Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3, GI

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systen
SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected

Note: Please complete the management effectiveness tracking tool for **EACH** protected area that is the target of the GEF intervention.

Important: Please read the Guidelines posted on the GEF website before entering your data

Data Sheet 1: Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites	Please indicate your answer here
Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	DFR / MEFR Directorate of Forest Resources / Ministry of Environment and Forest Resources
Date assessment carried out	June, 07, 2018
Name of protected area	Fazao-Malfakassa National Park
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.protectedplanet.net)	2 340
Designations(please choose 1-3)	2
Country	Togo
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)	Central and Kara Regions; N 8°20' - 9°30'; E 0°35' - 1°02'
Date of establishment	JUNE, 19, 1951
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	1
Management Authority	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MERF), General Secretary of MEFR
Size of protected area (ha)	192 000
Number of Permanent staff	2
Number of Temporary staff	62
costs	30 000
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds – excluding staff salary costs	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Protect the relict forests of the protected area for spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and tourism purposes
List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:	
Management objective 1	Protection of biological diversity
Management objective 2	Development of Ecotourism
No. of people involved in completing assessment	5
Including: (please choose 1-8)	8

Information on International Designations	Please indicate your answer here
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	n/a
Date Listed	n/a
Site name	n/a
Site area	n/a
Geographical co-ordinates	n/a
	n/a
Criteria for designation	n/a
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value	n/a
Ramsar site (see: http://ramsar.wetlands.org/)	
Date Listed	
Site name	
Site area	
Geographical number	
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)	
	n/a
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	n/a
Date Listed	n/a
Site name	n/a
Site area	n/a
Geographical co-ordinates	n/a
Criteria for designation	n/a
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB	n/a
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	n/a

	n/a
	n/a

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats	
Please choose all relevant existing threats as either of high, medium or low significance. Threats ranked as of high significance are those which are seriously degrading values; medium are those threats having some negative impact and those characterised as low are threats which are present but not seriously impacting values or N/A where the threat is not present or not applicable in the protected area.	
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area	
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint	
1.1 Housing and settlement	-
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	-
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	-
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area	
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture	
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation	1
2.1a Drug cultivation	-
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	-
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	1
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	-
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area	
Threats from production of non-biological resources	
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	-
3.2 Mining and quarrying	2
3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	-
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area	
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality	
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	-
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	-
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	-
4.4 Flight paths	-
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area	

Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)	
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	2
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	1
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting	1
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	1
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area	
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources	
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	-
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	-
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	-
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	-
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	-
7. Natural system modifications	
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions	
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	1
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	-
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	1
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	-
7.3c Other ‘edge effects’ on park values	-
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	1
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes	
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase	
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)	1
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1

8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)	-
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	-
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area	
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources	
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	-
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)	1
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	1
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	1
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	-
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	-
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-
10. Geological events	
Geological events may be part of natural disturbance regimes in many ecosystems. But they can be a threat if a species or habitat is damaged and has lost its resilience and is vulnerable to disturbance. Management capacity to respond to some of these changes may be limited.	
10.1 Volcanoes	-
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	-
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	-
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	1
11. Climate change and severe weather	
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation	
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1
11.2 Droughts	1
11.3 Temperature extremes	1
11.4 Storms and flooding	-
12. Specific cultural and social threats	

12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	-
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	-
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-

Assessment Form	
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	3
Comments and Next Steps	Following the "requalification" process, a new decree indicating the new boundaries and conservation objectives has been drafted and submitted to the Secretary General of the Government in April 2018 and is currently under review.
2. Protected area regulations: Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	3
Comments and Next Steps	Existence of memorandum of understanding for the co-management of the park signed between MEFR and neighboring communities
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	2
Comments and Next Steps	There is some enforcement capacity as officers are sworn, but further training is required for PA staff. PRAPT trained PA managers, provided surveillance equipment and GPS, and is restoring quoi???
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	2
Comments and Next Steps	The park is managed as a national park and following its management plan; MoUs with local communities that complement and are consistent with the management plan are under development.

5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	3
Comments and Next Steps	The park is large enough to ensure the survival of the animals in the park and the communities needs for farming activities
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	3
Comments and Next Steps	Boundaries are known and recognized due to the consensus-based delimitation process but some people dispute them in specific areas. The on-going delimitation process, also consensus-based should alleviate such disputes and allow to finalize the delineation and demarcation of the PA
7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	2
Comments and Next Steps	
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	1
Comments and Next Steps	The development of the management plan was completed in 2017 and implementation has started.
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	1
Comments and Next Steps	The management plan is developed for 5 years, to be revised periodically.
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	1
Comments and Next Steps	The management plan includes indications to integrate new information as provided by monitoring, research and evaluations and the trainings were conducted for this purpose by PRAPT
8. Regular work plan: Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented	1
Comments and Next Steps	A work plan is drawn up by the park manager and integrated into the overall work plan of the Central Regional Directorate for the Environment
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	2
Comments and Next Steps	A wildlife inventory was carried out in 2013 throughout the PA. University research is conducted in the park on themes related to biodiversity

10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area?	2
Comments and Next Steps	62 ecoguards oversee the park with limited resources. But the current involvement of the communities in the management of the park limits pressures on the park resources.
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	2
Comments and Next Steps	
12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	1
Comments and Next Steps	Early fires are set in November-December to renew the young shoots of grass for pasture and maintain the savannah
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	3
Comments and Next Steps	62 ecoguards and 02 forest engineers is enough to monitor 192000ha
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	2
Comments and Next Steps	Staff was trained in conflict management, participatory monitoring and anti-poaching, but more training is required to implement ecological monitoring in the park
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	2
Comments and Next Steps	30000 $ US available to cover ecoguards salaries and operating costs supported by the MEFR for the maintenance of park equipment and logistics as well as fuel for the surveillance of the park

16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	2
Comments and Next Steps	
17. Management of budget: Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	2
Comments and Next Steps	The budget is managed by the Regional Director primarily for the purposes of the PA but consideration should be given to self-financing the park and recruiting a fund manager
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	2
Comments and Next Steps	Existence of anti-poaching equipment
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	2
Comments and Next Steps	
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	2
Comments and Next Steps	No specific program; but some awareness activities are conducted by local NGOs - the project develops and implement an Information-Education-Communication plan on protected areas and biodiversity
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	2
Comments and Next Steps	There is no territorial planning of land and water resources use. The PRAPT developed a management plan in order to cover the PA and its surrounding area.
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pollution levels etc) to sustain relevant habitats	-
Comments and Next Steps	
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites and the sea, or to allow animal migration).	-
Comments and Next Steps	Existence of elephant migration corridors but they are not arranged or managed
21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species, fire management to maintain savannah habitats etc.)"	1
Comments and Next Steps	Management of early fires
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	-

Comments and Next Steps	
23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	2
Comments and Next Steps	Discussion with the AVGAP, traditional leaders and local officials. The AVGAPs participate in the discussions related to the consensus-based delimitation of PAs and the elaboration of management plan of PAs.
24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	2
Comments and Next Steps	PRAPT support the negotiations between the PA managers and local communities through AVGAP leading to the development of co-management agreements
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	1
Comments and Next Steps	AVGAP already contribute to the monitoring, spontaneously.
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	1
Comments and Next Steps	A program to support IGAs for local communities is implemented
24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	1
Comments and Next Steps	The AVGAP and communities organized into self defense groups (to apply traditional sanctions) already contribute to the monitoring, spontaneously.
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	1
Comments and Next Steps	Access to the PA for watering livestock - support for IGAs
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	1
Comments and Next Steps	The METT was applied in 2008, 2010 and 2014. The METT should be conducted regularly.
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	-
Comments and Next Steps	Tourists trails are not maintained and the hotel is in ruins.
28. Commercial tourism operators: Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	1
Comments and Next Steps	

29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	1
Comments and Next Steps	In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding signed with the Minister of the Environment and Forest Resources, a benefit sharing guide from the management of the park is defined in a consensual way to support the riparian communities
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	1
Comments and Next Steps	Some species were permanent in the past, but they have become rare. Destruction of gallery forests for agricultural expansion.
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1
Comments and Next Steps	The PRAPT is setting up a system of ecological monitoring for the PA.
30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1
Comments and Next Steps	
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1
Comments and Next Steps	Routine patrols.
TOTAL SCORE	**62**

EF-4, and GEF-5

ns
I Areas

Notes
Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
See also:
1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (please complete lines 35-69 as necessary)
1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
At the baseline it was 27.
1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agency staff 4: Donors 5: NGOs 6: External experts 7: Local community 8: Other

(i.e. criteria i to x)

Name
Detail

Name

Detail
Name
Detail

0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	

0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	

0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	

0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High	
0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is in the process of being gazetted/covenanted but the process is still incomplete (includes sites designated under international conventions, such as Ramsar, or local/traditional law such as community conserved areas, which do not yet have national legal status or covenant) 3: The protected area has been formally gazetted/covenanted	
0: There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some weaknesses or gaps 3: Regulations for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and provide an excellent basis for management	
0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget, lack of institutional support) 2: The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain 3: The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	
0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these objectives 3: The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	

0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being taken (e.g. agreements with adjacent land owners for wildlife corridors or introduction of appropriate catchment management) 2: Protected area design is not significantly constraining achievement of objectives, but could be improved (e.g. with respect to larger scale ecological processes) 3: Protected area design helps achievement of objectives; it is appropriate for species and habitat conservation; and maintains ecological processes such as surface and groundwater flows at a catchment scale, natural disturbance patterns etc	
0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users 1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users 2: The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users but is not appropriately demarcated 3: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents/neighbouring land users and is appropriately demarcated	
0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented 2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems 3: A management plan exists and is being implemented	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No regular work plan exists 1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented	
0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making 2: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making 3: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support all areas of planning and decision making	

0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use 2: Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use 3: Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use	
0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 3:There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	
0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being implemented but some key issues are not being addressed 3: Requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and, cultural values are being substantially or fully implemented	
0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area	
0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management 3: Staff training and skills are aligned with the management needs of the protected area	
0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management 3: The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	

0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding 1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a reasonably secure core budget for regular operation of the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding 3: There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs	
0: Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget management is excellent and meets management needs	
0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management 3: There are adequate equipment and facilities	
0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained	
0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme 2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully implemented education and awareness programme	
0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term needs of the protected area, but activities are not detrimental the area 2: Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account the long term needs of the protected area 3: Adjacent land and water use planning fully takes into account the long term needs of the protected area	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, but only some co-operation 3: There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users, and substantial co-operation on management	

0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved 3: Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	
0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to management but their involvement could be improved 3: Local communities directly participate in all relevant decisions relating to management, e.g. co-management	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area	
0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results do not feed back into management 3: A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	
0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved 3: Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	
0: There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values 3: There is good co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, and maintain protected area values	

0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs 3: Fees are collected and make a substantial contribution to the protected area and its environs	
0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted 3: Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	
0: No 1: Yes	