

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

Manual para la evaluación de la Eficiencia de Manejo del Parque Nacional Galápagos – SPNG

1.1 Organisation

Servicio Parque Nacional Galápagos – SPNG (Galapagos National Park Service)

1.2 Primary methodology reference

Velásquez M, Guerrero, P and Villegas, T (2004) 'Parque Nacional Galápagos. Evaluación de la Efectividad del Manejo (1996-2004).' Ministerio del Ambiente, Parque Nacional Galápagos.

Cayot,L and Cruz,F (1998). Manual para la evaluación de la Eficiencia de Manejo del Parque Nacional Galápagos. Servicio Parque Nacional Galápagos. Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Áreas Naturales y Vida Silvestre. Puerto Ayora, Islas Galápagos.

1.3 Brief description of methodology

The methodology used in the Galapagos in 2004 uses a matrix developed from the WWFCATIE methodology for the first evaluation of the Galapagos (Cayot and Cruz 1998), which was adapted to include variables, sub-variables and indicators of ecological, social and economical integrity, in order to follow the IUCN-WCPA Framework. New indicators were included and others were adapted from other places they have been applied, such as those used by Cifuentes *et al.* (2000a) and Courrau (1999). The methodology was also improved to incorporate workshops with the community and park's users, instead of only interviews with the members of the community (Velásquez *et al.* 2004).

1.4 Purposes

✓ to improve management (adaptive management)

1.5 Objectives and application

The evaluation methodology was used as a first step for the revision of the Galapagos National Park's (GNP) management plan in 1995, as well as to strengthen the technical administrative management processes of the protected area and to obtain feedback with community participation. It was then used to evaluate the implementation of management between 1996 and 2004.

In the report of the 1996-2004 evaluation, Velazquez *et al.*(2004) highlights the following objectives:

- 1) to know if the GNP management objectives have been reached;
- 2) to identify and external and internal factors which interfere with the management capacity of the park's team;
- 3) to improve the planning and the connectivity of the projects and the protected area in general;
- 4) to provide the needed inputs to the GNP's adaptive management;
- 5) to elaborate a key tool for the park's accountability enabling transparency for the community, the authorities and other interest groups.

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

1.6 Origins

'The de Faria method was used successfully in the Galapagos National Park in 1995, as a preliminary step to revising the park's management plan' (Cayot et al., 1998). The general procedure was administered in its entirety, including the establishment of new indicators Galapagos National Park and including the participation of key actors from the community in the park evaluation process. The macro-indicators (fields) evaluated in the Galapagos National Park were: bio-geographic, legal, political, administrative and planning characteristics, knowledge, management programs, threats, and current illegal and legal uses' (Cifuentes *et al.*, 2000).

Before its application in the Galapagos, the de Faria methodology was further developed to broaden the variables to be evaluated and building a system capable of involving the local interest groups of the province (Cayot & Cruz, 1998).

The park's second evaluation (1996-2004) applied a methodology resulting from the revision and compilation of three different methodologies: Cayot y Cruz, 1998; Courrau, 1999; Cifuentes, 2000; and Hockings, 2000 (Velasquez *et al.*, 2004).

1.7 How the methodology is implemented

The procedures to evaluate the management effectiveness include the following steps:

- 1) establishment of a technical team;
- 2) revision and adaptation of the themes, variables, sub-variables and weighting criteria;
- 3) information collection;
- 4) evaluation of the themes, variables and sub-variables by the technical team;
- 5) application and evaluation of the questionnaires to the groups of interest/communities;
- 6) comparison of the results of the technical team evaluation with the results of the community questionnaires;
- 7) interpretation of the results; and
- 8) application of the results in the protected area planning process.

1.8 Elements and indicators

To reflect the discussions in the Vth World Parks Congress, Variables, sub-variables and indicators were included to reflect ecological integrity, and social and economic factors.

Scopes of evaluation were:

1. Biophysical
2. Legal
3. Governance
4. Social
5. Knowledge
6. Administration
7. Planning
8. Management Programs
9. Threats
10. Legal Uses
11. Illegal Uses

See (Velásquez *et al.* 2004)) for the complete list of variables, sub-variables and indicators and the rating system.

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

1.9 Scoring and analysis

The evaluation of each variable, sub-variable and indicator results in a score which allows qualifying the management level according to the following scale, based on the ISO 10004 used by de Faria:

Value 4: 90-100% of accomplishment (very satisfactory)

Value 3: 76-89% of accomplishment (satisfactory)

Value 2: 51-74% of accomplishment (moderately satisfactory)

Value 1: 36-50% of accomplishment (less satisfactory)

Value 0: 0-35% of accomplishment (unsatisfactory)