
Table 6: Example of table for summarising results for “theme” categories	77
Table 7: Example of table for summarising comparisons of themes, elements, criteria, numbers of indicators, level of detail, areas of focus and sources of information	79
Table 8: Summary of the number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS in relation to the elements and criteria within the "design and planning" theme	82
Table 9: Summary of the number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS in relation to the elements and criteria within the "Adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes" theme	89
Table 10: Summary of the number of indicators used by METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS in relation to the elements and criteria within the "Delivery of protected area objectives" theme.....	97
Table 11: Summary of the numbers of indicators used in relation to themes, elements, criteria, level of detail and sources of information in METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS.	104

Table 12: Summary of the comparative analysis between METT, RAPPAM, EoH and SCS
..... 106

Table 13: Summary of principles for selecting or adapting PAME methodologies and
additional factors suggested by this research 129

Table 14: Summary of strengths and weaknesses of the four methodologies analysed. 133

List of acronyms

CAPAS	Central American Protected Areas System
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
EoH	Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit
GD-PAME	Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness Evaluations
GEF	Global Environmental Fund
IBA	Assessment of Important Bird Areas
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
METTT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OAS	Organisation of American States
PAs	Protected Areas
PAEL	Protected Areas Equity and Livelihoods
PAMEs	Protected Area Management Effectiveness Evaluations
PiP	Parks in Peril
PROARCA	Programa Ambiental Regional para Centroamérica / Regional Environmental Program for Central America
RAPPAM	Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management
SCS	Site Consolidation Scorecard
TILCEPA	Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WDPA	World Database of Protected Areas
WHS	World Heritage Sites
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

