

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

Indian Management Effectiveness Evaluation

Written with input and editorial assistance from Vinod Mathur, Wildlife Institute of India

1.1 Organisation

Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Government of India and the Wildlife Institute of India

1.2 Brief description of methodology

The methodology is based on the IUCN-WCPA Framework. The evaluation is done at three levels: national, state and site level. The process uses all six elements of the Framework. For each element, a set of indicators have been developed. All criteria are scored on a four point scale and a numeric value is assigned to each score (Very Good: 10; Good: 7.5; Fair: 5; Poor: 2.5) and sub-totals are calculated for each element. An overall management effectiveness score (in percentage) is assigned to each site and state and the results are presented graphically.

The evaluation is undertaken by a three member expert committee comprising wildlife managers and scientists. Six regional committees and one central/core committee have been constituted for this purpose by the Government of India.

1.3 Purposes

- ✓ for accountability/ audit (including reporting to Parliament)
- ✓ to improve management (adaptive management)
- ✓ for prioritisation and resource allocation

1.4 Objectives and application

This methodology has been developed to provide a comprehensive management effectiveness evaluation of the Protected Areas of India on a periodic basis with a view to ascertaining how well the Protected Area network in the country is meeting the conservation objectives as well as the social objectives for effective wildlife management.

1.5 Origins

In 2004-05 the Project Tiger Directorate, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India conducted evaluations of all 28 Tiger Reserves in the country. Four out of six elements of the IUCN-WCPA Framework were used in this evaluation, which was done by five teams comprising two members each. The process and the results were peer-reviewed by IUCN experts. The evaluation reports are available at http://www.wii.gov.in/envis/sdnp/docs/pt_review_of_assessment_report.pdf and http://www.wii.gov.in/envis/sdnp/docs/pt_evaluation_reports_india.pdf

In 2006, the Prime Minister office gave a directive to the MoEF to conduct an independent evaluation of all national parks and wildlife sanctuaries in the country. The present evaluation is a follow-up of this directive, for which the technical backing is being provided by the Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun.

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

1.6 How the method is implemented

The assessment is carried out by expert committees comprising wildlife experts and scientists, appointed to review management in each region of India and at the national level. The role of these committees is to apply the management effectiveness evaluation framework on a regional basis. Each year about 10% of the geographical area under Protected Area in the region would be randomly selected for review.

The Committee uses the evaluation system to assess:

- Whether the chosen approaches in PA management are sound, adequate and appropriate;
- To evaluate whether the funds allocated are used effectively for meeting the objectives of park management as established in the respective management plans and annual operation plans;
- To examine the adequacy and / or the constraints in the PA legislation and policy, administrative structures and procedures, and PA design in relation to management effectiveness; and
- To establish the process of long-term monitoring of the biological and socio-cultural resources of the PA system, socio-economic aspects of use and the impact of management on local communities.

The reports of each regional committee are to be submitted to the central monitoring and coordination committee of MoEF each year for consolidation and presentation to the Parliament.

1.7 Elements and indicators

Table 1: Indicators for Indian MEE assessment methodology

WCPA Element	Indicator	Level of assessment (Site, State, National)
Context	Are the values of the site well documented, assessed and monitored?	Site
	Are the threats to site values well documented and assessed?	Site
	Is the site free from human and biotic interference?	Site
	Is there a clearly articulated vision for the development and management of PA network in the State/India?	State/National
	Does the administrative framework adequately support the effective functioning of the PA network?	State
	Is there a cohesive and well coordinated approach to PA management?	State/National
	Is regional cooperation (i.e. inter-state/international) established and maintained in a manner which supports effective management of PA?	State/National
	Does the legislative framework adequately support the effective functioning of the PA network?	National
Planning	Is the site properly identified and categorized (in terms of zoning) to achieve the objectives?	Site
	Does the site have a comprehensive Management Plan?	Site
	Are Management Plan(s) routinely and systematically updated?	Site/State
	Does the site safeguard the threatened biodiversity values?	Site
	Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate in planning?	Site
	Are habitat restoration programs systematically planned and monitored?	Site
	Are reintroduction programs systematically planned and monitored?	Site
	Does the site has an effective protection strategy?	Site
Has the site been effective in the mitigation of human-wildlife conflicts?	Site	

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

WCPA Element	Indicator	Level of assessment (Site, State, National)
	Is the site integrated into a wider ecological network following the principles of the ecosystem approach?	Site
	Are protected areas designed and established through a systematic and scientifically based criteria and process with a clearly articulated vision?	State/National
	Are there mechanisms in place for sharing of revenues from PA	State
Inputs	Are personnel well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?	Site
	Are resources (vehicle, equipment, building etc.) well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?	Site
	Are resources (human and financial) linked to priority actions and are funds released timely?	Site
	What level of resources is provided by NGOs?	Site
	Does PA manager consider resources (human and financial) to be sufficient?	Site
	How have resource levels varied with increases in protected areas in recent years?	State/National
Process	Does the site have trained manpower resources for effective PA management?	Site
	Is PA staff performance management linked to achievement of management objectives?	Site/State
	Is there effective public participation in PA management?	Site
	Is there a responsive system for handling complaints and comments about PA management?	Site/State/National
	Does PA management address the livelihood issues of resource dependent communities, especially women?	Site
	Does the state have trained manpower resources for effective PA management?	State
	Is management performance against relevant planning objectives and management standards routinely assessed and systematically audited as part of an on-going 'continuous improvement' process?	State/National
	Is there an external and independent involvement in internal audit?	State/National
Outputs	Is adequate information on PA management publicly available?	Site/State/National
	Are visitor services (tourism and interpretation) and facilities appropriate for the relevant protected area category?	Site
	Are management related trends systematically evaluated and routinely reported?	Site/State
	Is there a systematic maintenance schedule and funds in place for management of infrastructure/assets?	Site/State
	Does India fulfill its monitoring and reporting obligations under international conventions?	National
Outcomes	Are threatened/ endangered species populations stable or increasing?	Site/State/National
	Are biological communities at a mix of ages and locations that will support native biodiversity?	Site
	Have the threats to the site being abated/ minimized?	Site
	Are the expectations of visitors generally met or exceeded?	Site
	Are neighbors and adjacent communities supportive of PA management?	Site
	Are cultural heritage assets protected?	Site

1.8 Scoring and analysis

All criteria are scored on a four point scale (poor, fair, good, very good) with a descriptive text attached to each point on the scale to assist in allocating the score. Scores are then assigned a numeric value (Poor: 2.5; Fair: 5; Good: 7.5; Very Good: 10) and sub-totals calculated for each element. Results are graphed at site and state level for comparison.