PROARCA/CAPAS Scorecard Evaluation

1.1 Organisation

PROARCA/CAPAS(Central American Regional Environmental Project / Central America Protected Area System), TNC/IRG

1.2 Primary references

Courrau J (1999) 'Strategy for monitoring the management of protected areas in Central America.' Programa Ambiental Regional para Centroamérica (PROARCA), Central American Protected Areas System (CAPAS), Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD), United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Corrales, Lenin. (2004a) Midiendo el éxito de las acciones en las áreas protegidas de Centroamérica: Medición de la Efectividad de Manejo. PROARCA/APM, Guatemala de la Asunción, Guatemala.

1.3 Brief description of methodology

According to its guidelines, the methodology should be simple, cheap, generate data in a short time, be applicable over the wide range of protected area types in the region and promote management excellence in protected areas (Izurieta, 1997) .

The methodology contains the following components:

1. a desired scenario for the protected area;
2. the agreed scope of the analysis;
3. the factors that should be addressed in the analysis;
4. criteria for each factor to be addressed; and
5. indicators for each criterion.

The achievement of the optimum scenario involves five stages of work, each of one year's duration .

The manual of the system refers to the site (protected area) level but the method allows the association of the various protected areas in the region or in the country to give the results an interpretation in a more general context (Corrales, 2004a).

1.4 Purposes

- ✓ **to improve management (adaptive management)**

1.5 Objectives and application

The system is designed to measure and help improve the quality of management, by comparing the results from the first monitoring session, which provides the baseline data, with the optimum scenario. Every six months thereafter, the results are compared against the scenario and the previous measurements in order to assess progress. Comparisons should be made of the same protected area over time; comparisons between and among protected areas are not considered appropriate; however, as the factors that influence their management differ so widely (Izurieta, 2000a)

This methodology has been introduced, adapted and made official in all the countries in Central America. The national protected area offices prepare annual reports on the state of the

areas based substantially on the results generated in monitoring sessions at site level. An overall report for Central America has also been produced.

1.6 Origins

This strategy was developed during a workshop organized and carried out in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, by PROARCA/CAPAS (Programa Ambiental Regional para Centroamérica/ Central American Protected Area System), in coordination with the Executive Secretariat of the Central American Council of Protected Areas and Forests (CCAB-AP). The 'scorecard' model used by the TNC Site Consolidation Scorecard contributed to the development of the methodology. The principal objective of the workshop was to develop the components of a monitoring strategy for Central American protected areas. This tool should fulfil some basic requirements that were agreed upon at the beginning of the event. These requirements included: simplicity, low cost, short time necessary for generating data and that excellent management of protected areas would be promoted. Once it was validated in the field, it was adopted at the regional level as a monitoring strategy for Central American protected areas.

The development of a regional methodology to monitor the protected area management in Central America started with the Tegucigalpa workshop and, based on this regional methodology, Costa Rica (1999), Honduras (2000), Guatemala (2001) Nicaragua (2001), Panama (2002) and El Salvador (2003) developed national versions of the methodology.

1.7 How the methodology is implemented

The method is implemented through people scoring at a workshop.

At first, it was intended to apply the same indicators to all pilot protected areas but experience has shown that there is a need to modify and/or include new indicators, according to the institutional and political realities and the management regimes which are unique in each case.

The procedure requires initial training of the protected area managers and technical personnel in charge of protected area in the state level. The training sessions allow the evaluators to review each indicator to be monitored and to make sure that they were relevant to their protected area.

There are minimum requirements for the evaluation: 1) the protected area must have a Management Plan published and approved, with goals, objectives and activities. Protected areas which don't have a management plan yet must, at least, have their goals and objectives established; and 2) there must be a base line to start with the data collection to evaluate protected area management; it is recommended that the area is in operation for at least two years and count with basic equipment for its administration (Corrales, 2004a).

The manual includes definitions and justifications for each indicator and also describes the background information required to arrive at a score. Although the question often appears simple, the participants are asked to provide a lot of information to decide on the current scoring level – the methodology is 'evidence-based' where possible.

Source: Leverington *et al.,* 2008. 'Management Effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – a global study. Supplementary Report No1: Overview of approaches and methodologies.' The University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, AUSTRALIA.

1.8 Elements and indicators

The methodology considers three levels of hierarchy:

At the highest level, it defines 5 different aspects or *ambitos*: social, administrative, resources (natural and cultural), policy/legal, and economic/financial. Each aspect is divided into a set of criteria. Each criterion is divided into a set of indicators

The initial proposal of the methodology considered 32 indicators but now they vary according to the national versions. The indicators are the most fundamental part of the evaluation and represent units of information which are measured through time to report changes in specific attributes (Corrales, 2004a).

PROARCA/CAPAS has identified some additional outcome indicators which should eventually be incorporated in the system, such as: changes in the population of the protected area key species; the presence of rare species; the behaviour, distribution and abundance of species; indicators of the integrity of ecosystems; changes in surface water; impact of global climatic changes; changes in air quality; changes in plant coverage; changes in human activities (Izurieta, 2000a).

Indicators for the PROARCA/CAPAS methodology

Ambito/ field	criteria	Indicator
social	communication	Evaluation of communication plan and its execution
	participation	Participation of Interest Groups
	information	Pa tenure demarcation and information? .
	education planning	Plan of environmental education - planning, implementation and evaluation
administration	equipment and infrastructure	Suitable equipment for management
		Maintenance of Equipment - preparation and implementation of a maintenance plan
		Management Infrastructure
		Infrastructure maintenance
		Visitor infrastructure and signage
	personnel	Adequate staff for management
		Personnel trained and capable for management according to capacity plan
		Staff satisfaction with living and working conditions
		Program of volunteers - implementation and evaluation
	planning	Plan of effective management and implementation
		Operation plan being implemented
		Internal management zoning
		Analysis of threats
natural and cultural resources	impact	Impacts of park uses on on the natural resources
	protection	Plan of Control and Protection (Monitoring) of the protected area
		Impact of the Plan of Control and Protection (Monitoring) of the protected area
		Limits of the protected area declared and demarcated
	knowledge	Research plan - existence, implementation and periodic implementation
		Systematization of the information
		Connectivity of the area evaluated and documented
		Indicator species Identified and studied
politico-legal	legal framework	Application of the law
		Decentralization of Administration of the protected area
financial	self-sufficiency	Plan for long term financing of the protected area
		Base funding
	goods and services	Goods and services produced by the protected area are identified and valued

Source: Leverington *et al.,* 2008. 'Management Effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – a global study. Supplementary Report No1: Overview of approaches and methodologies.' The University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, AUSTRALIA.

		Stakeholders are aware of goods and services
		Groups of interest receive benefits

1.9 Scoring and analysis

A method has been developed to allow the systematization of the results in a database, in the three different levels of hierarchy: indicator, criteria and field and any of those can have their results assessed in the scales of protected area, protected area category, or system of protected area.

Each indicator is scored on a 1 to 5 scale, where
0= 0% of the optimum condition (no progress towards effective management)
1=25%
2=50%
3=75%
5 = 100% or the optimum condition.

The steps of the PROARCA/CAPAS methodology are described in the system's manual (Corrales, 2004a), as follows:

a) obtain the value for each indicator (1 to 5);
b) obtain the value of each indicator based in a proposed scale of accomplishment (0 to 100%); and
c) establish the relative weight UCG (Units of Management Quality) of each criteria component of each field. The relative importance of each criterion is obtained from a subjective judgment. Within the criteria there are indicators, which will be valued according to their relative importance so each one of the indicators has their own UCG (for further details, see the system's manual).
d) Changes in the quality of management can be measured using the UCG obtained in two different evaluations. It is normally done in terms of percentage of change in the UCG, representing improvement or decrease in management quality, depending if the variation is negative or positive.

The overall evaluation is then rated as follows:

Gestión de Manejo *(Management evaluation)*	UCG *(Units of Quality of Management)*	
No Aceptable *(Not acceptable)*	0	200
Poco Aceptable *(Barely acceptable)*	201	400
Regular *(Regular)*	401	600
Aceptable *(Acceptable)*	601	800
Satisfactorio *(Satisfactory)*	801	1000

1.10 Further reading and reports

(COURRAU, 1997; Courrau, 1999; Izurieta, 2000a; Corrales, 2004b)