BIOPAMA

From Knowledge to Action for a Protected Planet

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

A rapid inventory and analysis to support the BIOPAMA programme and partners

August, 2019

Donors & Implementing Partners

Contents

Contributions and Acknowledgements

This report was commissioned by the International Union for Conservation of Nature's (IUCN's) Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) as a contribution to the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme. It is part of BIOPAMA's broader efforts to assist African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries to address their priorities for improved management and governance of biodiversity and natural resources, including by providing and assessing supportive tools. BIOPAMA is an initiative of the ACP Group of States financed by the European Union's 11th European Development Fund (EDF), jointly implemented by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC). It supports protected area actors at all levels, including through the provision of tools, services, and capacity development, as well as opportunities for funding for site-level activities. It operates across 79 countries, which host 9,000 protected areas across diverse ecological, social and cultural landscapes (adapted from BIOPAMA website).

The report was prepared by Jessica Campese and Emmanuel Sulle. We are deeply grateful to the many people who shared their guidance, insights, and expertise, all of which were critical contributions. Sue Snyman (BIOPAMA Coordinator, IUCN ESARO), Bastian Bertzky (BIOPAMA Point of Contact for Southern Africa, JRC), and Leo Niskanen (IUCN ESARO Conservation Areas and Species Programme Regional Technical Coordinator) provided supervision, guidance and direct technical support. Critical contributions were also made by all those who participated in interviews, completed the survey conducted in support of this report, or provided information via email, including[1]: Bastian Bertzky, John Bett, Nandipha Bhengu, Dominique Bikaba, Francesca Booker, Neil Burgess, Neil Dawson, Marine Deguignet, Motuma Didita, Zakhe Dlamini, Nigel Dudely, Zakaria Faustin, Phil Franks, Sandile Gumedze, Nancy Ingutia, Davis Kalima, Victor Kawange, Jennifer Kelleher, Nzigiyimpa Léonidas, Mzokhona Mabaso, Franklin Masika, Thulani Methula, Peter John Mills, Barbara Nakagu, Emmanuel Nuesiri, Ramanantsoa Seheno, Kate Shreckenberg, Rob Small, Jessica Stewart, Sue Stolton, Arthur Tuda, and Gretchen Walters. (Please see Annex 1 for further details).

---

[1] This is a partial list of individuals who contributed via survey response, interview, or email communication, comprised of those who consented to be acknowledged, listed in alphabetical order by family name.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

6

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BIOPAMA — Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme

BCP — Biocultural Community Protocol

BirdLife IBA Monitoring — BirdLife Important Bird Area Monitoring

BNS — Basic Necessities Survey

CA — Conserved Area

CBD — Convention on Biological Diversity

CEESP — IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

EoH — Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit

ESARO — Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (of IUCN)

FFI — Fauna & Flora International

FSC — Forest Stewardship Council

GAPA — Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas

GD-PAME — Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness

ICCA — Abbreviation for "territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities" or "territories of life"[2]

ICCA SSP — ICCA Self-Strengthening Process

IEG — Independent Evaluation Group (World Bank) Assessment

IIED — International Institute for Environment and Development

IMET — Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool

IUCN — International Union for Conservation of Nature

---

[2] As summarised in (CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8 fn.23) "The term 'community conserved area' (CCA) was first used before the World Parks Congress … Subsequently, this term was expanded to refer more specifically to 'indigenous and community conserved areas' (ICCA). Today, these phenomena are more broadly referred to as 'territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities' or 'territories of life', though 'ICCA' continues to be used as a general abbreviation".

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

8

KII	Key Informant Interview
LMMA	Locally Managed Marine Area
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MJUMITA	Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania (Mtandao wa Jamii wa Usimamizi wa Misitu Tanzania)
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NRGF	(IUCN) Natural Resource Governance Framework
OECM	Other effective area-based conservation measure
PA	Protected Area
PA-BAT	Protected Area Benefits Assessment Tool
PAME	Protected Area Management Effectiveness
PAMETT	METT adaptation for Madagascar
PEV	Participatory Economic Valuation
RAPPAM	Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management
RFGI	Responsive Forest Governance Initiative
RSIA	Rapid Social Impact Assessment
SAGE	Site-Assessment of Governance and Equity (provisional name)
SAPA	Social Assessment of Protected and Conserved Areas
SAPM	Management Effectiveness Assessment for Madagascar's Protected Areas System
SGBD/SMART	SMART variation specific to Madagascar
SMART	Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool
SR	Survey Response

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

9

SWIFT	Methodology for High-Frequency Forest-Poverty data collection
TAI	The Access Initiative
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas
WDPA	World Database on Protected Areas
West Indian Ocean MPA	West Indian Ocean Marine Protected Area Assessment
WH Outlook Report	World Heritage Outlook Report
WHS	World Heritage Site

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

10

Glossary of Key Terms and Concepts

Many of the terms and concepts in this report are used in diverse ways. This section describes how some are used for purposes of this report.

Term / Concept	Meaning	Sources
Assessment	This report uses 'assessment' as short-hand for a process that often involves elements of both assessment and evaluation, defined as follows: - "Assessment is a process by which: relevant information is identified and shared, and more information is collected, as needed; the situation is understood in relation to its context; the situation is analysed, identifying problems and opportunities." - "Evaluation is a process by which: the results of the assessment are examined vis-à-vis specific objectives, goals and values; needs for change are identified; a clear set of recommendations is developed to move closer to the desired situation."	Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013:66
Conservation	Conservation involves interactions between people and their environment that lead to the preservation, sustainable use, restoration and/or enrichment of nature.	
Conserved area	This report understands 'conserved areas' in relation to two key definitions. Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill (2015:178) describe a conserved area as one that "*…regardless of recognition and dedication, and at times even regardless of explicit and conscious management practices, achieves de facto conservation and/or are in a positive conservation trend and likely to maintain it in the long term*". Not all conserved areas are (or should be designated as) "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) for purposes of reporting to the CBD. Nonetheless, as many OECMs are conserved areas, the CBD definition of OECMs is also relevant as a point of reference. CBD Parties have defined an OECM as "*…a geographically defined area, other than a protected area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem functions and services and, where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio–economic and other locally relevant values*" (CBD Decision 14/8, 2018).	Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill, 2015:178 CBD Decision 14/8, 2018

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

12

De jure and *de facto*	These terms "distinguish between what is prescribed and recognised by the law (*de jure*) and what actually does happen in real life (*de facto*). The terms mean "in law" and "in practice", respectively."	Borrini-Feyerabend et. al., 2013:11
Equity	Equity can be understood in terms of three dimensions (Schreckenberg et al., 2016): – *Recognition* - acknowledging and respecting rights and the diversity of identities, knowledge systems, values and institutions of different actors – *Procedure* – equitable participation of actors in decision making, transparency, accountability, and processes for dispute resolution – *Distribution* - equitable allocation of benefits and recognition of costs incurred across actors, and, how the costs/ burdens experienced by some actors are mitigated	Schreckenberg et al., 2016
Governance	Governance can be understood as the: "interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are taken and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say".	Graham et al., 2003:2,3
Governance Diversity	In the protected and conserved areas context, governance *diversity* refers to the extent to which systems include diverse and appropriate governance types.	Borrini-Feyerabend et. al., 2013
Governance Quality	In the protected and conserved areas context, governance *quality* generally refers to how well a site is governed. This is often assessed in relation to a set of principles of "good" (equitable and effective) governance.	Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013
Governance Type	The CBD and IUCN distinguish between four 'types' of governance, depending on who has the authority and responsibility to make and enforce decisions: – Governance by government; – Shared governance (combinations of government, private actors, and/or Indigenous peoples and local communities); – Governance by private actors; – Governance by Indigenous peoples and/or local communities (often referred to as ICCAs)	Dudley, 2008 Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2014 Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

13

ICCA – Territory of Life	ICCAs have been defined as "natural and/or modified ecosystems containing significant biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural values, voluntarily conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities, both sedentary and mobile, through customary laws or other effective means" (CBD Decision 14/8, 2018) As noted above (see acronyms list), the term 'ICCA' is an abbreviation for areas and territories conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities or 'territories of life''. This abbreviation has emerged as a way to reference a diverse phenomenon that has many different names in cultures and locations around the world. The ICCA Consortium describes ICCAs as possessing three key characteristics[3]: 1. "There is a **close and deep connection** between a territory or area and an indigenous people or local community. This relationship is generally embedded in history, social and cultural identity, spirituality and/or people's reliance on the territory for their material and non-material wellbeing." 2. "The custodian people or community makes and enforces decisions and rules (e.g., access and use) about the territory, area or species' habitat through a **functioning governance institution**." 3. "The governance decisions and management efforts of the concerned people or community contribute to the **conservation of nature** (ecosystems, habitats, species, natural resources), as well as to community **wellbeing**."	CBD Decision 14/8, 2018 ICCA Consortium webpage
Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities	Consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity, this document does not define or describe "Indigenous peoples" or "local communities".	See CBD CoP Dec 14/13
Management	Concerns what is done in a given area to reach one or more specific objectives. It usually pertains to a set of activities and the means of carrying them out.	Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2014
Management Effectiveness	"[H]ow well protected areas are being managed – primarily the extent to which management is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives".	Hockings et al., 2006:xiii

---

[3] The ICCA Consortium further notes that the status of any given ICCA may vary, in relation to these three characteristics – i.e. "If an ICCA fulfils well and easily these three defining characteristics, it is an example of a '**defined ICCA**'. If only two or one of the characteristics are present, we do not have a defined ICCA, but we may still have a '**disrupted ICCA**' or a '**desired ICCA**'. (ICCA Consortium webpage).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

14

Methodology, method and tool	While the terms are often used inter-changeably[4], useful distinctions can made between "methodologies", "tools", and "methods": – "Methodology: Overall package of an analytical framework, research design, methods and an assessment process that links the methods" – "Method: An information/data gathering or analysis activity - for example, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, survey or participatory rapid appraisal (PRA) methods" – "Tool: Specific information/data-gathering or analysis instrument used within a method"	Franks et al., 2018b:15
OECM	CBD Parties defined "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECM) as "...a geographically defined area, other than a protected area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem functions and services and, where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio–economic and other locally relevant values"	CBD Decision 14/8, 2018
Protected area	"...clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values"	Dudley, 2008
Protected Area Management Effectiveness Assessment Framework	A Framework developed by the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), which aims to provide guidance and encourage standards for PAME assessment and reporting. It includes six elements – context, planning, inputs process, outputs and outcomes.	Hockings et al. 2006
Rightsholders	"In the context of protected areas, we refer to "rightsholders" as actors socially endowed with legal or customary rights with respect to land, water and natural resources."	Borrini-Feyerabend et. al., 2013:15

[4] As noted below, this report generally uses the term "methodology" because, even where discussing what might be considered a discrete tool (e.g. the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool), we also discuss the underlying analytical framework (e.g. WCPA PAME Framework) and methods through which they can be applied (e.g. participatory workshops).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

15

Stakeholders	"In the context of protected areas…. "Stakeholders" possess direct or indirect interests and concerns about those, but do not necessarily enjoy a legally or socially recognised entitlement to them".	Borrini-Feyerabend et. al., 2013:15
Wellbeing	"Wellbeing is not just the inverse of poverty or another term for livelihoods; it is a broader way of looking at the quality of human life… The three dimensions of human wellbeing [are:] – "Material wellbeing: Physical requirements of life, such as income, wealth, assets or physical health, and the ecosystem services provided by the physical environment. – "Relational wellbeing: Social interactions, collective actions, conflict and security and relationships involved in the generation and maintenance of social, political and cultural identities. – "Subjective wellbeing: Cultural values, norms and belief systems, notions of self, individual and shared hopes, fears and aspirations, levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, trust and confidence"	Franks et al. 2018:11 (with three dimensions adapted from White, 2009)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

16

Executive Summary

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and others have encouraged protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments. This report aims to provide the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme and its partners with information about, inter alia, where, when, and with what methodologies such assessments have been conducted in Eastern and Southern Africa[5], what lessons are being learned, and how these methodologies can best be used. These aims reflect the importance of such assessments for enhancing conservation effectiveness, equity, and sustainability.

This report was commissioned by the International Union for Conservation of Nature's

(IUCN's) Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) as a contribution to the BIOPAMA Programme. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.

Primary sources and methods of data collection included: literature and technical resource review; Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME) searches; key word searches in academic databases, public search engines, and targeted websites; a survey and key informant interviews; and targeted searches within the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) for supplemental details. Inventory contents are summarised in Table A.

Table A: Inventory Content	
Protected and conserved area management effectiveness assessments	2,878
Protected and conserved area governance assessments	378
Protected and conserved area social assessments	50
Assessments that focus on two or more elements of those above	31
Social assessments in landscapes with protected and/or conserved areas	14
Governance assessments in landscapes with protected and/or conserved areas	8
Other relevant reports and studies[6]	235
TOTAL	**3594**

---

[5] For purposes of this report, the ESA region includes countries covered by IUCN ESARO, i.e. Angola, Botswana, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, eSwatini, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

[6] "Other" refers to academic studies and other reports that include analysis / assessment of management effectiveness, governance, and/or social impact elements, but that do not constitute complete assessments using readily replicable methodologies.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

18

Scope and Distribution of Assessment Use: Nearly 2,880 management effectiveness assessments were found to have been done in the region (a conservative estimate) and the frequency of their use appears to be increasing. However, these assessments are concentrated in relatively few countries (with over half having been done in South Africa) and mostly in government-governed protected areas. Further, over 75% used the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) or a country-adapted version thereof. This points to some need for further expansion in management effectiveness assessments, including across more countries in the region and within areas under shared or non-state governance. However, the analysis found a much bigger gap with respect to governance and social assessments. Fifty social assessments were found to have been done using readily replicable methodologies. More governance assessments were inventoried (just under 380). However, 333 of these were under a single project in Tanzania. There were also just over 30 assessments using methodologies with joint focus on management effectiveness, governance, and/or social assessment, such as the IUCN *Green List* of Protected and Conserved Areas. The relatively small number of governance and social assessments implies an obstacle to addressing these important aspects of protected and conserved area sites and systems (though there are many academic studies that could be drawn on), and to reporting on the equity element of Aichi Target 11.

Assessment Objectives and Motivations: Assessments often have multiple, inter-related objectives. Broadly speaking, common objectives include: (in most cases) better understanding the current situation, (in many cases) developing recommendations to make adaptations or improvements, and (in some cases) monitoring / tracking change over time. The question of

whose objectives these are – i.e. who is driving assessments – also varies. Important factors driving uptake of new methodologies have been requirements by funding bodies and pilot testing and use by non-governmental organisations (NGOs). At the same time, the use of certain methodologies (particularly METT) has been institutionalised by some countries in the region and in-country demand for some other methodologies (including Social Assessment of Protected and Conserved Areas - SAPA) appears to be growing. There are also innovative processes developed and/or led by local actors, including Indigenous peoples and local communities.

Participation in Assessments: Assessments tend to be convened by the governing or managing bodies (which may be government, communities, private actors, or combinations of these). This is often done with external support actors, particularly in the case of newer methodologies or where substantial facilitation support or training is required. The scope and nature of participation varies by both the methodology and the context-specific process through which it is implemented. In general, management effectiveness assessments vary widely in whether and how rightsholders and stakeholders participate, while governance assessments tend to be the most inclusive. Inclusivity is important in part because the assessment process itself (not just the results) can be a powerful opportunity for exchange and co-generation of knowledge. However, designing genuinely participatory processes is challenging.

Resource and Capacity Requirements: The resources (time, financing) and capacities required for assessments vary widely by both methodology and context. Some methodologies, like METT, are designed to be relatively quick and low-cost. Others are more in-depth, like the Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit (EoH) and

Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET), and are therefore more time consuming and costly. Specific costs and time requirements also vary by the context (e.g. accessibility and social complexity of the site) and process. Capacity is another important resource, though people already have diverse capacities and assessment-specific skills can be built as part of the process. Further, while it is necessary to minimise costs, this should be balanced with ensuring a meaningful process and follow-up. There are also intangible resources that help ensure meaningful assessment, including commitment, openness, and enthusiasm.

Information Availability: Technical guidance on how to do management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments is available, with some exceptions and variability in the level of detail. Some of this guidance has evolved over time. Reports from some assessments are also available, e.g. from pilot initiatives, academic research, and periodic global reports, e.g., World Heritage Outlook Report (WH Outlook), at least in summary form. However, very few reports were found for other assessments, including all Green List assessments and most of the METT assessments. The limited availability of assessment reports (and raw results) clearly indicates an aspect of assessment practice that could be improved, including through the BIOPAMA Programme.

Considerations for BIOPAMA Partners: Experience in the region and existing guidance suggest the following:

– *For selecting and adapting methodologies*: There are many methodologies available for management effectives assessment and a growing (though still limited) number for governance and social assessment. Each has different strengths and limitations. Consider both the objectives and available resources for assessment, noting that there may be trade-offs between these, and select or develop sound methodologies. Verify their appropriateness for the context and adapt them as needed. Strive to be both practical and ambitious about what you can do with assessment.

– *For ensuring a meaningful process and results*: Regardless of the methodology selected, the meaningfulness of any assessment will be contingent in large part on how it is done in practice. Approach assessment as an inclusive learning process, while drawing on the best available information, being clear about scope and timeframes, and verifying results.

– *For making assessment a basis for meaningful action*: While the process of assessment is valuable in itself (e.g. by convening a space for shared learning), it should also lead to meaningful change. Moving from assessment to action was identified as a major challenge. To help address this challenge, ensure (engender) political will and openness to change, dedicate resources, make a detailed action plan (not just recommendations) and/or integrate assessment into regular planning cycles ("institutionalisation"), communicate and coordinate across levels, and establish a process for ongoing learning / monitoring.

Considerations for the BIOPAMA programme: This analysis suggests that the BIOPAMA programme could support its partners through, *inter alia*:

– Generating and sharing information about assessment (including resulting benefits) with concrete examples from the region and opportunities for peer exchange

– Developing comparative information on

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

20

different methodologies, complemented by capacity building opportunities (e.g. webinars), with a focus on governance and social assessment

- Engaging a wide range of rightsholders and stakeholders in capacity building efforts, including for co-generation of knowledge

- Providing guidance on how to tackle technical (and other) challenges in assessment

- Helping to develop standardised formats to share certain levels of data

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

21

Part 1:

Introduction and Background

Report Objectives

This report aims to provide the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme and its partners with information about protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments in Eastern and Southern Africa[7]. The analysis includes:[8]

– where, when, and with what methodologies such assessments have been conducted in the region;

– why and how these assessments are being done; and

– what lessons are being learned to inform best practice.

A key objective is to support BIOPAMA capacity building activities in the region. These aims reflect the importance of such assessments for enhancing conservation effectiveness, equity, and sustainability.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature's (IUCN's) Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) commissioned this report as a contribution to the BIOPAMA Programme. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.

Importance and Challenges of Protected and Conserved Areas

As part of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) adopted the Aichi Targets, including:

Aichi Target 11: "By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas… are conserved through **effectively** and **equitably** managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape" (Decision X/2, Nagoya, 2010, emphasis added).

Protected areas are a key biodiversity conservation tool (Bertzky et al., 2012) and can hold diverse material and non-material values for people at all levels (e.g. Stolton and Dudely, 2015b). **Protected area coverage is expanding** and, with continued effort, global "terrestrial and marine coverage targets may be achieved by 2020" (UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS, 2018:v), including in Eastern and Southern Africa. Coverage varies widely in Eastern and Southern Africa. In East Africa[9], for example, terrestrial protected area coverage is already estimated to exceed 27%, but this drops to about 12% when excluding Tanzania (Riggio et al., 2019).

While their international recognition is only more recently emerging, **conserved areas have long been contributing** to biodiversity conservation and human wellbeing (e.g. Kothari et al., 2012; Borrini-Feyerabend et.al., 2012). Despite data gaps, it is clear that **conserved areas cover vast territory**. For example, Indigenous peoples have customary and other tenure rights over one quarter of the world's land surface,

---

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

23

conservatively estimated (Garnett et al., 2018), and such areas are estimated to hold upwards of 80% of the world's biodiversity (Sobrevila, 2008). Specific figures are not available for Eastern and Southern Africa, but case studies undertaken for CBD guidance documents in Kenya, Namibia, and Madagascar, as well as an ongoing systems-level assessment in Tanzania, indicate wide coverage (see Kothari et al. 2012; CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8; KII).

Yet there are **major challenges concerning effectiveness, equity and sustainability**. Conserved areas are under increasing threat (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend and Campese, 2017; Kothari et al., 2012) and global biodiversity continues to decline (e.g. Butchart et al., 2010), including within some protected areas (e.g. Craigie et al., 2010 and Geldmann et al., 2013). Protected area establishment and management can also have substantial social costs and adverse impacts on the rights and interests of Indigenous peoples and local communities, including through physical or economic displacement and increased human-wildlife conflict (e.g. Tauli-Corpuz, 2016; Nyhus et al., 2005; and Woodhouse et al., 2018). Further, some protected area boundaries are contested, e.g. where territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities are 'overlapped' by protected areas (e.g. Stevens et. al., 2016).

Box 1: What are protected and conserved areas?

IUCN has defined a protected area as a "…*clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values*" (Dudley, 2008).[10]

There is less consensus on the definition of conserved areas. For purposes of this report, we understand 'conserved areas' in relation to two definitions.

Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill (2015:178) describe a conserved area as one that "…*regardless of recognition and dedication, and at times even regardless of explicit and conscious management practices, achieves de facto conservation and/or are in a positive conservation trend and likely to maintain it in the long term*".

There is ongoing discussion about the relationships between protected areas, conserved areas, and "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs) (e.g. IUCN WCPA, 2018). Not all conserved area governing bodies/ custodians may want their areas designated as OECMs. Nonetheless, as many conserved areas are consistent with the definition of OECMs, this definition is also a relevant point of reference. In particular, both definitions describe areas that achieve conservation, in practice, and in ways that can be sustained over time. CBD Parties have defined an OECM as "…*a geographically defined area, other than a protected area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem functions and services and, where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio–economic and other locally relevant values*" (CBD Decision 14/8, 2018).

---

[10] The IUCN definition of protected areas is compatible with the CBD definition (Lopoukhine and Ferreira de Souza Dias 2012).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

24

Importance of Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Equity… and their Assessment

In light of the environmental and social challenges facing protected and conserved areas,[11] it is **critical to understand and, where needed, enhance management effectiveness, governance, and equity (including in terms of social impacts)**. (See Box 2 for more information about what these concepts mean.) This is reflected in the Target 11 elements concerning effectiveness and equity,[12] as well as many other CBD decisions, IUCN Resolutions, calls from civil society and social movements, and growing evidence in the literature, as discussed throughout this report.

There is strong evidence that management is an important determinant of conservation effectiveness in protected areas (UNEP-WCMC, 2017:6). As summarised in the 2018 Protected Planet Report:

> "large-scale studies have found positive correlations between aspects of protected area management (such as staffing and budgets) and species conservation outcomes (in terms of trends in species' populations and abundance) in marine (Gill et al., 2016; Edgar et al., 2017) and terrestrial (Geldmann et al., 2018) protected areas" (UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS, 2018).

Governance is increasingly recognised as a critical determinant of conservation effectiveness, equity, and sustainability. For example, well-governed areas can help achieve and sustain conservation and other objectives, including because they engage, benefit, and have greater support from local people (e.g. Bennet et al., 2019; Bennett and Dearden, 2014; Oldekop et al., 2015). Likewise, protected and conserved area systems with diverse and appropriate governance may be more resilient because they incorporate the knowledge and action of diverse actors (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Stolton et al. 2014). The 2016 Protected Planet Report, for example, notes that many protected areas "benefit, or could benefit, from traditional knowledge, innovations and practices" (UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2016:55). Beyond effectiveness, a focus on governance helps ensure that conservation is equitable, including recognising and upholding the rights and contributions of Indigenous peoples and local communities. (Paragraph draws on CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8)

Assessments are a key strategy for understanding and identifying ways to adapt and improve current practice. **The CBD has called for protected area management effectiveness[13], governance[14], and social[15] assessments**. Partly in response to this demand, as well as the initiatives of Indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society organisations, governments, and donors, methodologies for such assessments have been growing over the last two decades.

---

[11] While this report considers both protected and conserved areas, the ways in which different methodologies, and in particular protected area management effectiveness assessments, relate to conserved areas is a topic that requires further exploration.

[12] The Target 11 element of being "equitably managed" is widely recognised as being closely related to, and perhaps more clearly described as, equitable governance (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013:114, Footnote 400; Franks et al., 2018a; SCBD, 2016:Para. 96)

[13] See, for example, PoWPA "Goal 4.2: To evaluate and improve the effectiveness of protected areas management" which suggests, among other things, developing "appropriate methods, standards, criteria and indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of protected area management and governance…", widely implementing such evaluations, and "[i]mplement[ing] key recommendations arising from site- and system-level management effectiveness evaluations, as an integral part of adaptive management strategies" (Decision VII/28, Kuala Lumpur, 2004).

[14] For example, CBD voluntary guidance on protected areas governance (CBD/COP/DEC/14/8) suggests, among others, conducting inclusive systems-level (Annex II para. 7(d)) and site-level (paras. 12(b) and 13(a)) governance assessments, including to improve governance policy and practice at multiple levels. CBD CoP 10 invited Parties to "[c]onduct, where appropriate, assessments of governance of protected areas using toolkits prepared by the Secretariat and other organizations…" (Decision X/31, para. 32 (f), Nagoya, 2010) and CBD CoP 13 invited Parties to "undertake or participate in, where relevant, national protected area governance assessments with a view to promoting, recognizing and improving governance diversity, efficiency and equity in protected area systems" (Decision XIII/2, para. 5(d), Cancun, 2016).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

25

Box 2: What are management effectiveness, governance, and equity?

'**Management effectiveness'** concerns "how well protected areas are being managed – primarily the extent to which management is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives" (Hockings et al., 2006:xiii).

'**Governance'** can be understood as "...interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are taken and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say..." (Graham et al., 2003:2,3). It concerns who makes decisions, how those decisions are made, who is (or should be) accountable for their implementation, and whether enabling conditions are in place (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2014). In the protected and conserved areas context, governance typically includes at least two key considerations – *quality* (how well a site is governed) and *diversity* (the extent to which protected and conserved area systems include diverse and appropriate governance types) (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013).[16] IUCN (Dudley 2008) and CBD (Decision X/31, Nagoya, 2010) distinguish between four broad 'types' of protected and conserved area governance, corresponding to who makes and enforces decisions:[17]

– governance by government (at various levels)

– governance by various actors together (shared governance)

– governance by private individuals and organisations (usually the landholders)

– governance by Indigenous peoples and/or local communities (often referred to as ICCAs or, increasingly, as 'Territories of Life')

---

[15] For example, CBD voluntary guidance on protected areas governance (CBD/COP/DEC/14/8) suggests, among others, facilitating "assessment and monitoring of economic and sociocultural costs and benefits associated with the establishment and management of protected areas, and avoid, mitigate or compensate for costs while enhancing and equitably distributing benefits" (para. 12(d)). PoWPA suggests that Parties "assess the economic and socio-cultural costs, benefits and impacts arising from the establishment and maintenance of protected areas, particularly for indigenous and local communities, and adjust policies to avoid and mitigate negative impacts, and where appropriate compensate costs and equitably share benefits in accordance with the national legislation" (Decision VII/28, Kuala Lumpur, 2004).
[16] 'Vitality' is another critical element of governance (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2014). However, as it is still an emerging concept, this analysis does not directly consider its assessment.
[17] Governance type is determined by several factors, including who holds authority in law (de jure) and also who makes decisions in practice (*de facto*). In some cases, these may differ. (see Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013 and Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill 2015)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

26

Social equity is a key element of good governance and of the impacts of management and governance. Simply put, equity means 'fairness' and is closely related to justice (Franks et al., 2018a). A recently developed framework, recognized in CBD voluntary guidance, describes equity in three dimensions (Schreckenberg et al., 2016; CBD/COP/DEC/14/8):

Recognition - acknowledging and respecting rights and the diversity of identities, knowledge systems, values and institutions of different actors

Procedure – equitable participation of actors in decision making, transparency, accountability, and processes for dispute resolution

Distribution - equitable allocation of benefits and recognition of costs incurred across actors, and, how the costs/ burdens experienced by some actors are mitigated

Sources of Guidance: This report can only touch on these critical and complex concepts. For more complete sources of guidance, please see the documents referenced in this section, among others.

Figure 1: The three dimensions of equity embedded within a set of enabling conditions (Adapted from McDermott et al., 2013 and Pascual et al., 2014)

Part 2:

Report Scope and Method

This section summarises the report scope and method. Annex 1 provides more detail, including survey questions and the names of survey respondents and interviewees who consented to be acknowledged.

Scope

The inventory and analysis considers management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments in terrestrial and/or marine protected or conserved areas in Eastern and Southern Africa. The primary focus is on methodologies developed specifically to assess one or a combination of these issues and intended for replicated use. The inventory also includes related academic studies and full or partial assessments contained within broader reports. Project-specific impact assessments and screening reports are not included. Research questions are in Box 3, below.

Box 3: Guiding Research Questions for this Report[18]

1.   What protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments have been undertaken in Eastern and Southern Africa, including:

- Where, when, and with what methodologies have assessments been done?

- What are common objectives and motivations for assessment (and whose are they)?

- Why are certain methodologies selected?

- Who typically convenes assessments? Who else participates and how?

- What resources are typically required (e.g. time, costs, technical resources)?

- Are results publicly available? If so, where?

2.   What are the main trends and gaps in terms of the points above, including, overall, whether appropriate methodologies are available and being used?

3.   What key lessons have been learned in use of these assessments, including:

- Strengths and challenges in using common assessment methodologies?

- Benefits and drawbacks of having done an assessment, including whether (and how) assessment informs substantive change?

4.   What are recommendations and 'best practice' suggestions to further enable effective and appropriate use of assessment methodologies in the region?

---

[18] Research questions are based on the report Terms of Reference and Inception Report.

Sources and Methods

Primary sources and methods of data collection included:

– Literature and technical resource review

– County-specific searches in the Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness ([GD-PAME](#)) (UNEP-WCMC & IUCN, 2019)

– Key word searches for assessments in academic databases, public search engines, and targeted websites

– Survey responses (SRs) and key informant interviews (KIIs), with requests for both circulated to key points of contact and networks in the region, including BIOPAMA stakeholders

– Targeted searches within the World Database on Protected Area ([WDPA](#)), including to identify reported governance types[19]

Information about each inventoried assessment (or other publication) was compiled in an Excel spreadsheet to enable quantitative and qualitative analysis in relation to the research questions in Box 3.

Limitations

This report has a number of limitations. Given these, **the analysis should be interpreted as illustrative rather than definitive.**

– While the aim was to be as inclusive as practically feasible in the time available, the inventory cannot, in practice, include every assessment and related report from the region. For example, management effectiveness assessments are not always reported in GD-PAME and, while sources went beyond GD-PAME, it is unlikely that

all additional assessments were identified. Likewise, the broader literature included in the inventory, while extensive, is a sub-set of what is available.

– In some cases, the inventory is based on an estimated number of management effectiveness assessments. For example, we estimate that 294 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) assessments have been (or will be) completed in South Africa in 2015, 2017, and 2019, based on survey responses, interviews, and email communications indicating such assessments are done either bi-annually or annually (depending in part on the site's score) in all national and provincial government-governed protected areas.[20]

– Consistent with experience in other methodology reviews (e.g. Schreckenberg et al., 2010:44), specific information on assessment timelines, costs, and technical requirements is rarely available, with costs in particular varying by context. Given this, the report shares information about typical resource requirements, except where details have been reported.

– Analysis of methodology strengths and limitations draws on several sources. These include self-reporting by individuals familiar with the methodologies (which may not fully reflect the experience of those who are new to using the methodology) and general / global analyses (which may vary in their applicability to the region).

– In some cases, the analysis considers whether assessment practice aligns with guidance, e.g. whether rightsholders and stakeholders are included. However, we did not analyse the quality of assessment results, as this was outside the research scope.

---

[19] The inventory and analysis rely on the governance type reported in WPDA. However, we note that governance type identification can be a complex and contested issue, including where de jure and de facto governance arrangements are different and where there are Indigenous peoples or local communities' territories or areas overlapped by PAs under other governance types.

[20] The figure of 294 comes from Cowen et al., (2010:2), who state that "[t]here are 294 state owned and managed (at national and provincial level) terrestrial protected areas recorded in the Register" in South Africa.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

30

Part 3:

Scope and Focus of Assessments

This section provides an overview of the scope and focus of management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments and lists some of the methodologies that have been used in the region. It also briefly considers linkages and distinctions between assessment types, some complementary approaches, and some common limitations and challenges of assessments.

Assessing Management Effectiveness:

Protected area management effectiveness (PAME) assessments concern how well protected areas are being managed, particularly with regard to "the extent to which management is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives" of the area (Hockings et al. 2006:xiii).

In 2000, the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) published a framework for protected area management effectiveness, which was updated in 2006. It aims to provide guidance and encourage standards for PAME assessment and reporting. It includes six elements (Hockings et al. 2015:890, based on Hockings et al. 2006):

– **Context**, "including its values, the threats it faces and opportunities available, its stakeholders, and the management and political environment"

– **Planning**, including "vision, goals, objectives and strategies to conserve values and reduce threats"

– **Inputs** - including "staff, money and equipment to work towards the objectives"

– **Process**, including "implement[ation of] management actions according to accepted processes"

– **Outputs**, including "goods and services,

which should usually be outlined in management plans and work plans"

– **Outcomes**, "hopefully achieving defined goals and objectives"

This Framework has informed the development of PAME assessment methodologies with varied processes (e.g., questionnaire-based, workshop-based, etc.) and scales (e.g., site-based and/or systems-based) (Leverington et al. 2010; Leverington et al. 2008, Hockings et al. 2015).

Box 4: What is assessment?

In this report, we use 'assessment' as short-hand for a process of assessment and evaluation. As described by Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2013:66):

"Assessment is a process by which:

– relevant information is identified and shared, and more information is collected, as needed;

– the situation is understood in relation to its context;

– the situation is analysed, identifying problems and opportunities."

"Evaluation is a process by which:

– the results of the assessment are examined vis-à-vis specific objectives, goals and values;

– needs for change are identified;

– a clear set of recommendations is developed to move closer to the desired situation."

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

32

Box 5: GD-PAME and example PAME assessment methodologies

The Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME), includes many thousands of records, compiled and managed by UNEP-WCMC. It has a public platform for searching, inter alia, where (country and site-name), when (year), and with what methodologies PAME assessments have been conducted. The WDPA PAME webpage also describes and provides links to resources on a wide range of PAME assessment methodologies. PAME assessment methodologies used in Eastern and Southern Africa include:

BirdLife IBA Monitoring	BirdLife Important Bird Area Monitoring
EoH	Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit
IEG	(World Bank) Independent Evaluation Group Assessments
IMET	Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (and adaptations)
PAMETT	METT adaptation for Madagascar
RAPPAM	Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management
SAPM	Management Effectiveness Assessment for Madagascar's Protected Areas System
SGBD/SMART	SMART variation specific to Madagascar
SMART	Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool
West Indian Ocean MPA	West Indian Ocean Marine Protected Area Assessment
WH Outlook Report	World Heritage Outlook Report

Assessing Governance

Governance assessment' may focus on one or several of the governance aspects noted above, including:

– **The extent to which governance is *effective* and *equitable***, i.e. its 'quality'. This is often evaluated with respect to a set of governance principles. Principles vary between frameworks, but typically include at least participation, transparency, and accountability. Some also include other elements of effectiveness (e.g. performance and direction) and/or equity (e.g. fairness and upholding human rights). (See, e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Franks and Booker 2018; MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014; Springer et al., forthcoming)

– **The appropriateness of the governance type in a particular site**, including whether it enables effective and equitable governance.

– **Governance *diversity***, or the variety of appropriate governance types recognised and supported within protected and conserved area systems.

Box 6: Example governance assessment methodologies

Governance assessment methodologies used in protected and conserved areas in the region include:

Equity Questionnaire	Prototype questionnaire used as part of a broader research project
Forest Governance Framework	Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance
GAPA	Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas
ICCA SSP	An ICCA resilience and security assessment, which includes governance assessment, done as part of a broader self-strengthening process
MJUMITA Dashboard Tool	Community Forest Governance Dashboard developed with communities by the Community Forest Conservation Network of Tanzania, known locally as MJUMITA
RFGI Analysis	Responsive Forest Governance Initiative assessments / analyses using the Choice and Recognition Framework
SAGE (provisional name)	Site-Assessment of Governance and Equity - the provisional name of a developing methodology to be piloted in Tanzania and Zambia
TAI Analysis	Governance analyses done as part of The Access Initiative (TAI)
WCPA Guidelines no. 20	An assessment methodology for protected and conserved area sites or systems described in IUCN WCPA Guidelines series no. 20 – Governance of Protected Areas – From understanding to action

Assessing Social Impacts

Social assessments have varied focus and scope (see Schreckenberg et al., 2010).[21] Some, particularly Social Assessment of Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA) (Franks et al., 2018b), are focused on assessing and addressing the positive and negative impacts of conservation on the wellbeing of local people, including whether benefits are equitably distributed and costs are effectively mitigated. SAPA also considers other dimensions of equity. Others methodologies, particularly the Protected Area Benefits Assessment Tool (PA-BAT) (Dudley and Stolton, 2008) focus more specifically on identifying protected area benefits. Yet others, particularly the Basic Necessities Survey (BNS) (Wilkie et al., 2015), are aimed at measuring poverty (broadly defined) in areas where protected and conserved areas or other conservation strategies are implemented, in part so that their impacts can be anticipated.

---

[21] Protected and conserved area social assessments arise in part from the recognition in the Durban Accord "that many costs of protected areas are born locally – particular by poor communities – while the benefits accrue globally" (WPC 2003: 2). In more recent years, some are also closely linked to efforts to understand equity in relation to protected and conserved areas in more in-depth ways (e.g. Franks et al., 2018b).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

34

Box 7: Example social assessment methodologies

Social assessment methodologies used in protected and conserved areas in the region include:

BNS	Basic Necessities Survey, including version adapted by Wildlife Conservation Society for use in conservation context
Forest-Poverty Linkages Toolkit	
Livelihoods Impact Assessment	
PA-BAT	Protected Area Benefits Assessment Tool
PEV	Participatory Economic Valuation
Photovoice	Participatory photography method for community-based evaluation, here used within broader study (Mahajan and Daw, 2016)
RSIA	Rapid Social Impact Assessment
SAPA	Social Assessment of Protected and Conserved Areas
SWIFT	Methodology for High-Frequency Forest-Poverty data collection

Linkages and Distinctions between Assessment Types

The relationships between management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments are being increasingly explored, including in relation to reporting on the equity element of Target 11 (e.g. Burgess et al., 2014; Corrigan et al., 2018; Franks et al., 2018a). While this topic is largely outside the scope of this report, it is useful to understand some key links and distinctions between them.

Many PAME assessment methodologies (including METT and RAPPAM) include a few questions pertaining to governance (e.g. participation) and/or social impacts (e.g. benefits). WH Outlook assessments incorporate a simplified version of PA-BAT.[22] Some, including EoH, go further in integrating governance and equity considerations, and others, e.g. IMET, are in the process of developing more governance related elements. However, **on the whole, PAME assessment methodologies do not address governance or social (equity) to a degree that enables sufficient understanding or action** (see, e.g. Burgess et al. 2014b; Corrigan et al. 2018).

---

[22] Further details available at www.worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org/benefits

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

35

Governance and social assessment methodologies overlap to varying degrees, e.g. around questions of benefit distribution. The updated version of SAPA, in particular, considers governance and equity, including equitable distribution of benefits and mitigation of costs as well as some aspects of rights, participation, and transparency (Franks et al., 2018b:17). However, on the whole, **governance assessments focus more on the structures and processes through which decisions are made and carried out while social assessments address the impacts of governance and management.**

Some methodologies inventoried for this report have joint focus on management effectiveness, governance, and/or social considerations (see Box 8). However, they tend to be tailored to a specific sub-sector (e.g. Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) risk assessment) or purpose (e.g. Whakatane Mechanism, IUCN Green List Standard).

The growing number of assessment methodologies – and the distinctions between them – raise challenging questions about the best way to enhance protected areas management effectiveness, governance, and social equity in robust and practical ways. Endless assessments are neither practical nor useful. At the same time, singular methodologies are (at present) unlikely to be sufficient. Some recent papers (Burgess et al. 2014b; Corrigan et al. 2018) raise a number of possible approaches to resolving this dilemma, including expanding the scope of existing methodologies and/or using more specialized assessments in complementary ways.[23] For now, however, there is clear value in understanding the range of options available, including when and how they can best be used.

Box 8: Example methodologies with mixed / integrated elements

Methodologies used in protected and conserved areas in the region that combine / integrate substantial elements of management effectiveness, governance, and/or social assessment include:

– Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) risk assessments of / including conserved forests

– IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

– Governance and social assessment using Sensemaker

– Governance and social assessment as part of the Whakatane Mechanism

---

[23] Notable, the CBD also invites Parties to include information about governance, equity, and/or social impacts in assessment of management effectiveness (e.g., Decision X/31, para. 19 (b); Decision XIII/2 para. 9(b)).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

36

Other Relevant Methodologies and Resources

In addition to the types of assessments described above, the inventory prepared for this report includes:[24]

– **Governance and social assessments conducted in landscapes that host protected and conserved areas** (see Box 9): The CBD Executive Secretary notes that, with respect to Target 11 implementation, "[p]rotected areas should be integrated into the wider land- and seascape, and relevant sectors" (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/INF/12/Rev.1, page 15). The ecological and social impacts of protected areas do not stop at their boundaries, and likewise their governance and management are not solely a matter of what happens within the area. Further, some conserved areas are part of (or all of) large landscapes, e.g. conserved rangelands in Eastern and Southern Africa (see IUCN WCPA, 2018). Given this, these **landscape assessments are relevant for understanding protected and conserved area governance and social impacts**. Further, some of the methodologies that have been used in landscape assessments, e.g. the IUCN Natural Resource Governance Framework (NRGF), can also be used in protected and conserved areas.

– **Innovative processes that involve elements of governance and social assessment**: For example, MIHARI, a network of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) in Madagascar, supports varied activities enabling communities to exchange experiences and build capacity, including to improve LMMA governance and advocate for their rights (email communication). Biocultural Community Protocols (BCPs) have also been developed in several countries in Africa, including Kenya (see Lassen et al., n.d. and Save Lamu, 2018). BCPs "articulate community-determined values, procedures and priorities", including with respect to protected and conserved areas. In developing BCPs, communities "set out rights and responsibilities under customary, state and international law as the basis for engaging with external actors such as governments, companies, academics and NGOs" (Natural Justice website).

– **Academic studies and other reports**: While not based on quickly replicable methodologies, these resources can serve as important sources of information and examples of other approaches to learning about protected and conserved areas. (See Annex 4)

---

[24] There are also many related experiences and resources not included in this inventory because, while relevant to the topic, they do not involve assessment per se. This includes case studies from Eastern and Southern Africa included in the ICCA Registry. The ICCA Registry – maintained by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) with support from the ICCA Consortium – includes detailed information about ICCAs. Among other functions, it enables custodians to share case studies about their ICCAs, including their multiple values and governance arrangements, based on free, prior and informed consent.

37

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

> **Box 9: Assessments in Landscapes with Protected and Conserved Areas**
>
> Governance and social assessments conducted in landscapes containing protected and conserved areas include (in chronological order):
>
> – Governance assessment in the Kilombero Valley, Tanzania, using the IUCN NRGF (NRGF, 2017)
>
> – Governance assessment and case study in the Garba Tula rangelands, Kenya (IUCN, 2011 and Roba, 2014)
>
> – Governance assessment of landscape including and surrounding Mt. Marsabit, Kenya (Robinson, 2013)
>
> – Governance-focused analysis using the Nature, Wealth, and Power framework in forests of the Menabe region, Madagascar (Raik and Decker, 2007)
>
> – Scenario building exercise in two micro-catchments in Chivi District, Zimbabwe (Campbell et al. 2000)
>
> – Social assessment (Basic Necessities Survey) and governance assessment (Natural Resource Governance Tool) in the Mamabay Landscape / Seascape, which includes Makira Natural Park, Masoala National Park and Antongil Bay in Madagascar (WCS, nd.)

Limitations and Challenges of Assessments

Along with the many potential benefits of assessing protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social impacts, there are limitations and risks to be aware of. Some are reviewed briefly here and explored further throughout this report.

These challenges and limitations are not reasons to avoid doing assessments. Rather, they highlight the importance of conducting assessments appropriately, including with openness and a commitment to responsive action.

Assessment is not just a technical exercise. It is also political and social process, and can have political and social benefits and costs. The question of who participates has important implications, including whose perspectives are (and are not) reflected in the results. Further, some governance assessments (and, to a lesser extent, social assessments) ask challenging questions about the nature and distribution of power, benefits, and costs. This can, if not approached appropriately, exacerbate underlying conflicts (KII; Franks and Booker, 2018).

Related to the point above, while assessment results can inform positive change, without effective and appropriate communication, they may also be misinterpreted or used in unintended ways, e.g. to make unwarranted comparisons (KII).

Assessments can pose a number of technical challenges. Often, they both generate new knowledge and rely on existing knowledge. Lack of quality baseline data was raised as a concern for the accuracy of some PAME assessments,

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

38

in particular (KII). Assessments also deal with complex and dynamic issues. Lack of understanding of the concept of governance, for example, was raised as an obstacle to effective assessment (KII). Attribution is also a common challenge, particularly in social assessment – e.g. figuring out whether and how the impacts that people are experiencing arise from protected area governance and management decisions (KII). Assessments may also uncover issues that cannot be directly addressed by the actors involved – e.g. site-level challenges that are grounded in broader policy or political issues. Some of these challenges can be addressed, at least in part, by selecting appropriate methodologies and implementing them well.

Finally, doing an assessment can (rightly) raise the expectation that the issues identified will be responded to. Yet making change in response to what is learned requires a variety of resources and, in many cases, political will and coordination across sectors and levels, which may or may not be available. (KIIs)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

39

Part 4:

Scope and Distribution of Assessment Use

This section provides reflections on:

– What methodologies are being used in the region

– Where and when these assessments have been done

– What the main trends and gaps are with respect to this use

Overall Trends

The inventory included nearly 3,600 assessments and other studies/ reports in total (see Table 1 and Annexes 2 and 4). Of these, 3,337 are protected and conserved area assessments using replicable methodologies developed for management effectiveness, governance, and/or social assessment. The remainder of the analysis in this section addresses these 3,337 assessments. The vast majority are management effectiveness focused (see Figure 1). Inventoried assessments are concentrated in South Africa, Tanzania, Madagascar, and Kenya (in descending order of frequency) (see Figure 2). At least one assessment was identified in nearly all countries in Eastern and Southern Africa, with the exceptions of Comoros,[25] Eritrea,[26] and Somalia.[27] There is a modest overall trend towards more assessments being done per year, though the greatest numbers were found to have been done 2013 - 2015 (see Figure 3).

Table 1: Inventory Content	
Protected and conserved area management effectiveness assessments	2,878
Protected and conserved area governance assessments	378
Protected and conserved area social assessments	50
Assessments that focus on two or more elements of those above	31
Social assessments in landscapes with protected and/or conserved areas	14
Governance assessments in landscapes with protected and/or conserved areas	8
Other relevant reports and studies[28]	235
TOTAL	**3594**

---

[25] For Comoros, the broader inventory includes two case studies concern governance and social aspects of co-management in Mohéli MPA (see Granek and Brown, 2005 and Poonian et al., 2008). It also includes a report from a participatory planning process to propose new protected areas in the country, including surveys of local perceptions and attitudes about conservation.
[26] For Eritrea, the broader inventory includes a Law Enforcement Capacity Assessment done as part of the CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) Minimising the Illegal Killing of Elephants and other Endangered Species (MIKES) Project. See https://cites.org/eng/node/17898
[27] For Somalia, the broader inventory includes guidelines for engaging on pastoralist issues (including governance), which is based on case examples and analysis from countries in ESA, including Somalia (IUCN, 2012); and ongoing research project, which includes Somalia (see Chao et al. 2018), and Somalia's 5th national report to the CBD, which touches on issues concerning protected areas system governance and management (Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources of Somalia, 2014). See Annex 4
[28] Other" refers to academic studies and other reports that include analysis / assessment of management effectiveness, governance, and/or social impact elements, but that do not constitute complete assessments using readily replicable methodologies.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

41

Figure 1: Protected and Conserved Area Assessments by Type[29]

Legend:
- Management Effectiveness
- Governance
- Social
- Combination

Values shown: 50, 31, 378, 2878

Figure 2: Protected and Conserved Area Assessments by Country (Total: 3,337)

Country	Value
Angola	4
Botswana	9
Djibouti	1
Eswatini	7
Ethiopia	29
Kenya	147
Lesotho	1
Madagascar	487
Malawi	30
Mauritius	13
Mozambique	49
Multiple	3
Namibia	55
Rwanda	6
Seychelles	12
South Africa	1606
South Sudan	4
Sudan	2
Tanzania	707
Transboundry	5
Uganda	73
Zambia	75
Zimbabwe	18

---

[29] Tables in this sub-section exclude assessments done in landscapes and resources in "other" category.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Figure 3: Protected and Conserved Area Assessments by Year (Total: 3,337)

Management Effectiveness Assessments

By Methodology/ Tool (See Figure 4 and Annex 2):[30] Nearly 2,880 management effectiveness assessments were inventoried, including 80 sites that were part of system-level RAPPAM assessments.

While at least 12 PAME methodologies have been used in the region, **METT assessments comprise over 75%** (2,224) of these. This figure includes assessments repeated in singular sites (see Annex 2), and country-adapted versions of METT. Not surprisingly, METT was also the assessment used across the greatest number of countries in the region (see below).

The next most frequently used have been:[31]

– BirdLife IBA Monitoring: 125 (4% of inventoried PAME assessments)

– SMART: 109 (4% of inventoried PAME assessments)

– RAPPAM: 80 sites included within four assessments (3% of inventoried PAME assessments)

– WH Outlook Report: 47 sites included within two assessments (2% of inventoried PAME assessments)

Other useful PAME methodologies that have been less widely used in the region to date include:

– EoH, used in 14 sites in Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Seychelles, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda between 2003 and 2014 (https://whc.unesco.org/en/eoh/)

– West Indian Ocean MPA, piloted in at least[32]

---

[30] Figures in this section come from a compilation of GD-PAME results (UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019), interview responses and survey responses, except where otherwise noted.
[31] The specific methodology is unknown for 200 of the inventoried PAME assessments due to phrasing in survey responses.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

43

seven sites in Kenya, Seychelles, and Tanzania in 2003 (Wells, 2014)

– IMET assessments completed in Uganda and Kenya, with use expected to increase in coming years, including as it is required for

areas receiving funding from the European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO). (BIOPAMA and IUCN, 2016)

Figure 4: Inventoried PAME Assessments by Methodology / Tool (Total: 2,878)

Repeated Assessments: METT assessments have been repeated in a large proportion of sites (see Annex 2) and, in more recent years, have been done annually or bi-annually in state-governed protected areas in South Africa,[33] Madagascar,[34] and Zambia. WH Outlook Reports were completed across 24 sites in 2014 and again in 2017.

By Governance Type: Of the 2,241 inventoried management effectiveness assessments in sites with a reported governance type,[35] over 95% were conducted in government-governed protected areas, followed by community governance (2%), private governance (2%), and shared governance (less than 1%). However, these figures come with several important caveats, including that governance type reporting rates in the WDPA

---

[32] Analysis suggests that further assessments were done in Kenyan MPAs between 2003 and 2005. The methodology for these is not specified in the analysis because more research is needed to clarify whether this was done with WIO MPA framework or the more expansive WCPA-Marine methodology. Leverington et al. 2008 note that: "Management effectiveness assessments were subsequently carried out in all Kenyan MPAs (except the Diani-Chale MPA) between 2003 and 2005. The findings of the MEAs of the Malindi and Watamu MPA complex and the Mombasa MPA have been reported in Muthiga (2006, and 2007 respectively)". https://www.oceandocs.org/bitstream/handle/1834/8325/ASC-1253933-09.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

[33] These annual or bi-annual assessments have been undertaken country-wide since a national audit in 2013. Many other METT, RAPPAM, and other assessments were also undertaken before this regular cycle was implemented.

[34] These annual assessments began in 2016, using a variety of management assessment methodologies, and have been repeated since 2018, using METT as a standardized methodology.

[35] As reported in WDPA or, if not available, other assessment-specific published literature.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

44

are relatively low in Eastern and Southern Africa (Belle et al., 2015) and that, even where reported, governance type may be contested or understood differently by different actors.[36]

These caveats notwithstanding, the dominance of government-governed protected areas with PAME assessment may reflect, among other factors, the low proportion of community and private governance among those areas with reported type in the region (Belle et al., 2015:5), and the fact that several governments are using METT in all the protected areas they govern.

By Country (See Figure 5 and Annex 2): At least one management effectiveness assessment was identified from each country in the region, with the exceptions of Comoros, Eritrea, and Somalia.[37] The majority of these were in South Africa (56%), followed by Madagascar (17%), Tanzania (12%), Kenya (4%), Mozambique, Namibia, Uganda, and Zambia (2% each). It is important to note that these are percentages of the total number of inventoried PAME assessments, and not the proportion of assessed areas within a given country. Further, in some countries, including eSwatini, assessments are being done with increasing frequency (KII).

By Year (See Figure 6 and 7 and Annex 2): While there is variation, the number of management effectiveness assessments done annually in the region has generally been increasing over time. The number of METT assessments, in particular, are increasingly annually.

---

[36] For example, Village Land Forest Reserves (VLFRs) in Tanzania are generally reported as being under community governance in the WDPA, but, as they are often governed by elected village government bodies, are understood as being under (municipal) government governance in the ongoing systems-level governance assessment in Tanzania under the ICCA Global Support Initiative (KII). It is also increasingly recognised that the de jure and de facto governance types may be different in many protected areas (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2013) and that some ICCAs are overlapped by government-governed or other protected areas (e.g. Stevens et al. 2016).
[37] Consistent with it being the mostly widely used PAME tool in the region, METT in particular was found to have been used at least once in each country, with the three mentioned exceptions, plus Sudan.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

45

BIOPAMA
From Knowledge to Action for a Protected Planet

Figure 5: Distribution of Inventoried PAME Assessments by Country (Total: 2,878)

Angola: 4, Botswana: 9, Djibouti: 1, Eswatini: 6, Ethiopia: 27, Kenya: 112, Lesotho: 1, Madagascar: 476, Malawi: 29, Mauritius: 13, Mozambique: 45, Namibia: 44, Rwanda: 5, Seychelles: 12, South Africa: 1606, South Sudan: 4, Sudan: 2, Tanzania: 340, Transboundry: 5, Uganda: 53, Zambia: 70, Zimbabwe: 14

Figure 6: Inventoried Management Effectiveness Assessments by Year (Total: 2,878)

Total
Linear (Total)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

46

Figure 7: Inventoried METT Assessments by Year (Total: 2,224)

Governance Assessments

By Methodology / Tool (See Figure 8 and Annex 2):

Of the roughly 380 inventoried governance assessments, the vast majority (333) are site-level assessments done in Tanzania between 2011 and 2013 using the Community Forest Governance Dashboard (MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014 and email communication). Other site-level assessments included:

– Seven GAPA assessments in sites in Kenya, Uganda and Zambia between 2017 and now (two ongoing) (Franks and Booker, 2018 and KII)

– Two analyses using the RGFI 'choice and recognition' framework (Kenya and Uganda)

– Four assessments in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe testing a prototype equity questionnaire (Zafra-Calvo et al., 2017) and two planned governance

and equity assessments (Tanzania and Zambia 2019 / 2020) using a developing methodology provisionally called SAGE (personal communication)

Several systems-level governance assessments were also identified, i.e.

– Ongoing assessment of the (customary and statutory) laws, policies, and practices recognising and supporting ICCAs (territories of life) in Tanzania (KII).

– Continent-wide analysis of governance diversity (Belle et al., 2015)

– Analysis of Madagascar's protected areas code using The Access Initiative (TAI) framework (Moses, 2011)

Some assessments bridge the site and systems levels, e.g. a set of 20 similarly-constructed case studies undertaken in 2015 as contributions to three meta-analyses of governance types in the region (see Franks and Booker, 2015; Stolton and Dudley, 2015a; and Wicander, 2015).

Figure 8: Inventoried Governance Assessments by Methodology (Total:378)

Legend:
- MUJUMITA Dashboard
- Case Study
- GAPA
- Equity Questionnaire
- Meta-analysis
- RFGI analysis
- ProFor Forest Governance Framework
- Principles-based evaluation (various)
- SAGE (provisional name)
- TAI Analysis
- Mixed-Methods
- WCPA Guidelines no. 20

By Governance Type: Of the nearly 290 governance assessments in sites with a reported governance type, 65% are reported in WDPA as community governed, followed by 29% government governed, 2% privately governed, and 4% co-governed. This is notably different from governance type in management effectiveness assessments (where the vast majority are in government-governed areas). It is possible that governance assessments may be more welcomed under community and shared governance, where there is often emphasis on inclusive processes (KII). However, it is difficult to draw concrete conclusions without more information given the (above) caveats regarding governance type reporting.

In Relation to Literature: Governance is addressed in nearly 80% of the academic studies and other reports included in the inventory (see Annex 2A and 4).

By Country (See Figure 9 and Annex 2): The majority of inventoried governance assessments were done in relatively few countries (including Tanzania, Namibia, Kenya, Madagascar, and Uganda). The outsized representation of Tanzania in this distribution is due primarily to the 333 assessments using the MJUMITA Community Forest Governance Dashboard.[38]

---

[38] Notably, while over half of inventoried management effectiveness assessments were conducted in South Africa, no governance or social assessments were identified in the country (aside from academic studies and other reports – see Annex 2 and 4).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

48

Figure 9: Inventoried Governance Assessments by Country (Total:378)

Legend:
- Tanzania
- Namibia
- Kenya
- Madagascar
- Uganda
- Multiple
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

By Year: (See Table 2 and Annex 2): While most inventoried governance assessments have been done relatively recently, and interviews suggest that they will increase over time, it is difficult to ascertain a clear trend. This is in part because of the concentration of assessments between 2011 and 2013 using the MJUMITA Dashboard. Most of the assessments completed in 2015 were case studies that contributed to a meta-analyses (Franks and Booker, 2015; Stolton and Dudley, 2015a; and Wicander, 2015).

Table 2: Inventoried Governance Assessments by Year	
2006 – 2010	2
2011 – 2015	359
2016 – 2020 (including planned and ongoing)	17
TOTAL	**378**

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

49

Social Assessments

By Methodology / Tool (See Figure 10 and Annex 2): The nearly 50 inventoried social assessments include:

- Nineteen SAPA assessments across 18 sites in Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (Franks and Small 2016, KII, email communication)

- Combined PEV and RSIA assessments in five sites (CARE et al., 2008)

- Four assessments based on the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (Ashley and Hussein, 2000; Vedeld et al., 2012; Ward et al., 2018)

- PA-BAT assessments in Ethiopia and Tanzania (Bunderforste, 2009 and Dudley et al., 2008)

- Forest-Poverty Linkages Toolkit assessments in Madagascar and Uganda (ProFor, 2008, KII)

- Two assessments in Namibia to test a wellbeing-based methodology (Jones, 2014)

- Two BNS done as part of broader studies (Harrison, 2013; Travers et al., 2017)

- Eight other methodologies used in one site

Figure 10: Inventoried Social Assessments by Methodology (Total: 50)

Legend:
- SAPA
- PEV
- RISA
- Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
- BNS
- PA-BAT
- Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit
- Wellbeing Assessment
- SWIFT
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
- Mixed-Methods
- Participatory Video
- Discrete Choice Experiment
- Participatory Mapping
- Socio-Economic Study
- Photovoice

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

50

each (see below)

By Governance Type: Of the 21 social assessments in an area with a reported governance type, 11 are government governed, 4 are under shared governance, 3 are under community governance and 3 are privately governed. (The caveats above regarding governance type reporting apply here as well).

In Relation to Other Assessments and Literature: While not inventoried as social assessments, WH Outlook assessments incorporate a simplified version of PA-BAT. Further, over 40% of the academic studies and other reports inventoried address social impacts (see Annex 2A and 4).

By Country (See Figure 11 and Annex 2): Inventoried social assessments are concentrated in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Madagascar, and Mozambique, and smaller numbers in Ethiopia, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

Figure 11: Inventoried Social Assessments by Country (Total:50)

By Year (See Figure 12 and Annex 2): While the frequency of social assessments appears to be increasing only very slightly overtime, this trend is substantially influenced by the combined PEV and RSIA assessments done around 2006.

Social assessment numbers are anticipated to increase as interest in and experience with these assessments grow, particularly with regard to SAPA (KII, SR).

Figure 12: Inventoried Social Assessments by Year (Total:50)

Assessments with Combined/Integrated Focus

The just-over 30 inventoried "combined" assessments,[39] i.e. those that have a combined focus on management effectiveness, governance, and/or social assessment, include (See Figure 13 and Annex 2):

– Twenty FSC risk assessments in conserved forests in Tanzania, eSwatini, and Rwanda[40]

– Five Green List assessments in three conservancies in Kenya in 2014 and 2018, including two re-certifications

– A variety of innovative dialogue-based processes, including the Whakatane Mechanism (used in one site in Kenya in 2011), Sensemaker (used in two sites in Uganda in 2018), participatory mapping (including in one site in Kenya in 2011), and assessments conducted within the broader ICCA Self-Strengthening Process (including in Tanzania in 2018)

Most of these assessments are relatively recent. This may reflect a trend towards increasingly holistic assessments (at least with respect to including social and governance considerations), but more evidence is needed to ascertain this. Inventoried assessments in this category are concentrated in Tanzania, Namibia, and Kenya. The Green List certification process is not yet widely accessible in Eastern and Southern Africa (so far only in Kenya) but it is expanding, including to Tanzania, South Africa and Madagascar.

---

[39] This categorisation involves a judgment call insofar as many assessment methodologies include management effectiveness, social, and governance issues to some extent. This 'combined' category includes those that integrate elements in a way, or to an extent, that makes their categorisation in one of the three other areas particularly difficult.
[40] Inventory includes three national assessments in eSwatini, Rwanda, and Tanzania that include conserved forests, among other areas, (FSC webpage) and 17 reserved forests in villages in Southeastern Tanzania seeking to join the MCDI hosted group certificate (MCDI webpage).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

52

Figure 13: Inventoried 'Combined' Assessments by Methodology / Tool (Total:31)

Legend:
- FSC Risk Assessment
- Green List
- Sensemaker
- Participatory Mapping
- Wahakatane Mechanism

Summary and Analysis

Management Effectiveness Assessments

Compared with governance and social assessments, a **relatively large number of management effectiveness assessments have been conducted** in the region – nearly 2,880 were inventoried, including repeated assessments in individual sites – and the frequency of their use appears to be increasing over time. There is also still **room for further their expansion**,[41] including across more countries in the region and within areas under shared or non-state governance.

While at least 12 PAME methodologies/ tools have been used in the region, **over 75% of inventoried PAME assessments used METT** or a country-adapted version thereof. The dominance of METT (as compared to other PAME methodologies) is likely to continue, including because South Africa, Madagascar, and Zambia are doing annual or bi-annual assessments across state-governed protected areas using country-adapted versions of METT.

RAPPAM is the PAME tool most commonly used at systems-level, but the last inventoried use was in 2006. The other most frequently used PAME assessments (aside from METT and RAPPAM) are specific to a country (e.g. the Management Effectiveness Assessment for Madagascar's Protected Area System) or institution (e.g. BirdLife IBA and WH Outlook assessments).

---

[41] This finding is broadly consistent with the 2018 Protected Planet Report finding that a relatively small proportion (20%) of protected areas in the WDPA (globally) report having done a management effectiveness assessment (UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS, 2018:1).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

53

Some more comprehensive assessments have also been used in the region, though less frequently. These include EoH, West Indian Ocean MPA assessment, and IMET. Of these, IMET use seems most likely to increase, including in the context of DG DEVCO funded projects.

Governance and Social Assessments and Related Studies

Relatively few social assessments (50) were found to have been done in the region using readily replicable methodologies. **More governance assessments were inventoried (just under 380). However, 333 of these were under a single project** in Tanzania (using MJUMITA Dashboard). The remainder include both site-level (e.g. using GAPA) and systems-level assessments (e.g. using the process in WCPA Guidelines no. 20), and some that infer system-level trends by looking across site-level experience (e.g. Franks and Booker, 2015; Stolton and Dudley 2015; and Wicander, 2015).

There are also **linkages between methodologies** that are not well reflected in these individual counts. For example, IUCN WCPA Guidelines no. 20 were an input in forming the GAPA methodology (Franks and Booker, 2018) and the process described in the Guidelines is being used in Green List assessments going forward (KII). Likewise, as noted, a simplified PA-BAT is included in WH Outlook assessments.

It is difficult to assess the extent to which social and governance assessments are increasing over time, including because of their relatively fewer numbers. Analysis shows a slight increase in social assessments over time and interviews suggest that, in particular, there is growing interest in SAPA (KII). Governance assessments are anticipated to increase, including to report on the equity element of Target 11 (KII).

Compared with management effectiveness assessments, governance and social assessments appear to have been conducted in areas under **more diverse governance types**, though the scope and nature of governance-type reporting makes this hard to verify.

Collectively, these trends suggest a **substantial need for further governance and social assessments in the region**, including across a wider range of countries and for understanding changes over time.

However, **99% of inventoried academic studies and other reports and approaches focus in whole or part on governance and/or social equity or impacts**.[42] These demonstrate growing interest in these issues and are excellent sources of information.

Likewise, while outside the scope of this analysis, there are **14 inventoried social assessments and 8 inventoried governance assessments done in landscapes that include protected and/or conserved areas**, some of which use protected and conserved area applicable methodologies (e.g. NRGF), and all of which can serve as important examples of how to understand social and governance aspects of protected and conserved areas in relationship to their broader landscapes.

Assessments with Combined / Integrated Focus

The inventory includes just over 30 assessments

---

[42] About 34% of inventoried academic assessments and reports include management effectiveness as a whole or partial focus.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

54

using methodologies categorised as 'combined'. These include assessments based on two standards – the Green List and the FSC standard – as well as a number of innovative processes that have been used so far only in small numbers - e.g. Whakatane Mechanism, Sensemaker, and assessments undertaken as part of the broader ICCA self-strengthening process. Where such assessments are used in lieu of more specific management effectiveness, governance, or social assessments, it will be important to understand their relative strengths and any gaps.

Considerations for the BIOPAMA Programme and Partners

The preceding analysis suggests that the BIOPAMA programme and partners may wish to:

– Encourage and support more governance and social assessments in the region

– Continue to support PAME assessments, including: encouraging use in more countries and in more diverse governance types, ensuring that METT is being used in line with best practice (given its scope of use), and considering use of other PAME methodologies, including for systems-level assessments

– Use available information from other studies and assessments (including landscape assessments)

– Recognise and support innovative approaches that enhance effective and equitable governance.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

55

Part 5:

Reflections and Lessons from Assessments

This section provides broad reflections on:

– Common objectives and motivations for assessment and methodology selection

– Common practice regarding who convenes and participates in assessments[43]

– Resources typically required, e.g. time, costs, and technical resources

– Public availability of information about assessments

– Best practice considerations, taking into account:

• Benefits and drawbacks of doing an assessment

• Strengths and challenges in the use of common methodologies

Annex 3 provides more detailed information about specific methodologies that are (or have been) commonly used in protected and conserved areas the region.[44]

In sum, assessments often have multiple, inter-related objectives, which vary by, among other factors, the methodology and the perspectives of actors involved. Common objectives include:

- *In most cases*, better understanding the current situation

- *In many cases*, developing recommendations to make adaptations or improvements

- *In some cases*, monitoring change over time

PAME assessment methodologies (and the concept of management effectives) appear to be generally better known than governance and social assessment methodologies. For METT, in particular, mandated use by the World Bank and Global Environmental Facility (GEF) has been a significant factor in its wide use and familiarity in the region (KII). This has positive impacts, including generating large amounts of data about management effectiveness and helping to initiate use beyond GEF projects, e.g. as a system-wide tool in a number of countries in the region (KII). It has also had drawbacks, including creating an incentive to do assessments in rote or 'box-ticking' manner because they are viewed as an external requirement (KIIs). This experience highlights the **importance of understanding whose motivations are driving assessments, and approaching assessments in ways that support meaningful learning and action**. Governance and social assessments are not, yet, required in such system-wide ways, but lessons from METT could be applied if they are in the future.

---

[43] Some important limitations are worth re-stating here, including that this report does not consider the quality of participation in any given methodology or in any individual assessment. Further, there are important, open questions regarding who has the power and responsibility convene and participate in assessments across different governance types. While this is touched on here as an important factor for consideration, this is not a question that can be sufficiently addressed within the scope of this assessment.

[44] For each methodology, this annex includes a general description, scope of usage in the region, key strengths and limitations, other considerations for best-practice use, and key resources.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

57

Assessment Objectives and Motivations

Objectives of Management Effectiveness Assessments

Generally, PAME assessments are aimed at understanding the current state of management, with respect to all or some of the WCPA PAME Framework elements (see Section 1) and, from this, identifying adaptations; informing resource allocation decisions; providing information about a protected area to senior management, funding bodies, the public, or others; and supporting and promoting the values of the protected area (Hockings et al., 2015:894, 895).[45]

While some methodologies are designed to enable tracking over time, in practice, consistent monitoring appears to be relatively rare unless there is a specific plan or policy for doing so. Key examples include government-required use of METT at set intervals (e.g., in Madagascar, South Africa, and Zambia) and periodic assessment in World Heritage sites (WH Outlook Reports in 2014 and 2017). Repeated METT assessments have also been done in three sites in eSwatini, with plans to continue (KII) and in various sites, but not consistently, in Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, and Uganda, among others (see Annex 2).

Objectives of Governance Assessments

Consistent with the focus of social assessment as described in Section 3, inventoried governance assessments have been done with the objectives of, among others,

– Assessing governance equity and effectiveness ('quality'), including identifying

strengths and challenges and identifying ways to improve the current situation - e.g. in use of GAPA (Franks and Booker, 2018) and governance dashboards (Child, 2007 and MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014), among others. GAPA, in particular, seeks to understand the root causes of governance challenges. Facilitators are encouraged to ask participants why challenges are arising, not just what they are. This in-depth inquiry is a strength of the methodology, as well as a challenge insofar as it can raise particularly difficult issues (KII).

– Assessing governance diversity, including identifying ways to strengthen or support diverse governance types – e.g., in a systems-level assessment in Tanzania (KII) and a case study series (Franks and Booker, 2015; Stolton and Dudley, 2015a; and Wicander, 2015)

Governance assessments are not yet being widely used to track change over time. Establishing a baseline and tracking changes was an objective of the MJUMITA governance dashboard (MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014), but it is not clear that this has been done following project closure. In some other governance assessments, including GAPA, the process itself aims to establish a baseline and key issues to be monitored and acted on (as part of the process) rather than being designed for repeated assessment.

Objectives of Social Assessments

Consistent with the focus of social assessment as described in Section 3, inventoried social assessments have been done with diverse objectives including, among others:

---

[45] These objectives, summarised by Hockings et al., 2015, are consistent with those reported in surveys and interviews for this report.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

58

- Understanding "the impacts of conservation on human wellbeing at a local level [and] the distribution of these social impacts" and generating "ideas for improving the situation" in use of SAPA (Franks et al., 2018b:14)

- Identifying protected area benefits (Bunderforste, 2009; Dudley et al., 2008)

- Collecting detailed information about socioeconomic conditions around or within a protected area, using BNS or other household / areas surveys (e.g. Harrison, 2013; Travers et al., 2013)

Donor Requirement as Assessment Driver

Management effectiveness assessments are required by some funding agencies. This can have both positive and negative implications. For example, the World Bank and GEF have required METT assessments in protected areas they fund. This has helped expand METT use in the region (within and beyond GEF projects), raised awareness about METT, and helped generate a large amount of data (KIIs). At the same time, an external assessment requirement can create incentives to inflate or otherwise manipulate scores and encourage assessments to be done as 'box ticking' to meet an obligation rather than as a process of substantive reflection (KIIs). In particular, less in-depth assessments may generate a METT score while skipping or providing too little information about evidence (why a score is given) and next steps (what can be done to address concerns) (KII).[46] This in not inevtibale, however. At least one respondent indicated that they felt strong ownership over and commitment to METT assessments in their jurisdiction, despite the external obligation (KII). In all cases, lessons from the impact of donor-requiredMETT assessments could be taken

into account in other contexts, e.g. IMET in DG DEVCO funded projects and if governance or social assessments are systematically required in the future.

Assessments for Reporting to National Level

METT assessments are now required country-wide on annual or bi-annual basis in state-governed protected areas in Madagascar, South Africa, and Zambia.[47] These initiatives are clearly 'country-owned', including using country-adapted versions of METT. At the same time, interviews suggest that such institutionalised use can have both positive and negative implications, which can largely mirror those described above, depending on, inter alia, whether the emphasis is placed on the METT score (to be centrally reported) or the substantive learning and action (KIIs).

The points above are not meant to discourage wide use of assessments, but rather to underscore the **importance of structuring them in ways that focus on learning, even when externally or centrally required**.

Assessments as Part of Methodology Development

A number of assessments appear to have been motivated, in part, by international and national organisations piloting new methodologies. This includes West Indian Ocean MPA assessments in 2003 (Wells, 2004), EoH assessments between 2003 and 2007 (See Annex 2), early SAPA assessments (Franks and Small, 2016), assessments using community dashboards in Namibia (Child, 2007), and recent GAPA assessments (Franks and Booker, 2018). In some

---

[46] The updated METT handbook stresses the importance of doing the assessment in full, including the 'next steps' (see Stolton and Dudley, 2016 and Annex 3).
[47] In South Africa, this country-wide initiative appears to have arisen in part because METT assessments were already being required by World Bank and GEF (see above) and because governing authorities were aware of the tool through professional connections, including in WCPA (KII, per. communication).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

59

cases, methodologies do not appear to have been widely used following these pilots (e.g. West Indian Ocean MPA), while in other cases, post-pilot use has continued (e.g. EoH) and may be increasing (e.g. SAPA).

Doing assessments to pilot and refine new methodologies raises the question of whose interests are being met. This analysis found that many pilot assessments are done at the invitation of, or at least in agreement with, local partners, and in ways that advance local interests (KIIs; Wells, 2004; http://whakatane-mechanism.org/). Further, while some methodologies have been largely externally developed, others are developed in partnership with and/or based on the experience of local actors – e.g. community dashboards (Child, 2007 and MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014), the Whakatane Mechanism, the ICCA SSP, and the developing SAGE methodology). Others are adapted based on learning with local partners – e.g., the West Indian Ocean MPA (Wells, 2004). Nonetheless, **questions of who has power to define and adapt assessment content and methods are important, including for ensuring that they are locally meaningful**.

Assessment Use within Specific Organisations or Projects

Some management effectiveness assessments are required as part of reporting /monitoring within specific global initiatives, including periodic WH Outlook assessments. Some are also regularly used by specific NGOs, often the ones that have developed or refined the methodology. This includes wide use of METT and (less so, recently) RAPPAM by WWF, use of IMET within BIOPAMA, use of BNS and a landscape governance assessment tool by WCS, use of the ICCA self-strengthening process within the ICCA Global Support Initiative, and use of the MJUMITA dashboard within Tanzania.

Assessment for Certification

Assessments are sometimes conducted to obtain certification under a standard. The IUCN Green List, for example, creates a powerful incentive to be recognised for good management and governance. While use of the Green List has been limited in the region, there is growing interest, including with planned expansion to Madagascar, South Africa and Tanzania (KII). FSC certification has been sought by, among others, villages joining the Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative's (MCDI) group certificate for better timber prices (MCDI website).

Other Motivations

Other objectives and motivations include:

- Reporting to CBD (though this was mentioned by surprisingly few respondents)
- Seeking resolution or redress of issues in a specific situation (e.g. Whakatane Mechanism)
- Articulating and claiming / defending specific rights, responsibilities, and relationships (e.g. BCPs)
- Drawing broader conclusions (e.g. academic studies)
-

Motivations for Management Effectiveness vs. Governance and Social Assessment

A full analysis of reasons for the gaps between the number of management effectiveness vs. governance and social assessments is beyond the scope of this report. However, interviews suggest that some inter-related reasons include: longer-term existence of the PAME framework and some related methodologies (particularly METT);

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

60

donor requirements to use METT; availability of a low-cost and rapid methodology (i.e. METT); and, overall, greater familiarity and comfort with the concept of management effectiveness

and its importance, as compared to governance and equity (KIIs). Some of these issues could be addressed by the BIOPAMA programme, including within capacity-building exercises.

> **In sum**, assessments tend to be convened by the governing or managing bodies (which may be government, communities, private actors, or shared). This is often done together with external support actors, particularly in the case of newer methodologies and where substantial facilitation or training is required. The scope and nature of rightsholder and stakeholder participation varies by both the methodology and the context-specific process through which it is implemented. In general, PAME assessments appear to vary most widely in whether rightsholders and stakeholders participate, while governance assessments tend to be the most inclusive. Inclusivity is important in part because the assessment process itself (not just the results) can be a powerful opportunity for co-generation of knowledge. However, designing genuinely participatory processes can be challenging and deserves careful attention. Finally, especially as assessments are done outside of formal protected areas, and across more diverse governance types, there are critical questions about how and by whom assessments are done, including who has the mandate and legitimacy to convene and facilitate them and to make decisions about how information is used.

Reflections on Who Convenes and Participates in Assessments

Management Effectiveness Assessments

PAME assessments are often convened by protected area managers, sometimes (but not always) with NGO or donor technical support and financing. Specific arrangements vary, with one determining factor being the methodology – e.g. IMET assessments generally require direct technical support from trained facilitators, while METT assessments can largely be done without external support. Some organisations also regularly convene assessments using certain methodologies, working with site authorities (e.g. WWF use of METT, BirdLife IBA assessments, WH Outlook assessments). METT assessments are also sometimes 'outsourced' to external consultants who do all or part of the assessment,

working with managers to varying extents (KIIs). One interviewee raised concerns about whether consultant-led processes undermine key aspects of assessment (i.e. learning by doing) and overlook the more in-depth knowledge of local actors (KII).

General PAME guidance encourages stakeholder engagement (e.g. Hockings et al., 2015; Leverington et al. 2010). Further, guidance on many specific methodologies encourages stakeholder engagement as best practice, including because inclusive processes can yield more reliable results (e.g. Wells and Mangubhai, 2005; Ervin, 2003; Stolton and Dudley, 2016). At the same time, relatively few PAME assessment methodologies require rightsholder and stakeholder participation in the process (vs. presenting it as a best practice suggestion). Perhaps as a result, this analysis found wide variation in whether and how rightsholders and

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

61

stakeholders are engaged in PAME assessments in the region. For example, METT assessments in eSwatini were reported to involve wide community input, though done as separate consultations (SR, KII). METT assessments in South Africa appear to be more variable, with some involving community members and others being led by PA managers (or external consultants) with minimal input from wider communities (KII). Interviews suggest that conveners' reasons for limiting participation in assessments include concerns about the increased complexity (i.e. greater difficulty reaching consensus), extended time, greater costs, and opening managers' discussions to community / stakeholder visibility (KIIs). However, such complexities need to be balanced with the importance of inclusive processes for ensuring meaningful and legitimate processes and results.

Governance Assessments

Most of the inventoried governance assessments were convened by governing bodies (government, community, private, or shared) working together with national or international NGOs. These assessments are based on methodologies that are, by design, participatory, with rightsholders and stakeholders playing key roles in assessment (e.g., GAPA and community dashboards). This may be in part because of the centrality of participation and voice in the concept of governance itself.

Other inventoried governance assessments rely on individual response (e.g., equity questionnaire) or were done as researcher-led analyses (e.g. cases studies to inform governance diversity analyses).

Social Assessments

Most of the inventoried social assessments rely in part on surveys, which draw information from concerned rightsholders and stakeholders, but which are not participatory per se. However, in some cases the survey itself is the primary focus (e.g. in BNS) while in others surveys are a component of a broader, participatory and multi-stakeholder process (e.g. SAPA).

Assessments with Combined Focus

Assessments in the 'combined' category vary widely in terms of how and by whom they are convened and who participates in them. The Green List process, for example, starts with self-assessment by the managing / governing authority. This is followed up by a body of independent experts, which typically consults local rightsholders and stakeholders (KII). Sensemaker is inclusive, but primarily involves collection and analysis of individual or small group narratives. The Whakatane Mechanism process in Kenya was convened at the request of concerned rightsholders and facilitated engagement with other management authorities and stakeholders.

Ensuring Appropriate Conveners and an Ethical Process

Underpinning the discussion on who convenes and participates in assessments is the question of who has the mandate and legitimacy to do so… Who decides that an assessment is required, how and with whom it is done, and how and by whom the resulting information will be used?[48] In all cases, and especially as assessments are done in areas outside of formal protected areas

---

[48] The related issue of enabling genuinely inclusive processes is discussed below.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

62

and across more diverse governance types, these are critical considerations. In all cases, the assessment process, including use of any results, should follow ethical standards and respect the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities, including to free, prior and informed consent (see, among others, Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013 and Campese et al., 2019).

Resource Requirements for Assessment

The time, cost, and technical requirements of assessments are important, practical considerations. Pinpointing these resource requirements is challenging, however, because they vary and there is limited information.[49] With these caveats in mind, this sub-section and Annex 3 provide reflections on resource requirements for meaningful assessment.

In sum, the resources (time, financing) and technical skills required for assessments vary widely. Some methodologies, like METT, are designed to be relatively quick and low-cost, while others are more in-depth, like EoH and IMET, and are therefore more time consuming and costly (Bammert, 2018). Specific costs and time requirement also vary by the context (e.g. accessibility and social complexity of the site) and process. Capacity is another important resource, though can be built into the assessment process, e.g. by training facilitators and 'learning by doing'. Further, while it is necessary to minimise costs, this should be balanced with ensuring a meaningful assessment process and follow-up. Finally, there are important intangible resources that help ensure meaningful assessment, including commitment, openness, and enthusiasm for the process.

Time and Costs

A range of days, weeks, or months can be estimated for most methodologies (see Annex 3). However, specific time requirements depend on the context (e.g. site size and accessibility, social circumstances) and process (e.g. how many workshops are convened, how many participate, etc.). Likewise, while cost drivers are usually clear (e.g. travel, workshop expenses, etc.) specific costs vary by context and process. For example, METT takes one or two days (sometimes three) per assessment, with the time required on the higher end of this range when following the best-practice of including rightsholders and stakeholders (Bammert 2018;[50] Stolton and Dudley, 2016; KIIs; SRs). EoH, IMET, and West Indian Ocean MPA take more time and are more costly, including in terms of up-front preparation, but are also more in-depth assessments (Bammert, 2018 and Wells and Mangubhai, 2005).

---

[49] Some technical resources on how to do assessments provide a fairly detailed account of timeframes and steps (from which required skills can be inferred), including the SAPA methodology manual (Franks et al., 2018b). Other technical resources are more open ended about timeframes, presumably because the methodologies are more open ended, e.g. EoH toolkit (Hockings et al., 2008). While there are exceptions, individual assessment reports tend not to include these details.

[50] Bammert 2018 focuses on the updated / expanded Advanced METT. Our inventory did not identify specific use of Advanced METT, but, as noted above in the limitations section, this does not necessarily imply that it is not being used in the region.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

63

Regarding governance and social assessments, GAPA, SAPA, and the MJUMITA dashboard are relatively rapid (compared to some governance assessments) and low cost. However, they are also in-depth assessments of complex issues and involve multi-step, multi-stakeholder processes. As such, they take longer than many (not all) PAME assessments. SAGE, which is being developed, will be a more rapid and lower-cost option for governance and equity assessment, but may not provide the same depth of analysis. (See Annex 3 for more specific time and cost estimates.)

While resource requirements are important considerations, **assessment results will only be as good as the process**. Simply using the lowest-cost approach may mean missed opportunities for learning and change. This is true with respect to both the methodology selected and the process chosen to implement it – e.g. how inclusive the process is and how much time it is given. In reflecting on a sustainable livelihoods framework assessment in Kenya, Ashley and Hussein (2000:28, emphasis added) note that:

> "Ensuring the cost effectiveness of applying the methodology has two elements – minimising costs, but also maximising effectiveness, i.e. **if you're going to do it, do it well enough to be useful**. This means learning from mistakes and weaknesses, and investing sufficient time in analysis and dissemination".

Capacity and Commitment

As with time and costs, required technical resources and capacities vary. They generally involve a mix of the following, depending on the methodology:

- Knowledge of the context – including local history, languages, social-political context
- Shared understanding of the concepts and process
- Collection and analysis of laws, policies, and existing qualitative and quantitative data
- Stakeholder analysis / mapping
- Participatory process design
- Participatory process facilitation
- Survey / questionnaire design and administration
- Qualitative data / trend analysis
- Quantitative data / statistical analysis
- Report writing and communications
- Action planning, e.g. to follow up on assessment findings

Some of the above may seem self-evident, such as understanding of the process and concepts. However, dialogue to get to such shared understanding, or 'co-translation', is often an important step. Lack of shared understanding of the concept of 'governance', for example, has been a challenge in its assessment (KII).

While it is important to select a methodology appropriate to the context, lack of experience with formal assessments is not prohibitive. Local actors typically already have a great deal of knowledge about the context, which is in itself a key capacity (KIIs). In some cases, technical capacity building is also part of the process. IMET assessments are supported by coaches/ trained facilitators (Bammert, 2018). With both GAPA and SAPA, training facilitators is a key step (Franks and Booker, 2018; Franks et al., 2018b). Further, capacity is often built through 'learning-by-doing', and not everyone involved needs to have all the requisite experience upfront (KII).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

64

Finally, there are important intangible resources, including the enthusiasm and commitment of the conveners, facilitators, and participants. As summarised in WCPA Guidelines on. 20:

The governance assessment "process cannot be captured entirely on paper: it will become alive only when individuals will become its "champions". Champions have no need to be governance experts, but they should be committed to improve governance and have the qualities of awareness, integrity, credibility, enthusiasm and the capacity to inspire others" (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013:70).

In sum, technical guidance on how to do management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments is available, with some exceptions and with variation in the level of detail provided. Assessment reports (at least in summary form) are also available from some pilot assessments, academic research, and periodic global reports (e.g., WH Outlook Reports). However, overall, very few assessment reports, and no sources of detailed (raw) results, were found to be publicly available, particularly from assessments done by governments or other governing bodies in their own capacity (including with METT). This is an area where substantial improvement can be made.

Public Availability of Assessment Information

Availability of Technical Guidance for Conducting Assessments

Technical guidance on how to do assessments is publlically available for a number of methodologies (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2013; Ervin, 2003; Franks et al., 2018b; Hockings et al., 2008; Stolton and Dudley 2016). However, some methodologies are not well documented (yet), or the documentation may not be easily accessible, as in the case of IMET, which requires coaching / hands-on technical support (see Paolini et al., 2016).

Some technical guidance also evolves over time. Methodologies may be updated as concepts evolve or their limitations become clearer. For example, SAPA guidance has been updated to,

among other things, incorporate more reflection on equity and governance (Franks et al., 2018b). The 2016 METT Handbook includes best practice guidance based on its use over the years (Dudley and Stolton, 2016). METT itself has undergone evolutions and adaptations, including the more comprehensive Advanced METT (see Bammert 2018) and country-adapted versions (see Cowan et al. 2010 for a description of how METT-SA was developed).

Beyond this, there is widely available general guidance on selecting, adapting, and conducting PAME assessments (e.g. Hockings et al. 2006, Leverington et al. 2010 Annex 3) as well as broad guidance on the use and comparative advantages of various PAME tools (e.g. Leverington et al. 2008, www.protectedplanet.net).

For governance assessment methodologies, there are a few sources of overarching guidance

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

65

(e.g., Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013) and some available compilations of assessment tools and resources (e.g. Franks and Booker 2018 Annex 1). Likewise, for social assessment methodologies, there is at least one comparative analysis (Schreckenberg et al., 2010). However, governance and social assessments generally lack the type of unifying overarching guidance available for PAME.

Availability of Assessment Reports and Results

With respect to individual assessments, reports (at least in summary form) are available from many pilot assessments, academic research, and periodic global reports (e.g., WH Outlook Reports). Beyond these, assessment reports were found for very few inventoried management effectiveness assessments. Reasons for this vary. With respect to METT, several survey respondents indicated that the information is confidential, with some further noting that resources are not available to host information online. Green List assessments may be publically available in the future, but for now are housed within an internal system. Assessments reports are also not yet publicly available via GD-PAME.

Even where assessment reports are available, we did not identify any sources of detailed results (e.g. in raw, digital format). Some details, of course, should be retained internally, e.g. where there is sensitive information about governance challenges that could put assessment participants at risk. At the same time, providing as much information as possible can have benefits at the local level (e.g. ensuring that rightsholders and stakeholders who are not able to participate directly are informed about the process and results, including to hold actors accountable to follow-up) and more broadly (e.g. sharing lessons across contexts and levels, meeting national and global reporting

requirements, and identifying broad trends). Given that, the limited availability of assessment reports and results clearly indicates an aspect of assessment practice that could be improved, including through the BIOPAMA Programme, its Regional Observatories and regional information systems.

Best Practice Considerations

This section highlights some best-practice considerations for assessment. It draws on experience in the region with both benefits and drawbacks of having done an assessment and the strengths and challenges of particular methodologies. It also draws on general guidance on relevant assessments (including Bammert 2018; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Campese et al., 2019; Hockings et al., 2015; Leverington et al. 2010; and Stolton and Dudley, 2016). These considerations are largely cross-cutting. More assessment-specific considerations are provided in Annex 3.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

66

In sum, experience in the region and existing guidance suggest that key considerations include:

– **_For selecting and adapting methodologies_**: Consider both the objectives and available resources, noting that there may be trade-offs between these, and select or develop technically sound methodologies. Verify their appropriateness for the context and adapt them as needed. Strive to be both practical and ambitious in what you can learn and do with assessment.

– **_For ensuring meaningful process and results_**: Approach assessment as an inclusive learning process, while drawing on the best available information, being clear about assessment scope and timeframes, and verifying results.

– **_For making assessment a basis for meaningful action_**: Ensure (engender) political will and openness to change, dedicate resources, make a plan (not just recommendations) and/ or integrate assessment into regular planning cycles, communicate and coordinate across levels and sectors, including to share information, and establish a process for ongoing learning / monitoring.

Selecting and Adapting Appropriate Methodologies

– **Objectives**: Finding a methodology that meets your objectives is key. This may seem self-evident, but in practice it can be challenging to clearly define and agree upon what these objectives are… and whose they are. (See section above on assessment objectives and motivations.) Strive to be both practical and ambitious in what you can learn and do with assessment.

– **Resources and Capacities**: The selected methodology should be practical to implement, noting that this may require allocating additional resources, that people already hold important knowledge and capacities, and that further capacity can be built through the assessment process. (See section above on resource requirements).

– **Context Appropriateness**: Not all assessment approaches are appropriate in all contexts. For example, addressing governance, rights, and social impacts

is critical. At the same time, assessment processes should not exacerbate conflict without being able to support resolution and should not put participants at undue risk. With this in mind, both SAPA (Franks et al., 2018b) and GAPA (Franks and Booker, 2018 and Franks and Booker, forthcoming) guidance include a feasibility check. GAPA, in particular, can raise difficult issues (e.g. around power and accountability) because it goes in-depth (KII). Franks and Booker (2018) suggest that SAPA can be used as a first step when a GAPA assessment isn't feasible. Other assessment approaches, including the Whakatane Mechanism and the Sensemaker-based assessment in Uganda, were designed to help understand and/or seek resolution within contexts with recent and ongoing conflicts (KII; http://whakatane-mechanism.org/).

– **Appropriate Adaptations**: Most methodologies will require some adaptation to context. For example:

- GAPA is a relatively defined process but involves, among other adaptations, selecting the most pressing governance principles to assess (Franks and Booker, 2018)

- WCPA Guidelines no. 20 includes suggested methods and provides supporting tools but leaves a number of specifics to be defined (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013)

- METT includes defined questions with a scoring and analysis framework, but encourages adaptation to specific contexts (Stolton and Dudely, 2016), which has been done in South Africa, Madagascar, and Zambia, among others. For example, METTPAZ (a METT variation for areas managed by the Zambiam Wildlife Authority) was adapted to include a score for threat assessment (Mwima, 2007, as cited in Stolton and Dudley, 2016).

- In West Indian Ocean MPA pilots, the standard worksheets were too complex for many participants, so a simpler questionnaire was developed as an alternative.[51]

- **Methodology Quality**: Overall, the methodology selected or developed should be sound, including being clear and accurate with respect to what it is assessing, what the process is, and how results are to be generated and interpreted. (For PAME assessments, see the checklist below.)

Principles for Selecting a PAME Assessment Methodology

Hockings et al. (2015:902) provide eight principles for management effectiveness assessments, which can support the selection and adaptation of methodologies. These principles, which were developed by drawing on a number of existing sources,[52] "state that evaluations of management effectiveness of protected areas should be:

- "part of an effective management cycle, linked to defined values, objectives and policies and part of strategic planning, park planning and business and financial cycles

- "practical to implement with available resources, giving a good balance between measuring, reporting and managing

- "useful and relevant for improving protected area management; for yielding explanations and showing patterns; and for improving communication, relationships and awareness

- "logical and systematic: working in a logical and accepted framework with a balanced approach • based on good indicators, which are holistic, balanced and useful

- "accurate: providing true, objective, consistent and up-to-date information

- "cooperative and participatory: with good communication, teamwork and participation of protected area managers and stakeholders throughout all stages of the project wherever possible

- "focused on positive and timely communication and application of results."

Source: Hockings et al., 2015:902

---

[51] Though the methodology still requires that the facilitation team then translate the questionnaire results into the standardized worksheet format.
[52] As summarised by Hockings et al., 2015:902: "In the protected area context, a number of writers have listed characteristics of 'good' management is

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

68

(For more in-depth discussion on assessment design and methodology selection see, among others, Bammert 2018; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Campese et al., 2019; Hockings et al., 2015 and Leverington et al., 2008)

Ensuring Meaningful Process and Results

As noted above, assessment is not solely a technical exercise, but also a social (and often political) one. Given this, it is important to consider the governance and management of the assessment process itself.

– **Assessment as a learning process**: The assessment process itself can be very beneficial, sometimes as much or more than its formalized results (KIIs). In many cases, it may be the first time, or one of the few times, actors come together to reflect on these issues (KIIs, Stolton and Dudley, 2016). The process itself, and the discussions it enables, can be transformative, including to reflect on assumptions (KII), enable adaptive management (Wells and Mangubhai, 2005), and enhance shared understanding between participants (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013). Given this, it is important to structure the process in ways that engender honest and critical reflection (KII), enable a learning environment (KII, Wells and Mangubhai, 2005), and engage diverse viewpoints.

– **Inclusive Assessment**: In light of the points above, the question of who participates – i.e. whose voices are (and are not) part of the learning process – is critical. In this sense, it is important that, to the extent possible,

Assessment "… A learning environment is one that encourages the sharing of knowledge, skills and experiences both within and outside an organisation, so that lessons learnt are not lost and mistakes are not repeated…." (West Indian Ocean MPA Handbook, Wells and Mangubhai, 2005:1)

"The biggest advantage of assessment… is often taking the time to do it" (Interviewee)

"This assessment really made us question our assumptions… about who was poor and about how different people use the forest" (Interviewee)

assessments include and inform those with the responsibility to act on results (see Cook and Hockings, 2011). Best practice also includes the meaningful participation of rightsholders and stakeholders, or their legitimate representatives. Inclusive processes can help ensure more robust, valid, and accepted results (e.g. Bammert, 2018; Stolton and Dudley, 2016; Zimsky et al., 2010). In contrast, processes that exclude, or only superficially include, rightsholders and stakeholders discount their critical experience and knowledge, and are missed opportunities to build mutual understanding (KII). At the same time, more inclusive processes are not without costs[53] and ensuring effective representation and participation of differing groups, often across substantial power differentials, requires careful planning and skill. Participation means more than inviting people into an already-set process. It is

---

effectiveness evaluations. Basic principles were defined by Courrau (1999) and recommended in the Regional Environmental Program for Central America (Programa Ambiental Regional para Centroamérica: PROARCA) manual (Corrales 2004a). An excellent synthesis of guidelines was also presented in the report on strengthening PAME in the Andes region (Cracco et al. 2006). The IUCN WCPA guidelines on management effectiveness (Hockings et al. 2006) are highly recommended reading and provide detailed guidance on how evaluations can be planned and implemented, and some of the material in this chapter is drawn from these guidelines, while recommendations and summaries relating to methodologies can be found in documents produced by the global study (Leverington et al. 2010b, 2008) and a study of PAME in Europe (Leverington et al. 2010c; Nolte et al. 2010)".

[53] One respondent noted that PA managers may be hesitant to do participatory METT assessments because involving more actors, including some who may not agree, increases the complexity and costs of an already complex process.

about co-designing and facilitating a process that enables meaningful engagement. At the same time, there may be cases where other methods (e.g. surveys, in-depth interviews) may be more appropriate, at least as a starting point, (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013) e.g. where existing conflicts and inequitable power relationships make direct participation untenable at first.

As summarised in the 2016 METT Handbook:

"Group discussions have been shown to result in better PAME results because discussion can stimulate additional recollections from other members of the group (Cook et al., 2014). In Zambia, where the METT was completed with peer review and full stakeholder – including protected area managers, private sector in the form of tour and lodge operations, and local communities living in the Game Management Areas (GMAs) – the scores had more buy-in and were more accurate as more debate and discussion had been undertaken before a score was decided upon. The METT thus serves not only as a performance metric but also as a means to foster communication and participation in the management of the protected area or GMA (Zimsky et al., 2010)" (Stolton and Dudley, 2016:28)

– **Clear Scope and Timeframe**: While many assessments focus on the current situation, some also consider the history of a site or system (e.g. Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013). In all cases, it is important to be clear about the assessment scope and timeframe. This can be challenging, given the dynamic nature of governance and management and their social impacts (e.g. Cook et al., 2014; NRGF, 2017).

– **Enhancing Validity**: To help ensure reliable results, assessments should draw on the best available information. However, the 'best' information may come from diverse sources. Many assessments involve some perceptions-based measures. This sometimes raises concerns about results being too subjective (KII, Stolton and Dudley, 2016). Yet, perceptions-based questions and processes can also be valid and quite powerful, including by enabling participants

to make connections between experienced impacts (e.g. social costs) and their causes (e.g. specific management decisions) (KII).[54] The validity of results in such processes can be enhanced through triangulation and group verification, e.g., the validation workshops in GAPA, SAPA, and community dashboards. Some PAME assessments also use external reviewers, either during or after the assessment (see Cook and Hockings, 2011). In Zambia, METT assessments include both analysis with stakeholders and peer review (Zimsky et al., 2010).

– **Appropriately interpreting and wisely-using results**: Different assessments use different means to summarise and communicate results, from aggregate scores (e.g. METT) to narrative analyses of strengths and challenges (e.g. GAPA). (See Annex 3 for more specific examples). There are benefits and drawbacks to each approach.

---

[54] In contrast, attribution issues (i.e. determining what is causing or contributing to the circumstances/ issues identified) can be more challenging with some more ostensibly 'objective' assessments – e.g. broad Basic Necessities Surveys – because they inquire about what the objective circumstances are at a given point in time but do not delve into questions of why those circumstances have come to be (KII).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

70

In all cases, it is important to be clear about how results can (and cannot) be interpreted and which information is most meaningful. For example, while METT scores are often given focus, some of the most important, actionable information is in the narrative about why a certain score was given and how challenges can be addressed (KII, Stolton and Dudley, 2016).

(For more in-depth discussion on governance of the assessment process itself, see, among others, Bammert 2018; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Campese et al., 2019; Hockings et al., 2015; Leverington et al., 2008; Wells and Mangubhai, 2005)

Making Assessment a Basis for Meaningful Action

While the process itself is valuable, it is also important to move from assessment to action, including to avoid identifying problems without addressing them. Survey responses and interviews suggest a mixed picture of whether assessments are having an impact. Some feel that the assessment process itself is a form of action (because of the engagement and learning it involves). Others noted that assessments (particularly institutionalised METT assessments) are informing management decisions. However, most respondents noted barriers to action. (KIIs) Considerations for translating assessment to action include:

– **Ensuring Political Will and Openness to Change**: While it seems self-evident, starting an assessment with a commitment to taking action is important. This may be especially true when the assessment suggests changes that are politically challenging (KII). For example, recommendations from GAPA may not be expensive in financial terms, but may call for shifts in processes, accountability structures, and power that are politically challenging (KII).

– **Dedicating Financial and Other Resources**: In PAME and social assessment, a key barrier to implementing recommendations is access to funding. For example, a SAPA assessment identified wildlife damage to surrounding farms as a key issue, which requires substantial financial investment in infrastructure and subsequent maintenance (KII).

– **Planning, and Linking with Planning Cycles**: Assessments often result recommendations. These are important, but may be more impactful when reformulated into specific action plans (KII, Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013). Ideally, this can be linked to regular planning cycles, so that assessments are not isolated exercises (KII).

– **Effectively Communicating and Sharing Information Across Levels**: Assessment results cannot be acted on unless effectively communicated. This involves, principally, audiences at the level at which the assessment is done. Beyond this, some results can be 'upscaled' to national or regional levels, e.g. to inform planning, policy-making, financing, etc.[55] Summary information can also be shared at higher levels, such as CBD and GD-PAME, for global monitoring and reporting. For example, the recent United Nations List of Protected Areas - Supplement on protected area management effectiveness (UNEP-WCMC, 2018) draws on assessment information reported to GD-PAME. There are also challenges to using assessment information at multiple levels, including lack of direct comparability across contexts. Careful consideration needs to be given to how information can be meaningfully shared and interpreted (see Box 10).

---

[55] While outside the scope of this report, one useful example comes from system-level application of IMET in Burundi.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

71

- **Coordinating and Demanding Action at Multiple Levels**: Related to the point above, assessments often reveal issues that cannot be fully addressed by local actors (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Booker and Franks, 2018; Cowan et al., 2010; Wells and Mangubhai, 2005). To help parse these issues out, West Indian Ocean MPA methodology encourages assessment participants to identify those actions they can take and those that have to be taken by others (Wells and Mangubhai, 2005). Capacity to coordinate action and/or demand change across levels and sectors may be important.

- **Establishing a process for ongoing learning**: Ideally, assessment is the start of a longer-term process of learning and progress towards desired ends. Monitoring / tracking change can be part of this process. Some methodologies can be repeated as part of monitoring, e.g. EoH, IMET, METT, MJUMITA Dashboard, and WH Outlook Reports. In other cases, it may be more practical to do monitoring with simpler means, using the initial assessment as a baseline, e.g. with SAPA, GAPA and the process described in WCPA Guidelines no. 20.[56]

> "Assessment is often seen as an end point when it is really a step in a process" (Interviewee).

Box 10: Use of assessment results across sites and levels

As noted above, there is both value in and challenges to meaningfully using assessment results across sites and levels. METT, for example, is designed to enable tracking over time in individual sites, but not comparisons across sites (KII, Stolton and Dudley, 2016). Yet the wide use of METT means that there is a great deal of site-level data available (including in the database compiled and managed by UNEP-WCMC), and there is interest in analysing that data at various levels.

In South Africa, where METT-SA is used system-wide, there does not appear to be explicit cross-site comparison (except insofar as sites with substantially lower scores are required to do assessments more frequently). Further, comparing across sites, or using METT-SA scores as indicators of PA manager performance, have been specifically advised against (Cowan et al. 2010:14). Nonetheless, some have raised concerns that protected area managers may over-score because there is a perception that they will be judged based on comparative scores (KII).

Zambia's 2015-2025 Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan includes a table of high-level METTPAZ results for 19 of its 20 national parks (see Table 4 in Zambia's NBSAP 2015-2025, drawing on Mwima, 2007), which could be interpreted as a cross-site comparison, though detailed results are not provided.

There are also a number of studies that rely on aggregated site-level data to infer broader trends in management effectiveness, though with caveats and guidance about interpretation (e.g. Knights et al., 2014; Leverington et al., 2010).

These examples highlight the importance of reflecting carefully and communicating clearly about how assessment data can (and cannot) be interpreted at different levels.

---

[56] Though SAPA is being repeated in at least one site in the region.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

72

Questions and Considerations Going Forward

This report touches briefly on a range of topics, and many important questions are not addressed here. Some points for reflection going forward include:

– **What isn't being assessed?** Assessments are often done as point in time, but the roots of governance concerns, and the origin of social impacts, often go beyond protected and conserved area boundaries and back in time, including to when protected areas were demarcated (KII). In some cases, this means going quite far back, to understand the historical roots of current governance and social concerns (e.g. Stevens et al., 2016). Even in near-term, however, there is sometimes a failure to assess anticipated social costs of protected area demarcation, as seen in a recent study of biodiversity offsets in Madagascar (Bidaud et al., 2017). Further, as noted above, protected and conserved areas are managed and governed within broader landscapes, and there are natural resource governance assessments at the landscape level that may be useful for consideration at the site-level. How can our approaches to assessment better integrate concerns that cross time and geographical boundaries?

– **Are standardised assessments the best way to go?** This analysis implicitly assumes that many governing and managing bodies will choose to use 'out of the box' assessments, with appropriate adaptations. However, the analysis also shows the wide diversity in approaches – including country-specific tools (e.g. MJUMITA Dashboard) and community-driven processes (e.g. participatory mapping, Photovoice, MIHARI network, BCPs, etc.). It is worth reflecting further on when standardised

approaches vs. context-specific approaches may be appropriate… and for whom.

– **How can existing information be better utilised?** While this analysis has focused on readily replicable methodologies and tools, the inventory also included well over 200 academic studies and other reports, and these are only a sub-set of what is available from the region. How can this wealth of information be better brought into use, e.g. as information to inform assessments? This may be an area for consideration for BIOPAMA Regional Observatories.

– **How can different assessments be used, in cost-effective and practical ways, to complement one another… while avoiding 'assessment fatigue'?** Doing endless assessments is at best impractical, and can also have drawbacks, including asking people to spend undue time and energy (KII). There are ongoing discussions on how existing methodologies can be expanded, or used together, to address management effectiveness, governance, and social equity concerns (e.g. Burgess et al., 2014b; Corrigan et al., 2018). At this moment, however, there are many methodologies available, and none that, on their own, appear to be widely replicable, stand-alone options for adequately addressing management, governance and social impact concerns. Given this, it may be useful for the BIOPAMA programme and its partners to consider how they can best use different methodologies in complementary ways.

– **Who has the mandate and legitimacy to convene and use information resulting from assessments, and how can we ensure rights are respected?** This is important particularly when considering both protected and conserved areas and areas under different governance types. Who needs to be engaged? Whose consent is required

(including with respect to Indigenous peoples' right of free, prior, and informed consent)? This also pertains to the (very basic) information necessary for global monitoring and reporting, such as through GD-PAME and for the CBD and Aichi Target 11, and more general questions on how to store, analyse, visualise, and share (as appropriate) information from the assessments to inform and support decision making, planning, monitoring, reporting and financing at various levels from local to global.

– **What methodologies are most appropriate in conserved areas? In areas under different governance types?** Some methodologies are designed for specific contexts, e.g. assessment done as a component of the ICCA self-strengthening process, but many are designed for wide use. It may be useful to further consider which methodologies are most useful and appropriate in different contexts. In particular, are there adaptations that need to be made to PAME assessment methodologies for them to be meaningfully applied to conserved areas?

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

74

Part 6:

Conclusions and Considerations

![BIOPAMA logo]
From Knowledge to Action for a Protected Planet

This report has summarised and analysed findings from an inventory of protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments and related resources in Eastern and Southern Africa.

While management effectiveness assessments are done fairly widely in the region, there is room for their expansion, including across more countries, areas under more diverse governance types, and possibly with a broader range of methodologies. METT is the most common methodology, with more than 75% of inventoried PAME assessments having used it.

However, the more pressing gap concerns governance and social assessments. Far fewer are being done in the region, outside of academic studies. GAPA and SAPA are among the most commonly used methodologies, aside from the more context-specific MJUMITA governance dashboard.

Beyond questions of where, how many, and what types of assessments are being done, the more critical questions concern how assessment are (and can best) be done. With this in mind, **this section focuses on considerations for meaningful protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and social assessments.** (Annex 3 provides more detailed analysis of some common methodologies).

Considerations for the BIOPAMA Programme

This analysis suggests that the BIOPAMA programme could support its partners through, inter alia:

Generating and Sharing Information

Document and share information, with concrete examples from the region, about:

– Key concepts, including governance, equity, and wellbeing

– Ways that diverse actors have conducted and taken action on assessments, including protected and conserved areas under different governance types

– Environmental and social benefits (and challenges) of assessment, including the impacts of improving management effectiveness, governance, and equity

– Innovative approaches to assessment and action that may not yet be widely known about or used, including those developed and led by Indigenous peoples and local communities

Building Capacity

Give focus to expanding governance and social assessment, given their smaller scope of use

– Enable peer-exchange and support for assessment, including to foster a learning approach

– Develop accessible information on options, such as a toolkit of methodologies complemented by capacity building courses and webinars with information about their strengths and limitations[57]

– Offer targeted skill-building opportunities (e.g. webinars, clinics, hands-on learning) on participatory process design and facilitation, qualitative and quantitative data analysis, communications, etc.

– Engage diverse rightsholders and stakeholders, including for knowledge co-generation

---

[57] Based on recommendation from Leo Niskanen (IUCN ESARO Conservation Areas and Species Programme Regional Technical Coordinator)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

76

Tackling Technical Challenges and Thorny Issues

– Assess and provide guidance on how different methodologies can be used in complementary ways

– Provide guidance on sharing meaningful information across levels – including in standarised formats and in ways that can inform policy-making and planning at the national and regional levels

Table 3: Considerations for Assessment Planning, Implementation, and Follow-up[58]

Topic	Considerations
Setting Objectives	Have clear, agreed upon objectives - e.g. Assessment of what? Towards what (and whose) ends? Assessment by and with whom? Aim to balance practical considerations with being ambitious about what you can learn from and do with assessment.
Selecting / Adapting a Methodology	Select and adapt (or develop) a methodology that meets the objectives and context. Considerations include:
Context Appropriateness	– Is the assessment appropriate for this context? (See feasibility checks for GAPA and SAPA)
Framework	– Is there a clear framework (e.g. principles, criteria, indicators, guiding questions, etc.)? – If not, how will you clarify the key issues to address? – Is the framework meaningful to your context? – Are adaptions or refinements required?
Methods / Process	– Do the methods fit the context? How can they be adapted? – Is it inclusive, including of the governing bodies, rightsholders, and stakeholders?
Tools	– Are there any tools to support the assessment? Are they appropriate, including being accessible to participants? Are adaptations required?
Time	– How long will the process take? – Have you dedicated enough time to ensure the process will be meaningful?

---

[58] These cross-cutting considerations aim to summarise key points from the analysis above, and in particular the section on best practice considerations. As such, they draw on assessment reports, interviews, survey responses, and broader literature and guidance on assessments, including Bammert 2018; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Campese et al., 2019; Hockings et al., 2015; Leverington et al. 2008; and Stolton and Dudley, 2016. More detailed, methodology specific considerations are provided in Annex 3.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

77

Capacity	– What capacities are required? How can they be meaningfully built through the assessment process?
Carrying out Assessment	The specific assessment steps may be largely defined by the considerations above. However, 'good' assessment goes beyond this, including asking whether it is being approached as a learning process. If not, how can it be structured to enable this?
Analysing and Expressing Results	In some cases, the methodology will largely define how results are expressed. In others, this will be determined by the conveners and other participants. In all cases, it is important to be thoughtful about how results are analysed and expressed, including whether results are shared in ways that are meaningful to the participants as well as the other decision-makers, rightsholders, stakeholders who will be using them at different levels.
Developing Recommendations	Many assessment processes will involve formation of specific recommendations to address concerns (and/ or build on strengths). One useful question to keep in mind is who the recommendations are directed to… Is it something that can be addressed at site-level, or something that requires action at the policy level?

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

78

Communicating Throughout the Process... **Including for Reporting on Global Targets**	Communication is key throughout and after assessments. Careful consideration should be given to how (with whom, in what formats) assessment processes and results will be communicated. Communications should, as much as possible, ensure transparency and accessibility of the information (including with diverse audiences) while also respecting anonymity (especially where needed for safety) and ensuring responsible use of results. – What can be shared, to promote transparency and accountability? – Where can it be shared, to make it most accessible? This can be written reports, as well as radio, social media, etc. – At what levels will it be shared? *(Remember that basic information on PAME assessments can be reported to UNEP-WCMC for inclusion in GD-PAME and CBD reporting)* – What has to be kept confidential, e.g. to protect those who may have shared sensitive information?
Taking Action	In most cases, part of the purpose of the assessment is to inform responsive action. This can be facilitated by, among other things: – Having a commitment (political will) to take action – Going beyond making recommendations to making concrete plans – Integrating assessment into planning or other processes – Budgeting for follow-up action, in addition to assessment itself – Communicating and coordinating and/or advocating across levels / sectors

Continued Learning	Assessment should be a starting point for a continual learning process. However, the specific means of doing so will vary. Many methodologies are designed to be repeated and track change over time, e.g. METT, EoH and IMET. Others are intended more as an in-depth process that can provide a baseline from which monitoring can be put in place, e.g. GAPA followed by a site-specific 'scorecard' or other monitoring process.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

80

References

Aldrich, M. and J. Sayer (2007). In Practice – Landscape Outcomes Assessment Methodology (LOAM). World Wildlife Fund, Forests for Life Programme: Geneva, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: http://assets.panda.org/downloads/loaminpracticemay07.pdf

Ashley, C. & K. Hussein (2000). Developing methodologies for livelihood impact assessment: Experience of the African Wildlife Foundation in East Africa. Overseas Development Institute: London.

Bammert, M. (2018). Monitoring Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas - A Guide for KfW and Partners in Financial Cooperation. Commissioned by: KfW Development Bank https://www.biopama. org/sites/default/files/resources-doc/KfW%20User%20Guide_Monitoring%20Management%20 Effectiveness%20of%20Protected%20Areas.pdf

Belle E., S. Stolton, N. Dudley, M. Hockings & N.D. Burgess (2012). Protected Area management effectiveness: A regional framework and additional METT module for monitoring the effects of climate change. UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC): Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Belle, E., S. Wicander, H. Bingham, and Y. Shi (2015). Governance of protected areas in Africa: A global review. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Bennett, N. and P. Dearden (2014). Why local people do not support conservation: Community perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management in Thailand. Marine Policy. Volume 44, February 2014, Pages 107-116.

Bennet, N., A. Di Franco, A. Calo, E. Nethery, F. Niccolini, M. Milazzo, P. Guidetti (2019). "Local support for conservation is associated with perceptions of good governance, social impacts, and ecological effectiveness". Conservation Letters. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12640

Bertzky B., C. Corrigan, J. Kemsey, S. Kenney, C. Ravillous, C. Besancon & N. Burgess (2012). Protected planet report 2012: Tracking progress towards global targets for protected areas. IUCN and UNEP-WCMC: Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Bhola, N., D. Juffe-Bignoli, N. Burgess, T. Sandwith & N. Kingston (eds.) (2016). Protected planet report 2016: How protected areas contribute to achieving global targets for biodiversity. IUCN and UNEP-WCMC: Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, United Kingdom. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://papaco.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Global-Protected-Planet-2016.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

82

Bidaud, C., K. Schreckenberg, M. Rabeharison, P. Ranjatson, J. Gibbons& J.P. Jones (2017). The sweet and the bitter : Intertwined positive and negative social impacts of a biodiversity offset. Conservation and Society, 15(1), pp. 1.

BIOPAMA and IUCN (2016). IMET (Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool) training summary report. IMET Training Workshop, Mbale, Uganda, 3-7 October 2016.

Booker, F. and P. Franks (2018). Governance, Equity and the Green List : Developing a multi-stakeholder and participatory governance assessment methodology for protected areas. Workshop, Nairobi, Kenya 13-15 February 2018. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17616IIED.pdf

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., et al. (2012). Bio-cultural diversity conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities— examples and analysis. Tehran: Cenesta for the ICCA Consortium, IUCN, UNDP GEF SGP and GIZ on behalf of BMZ.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., N. Dudley, T. Jaeger, B. Lassen, N. Pathak Broome, A. Phillips and T. Sandwith (2013). Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., P. Bueno, T. Hay-Edie, B. Lang, A. Rastogi and T. Sandwith (2014). A primer on governance for protected and conserved areas, Stream on Enhancing Diversity and Quality of Governance. IUCN World Parks Congress. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. and R. Hill (2015). 'Governance for the conservation of nature', In Protected Area Governance and Management, Worboys, G. L. et al. (eds.). ANU Press, Canberra.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. And J. Campese (2017). Self-Strengthening ICCAs – Guidance on a process and resources for custodian indigenous peoples and local communities - draft for use by GSI partners. The ICCA Consortium.

Bunderforste, O (2009). Assessment of the Value of the Protected Area System of Ethiopia "Making the Economic Case". Volume 2. Purkersdorf, Austria

Burgess, N, F. Danks, M. Gonçalves de Lima, N. Kingston, S. Blythe, I. Tompkins, L. Coad, L. Leverington, I. Cuadros, C. Zamora & M. Hockings (2014a). Protected area management effectiveness in WWF global priority places. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Burgess, N., F. Danks, R. Newham, P. Franks and D. Roe (2014b). Towards equitably managed protected areas: A review of synergies between Protected Area Management Effectiveness and Social or Governance Assessment. IIED Discussion Paper. IIED, London. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/14647IIED/

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

83

Butchart, S. et al. (2010) Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. Science 328, 1164–1168. doi:10.1126/science.1187512

Campbell B, A. Mandondo, C. Lovell, W. Kozanayi, O. Mabhachi, T. Makamure, F. Mugabe, M. Mutamba, S. Sibiza (2000). Forging new institutional arrangements for common property resource management: A case study from southern Zimbabwe. Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Zimbabwe: Harare, Zimbabwe.

Campese, J. with M. Jones, B. Nakangu, A. Silverman, and J. Springer (2019). The NRGF Assessment Guide: Learning for improved natural resource governance. (Updated to 2016 Working Paper). IUCN and CEESP.

CARE International, IUCN, and AWF (2008). Assessment of protected area costs and benefits. (Methodology guidelines, January 2008) (Unpublished draft).

CBD (2004). Protected areas. DecisionVII/28, Kuala Lumpur. (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/VII/28)

CBD (2010). Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Decision X/2, Nagoya. (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/2)

CBD (2010). Protected Areas. Decision X/31, Nagoya. (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/31)

CBD (2016). Progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. Decision XIII/2, Cancún. (CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/2)

CBD (2018). Protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures. Decision 14/8, 2018, Sharm El-Sheikh. (CBD/COP/DEC/14/8)

CBD Secretariat (Inf Doc) (2011). FURTHER INFORMATION RELATED TO THE TECHNICAL RATIONALE FOR THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS, INCLUDING POTENTIAL INDICATORS AND MILESTONES. UNEP/CBD/COP/10/INF/12/Rev.1

CBD Secretariat (Inf Doc) (2018). Protected and conserved areas governance in the convention on biological diversity: A review of key concepts, experiences, and sources of guidance. CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8

Child, B. (2007). The Community Dashboard: Developing at tool for the adaptive management of governance in community conservation in southern Africa. Unpublished

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

84

Coad, L., F. Leverington, K. Knights, J. Geldmann, A. Eassom, V. Kapos, N. Kingston, M. de Lima, C. Zamora, I. Cuardros, C. Nolte, N.D. Burgess & M. Hockings (2015). Measuring impact of protected area management interventions: current and future use of the Global Database of Protected Area Management Effectiveness. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B 370: 20140281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0281

Cook C and M. Hockings. (2011). Opportunities for improving the rigor of management effectiveness evaluations in protected areas. Conservation Letters, 4(5), pp. 372-82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00189.x

Cook, C, R. Carter, and M. Hockings (2014). Measuring the accuracy of management effectiveness evaluations of protected areas, Journal of Environmental Management 139: 164-171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.02.023

Corrigan, C., C. Robinson, N. Burgess, N. Kingston, and M. Hockings (2018). Global review of social indicators used in protected area management evaluation. Conservation Letters, 11(2), pp. 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12397

Cowan, G., N. Mpongoma, and P Britton, (eds) 2010. Management effectiveness of South Africa's protected areas. Department of Environmental Affairs, Pretoria.

Craigie, I., J. Baillie, A. Balmford, C. Carbone, B. Collen, R. Green, and J. Hutton (2010). Large mammal population declines in Africa's protected areas. Biol. Conserv. 143, 2221–2228. (doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.06.007)

Davies, R. & W. Smith (1998). The basic necessities survey: The experience of ActionAid Vietnam. Action Aid: London. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at:

Dilke, A. (2016). Local biodiversity outlooks. Indigenous peoples' and local communities' contributions to the implementation of the strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020. Forest Peoples Programme, The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity & Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity: Moreton-in-Marsh, United Kingdom. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322662986_Local_Biodiversity_Outlooks_Indigenous_Peoples'_and_Local_Communities'_Contributions_to_the_Implementation_of_the_Strategic_Plan_for_Biodiversity_2011-2020_A_complement_to_the_fourth_edition_of_the_Gl

Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008). Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. x + 86pp. WITH Stolton, S., P. Shadie and N. Dudley (2013). IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types, Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xxpp.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

85

Dudley, N., S. Mansourian, S. Stolton, and S. Sukauwan (2008) Safety Net Protected Areas and Poverty Reduction. Arguments for Protection series. WWF/Equilibrium. https://www.iucn.org/content/safety-net-protected-areas-and-poverty-reduction

Dudley, N. and S. Stolton (2008) The Protected Areas Benefits Assessment Tool: A methodology. WWF. Available at: http://www.equilibriumresearch.com/upload/document/PA_BAT_-_Final_Feb_2008.pdf

Ervin, J. (2003) WWF: Rapid Assessment and prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology. WWF Gland, Switzerland

Franks, P. and F. Booker (2015). Shared governance of protected areas in Africa: Case studies, lessons learnt and conditions of success. (Report). IIED: London, UK. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/X00139/

Franks, P. and R. Small (2016). Understanding the social impacts of protected areas: A community perspective. (IIED Research Report). IIED, London. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/14661IIED/

Franks, P. and F. Booker (2018). Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (GAPA): Early experience of a multi-stakeholder methodology for enhancing equity and effectiveness. (IIED Working Paper). IIED: London. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/17632IIED/

Franks, P., F. Booker, and D. Roe (2018a). Understanding and assessing equity in protected area conservation A matter of governance, rights, social impacts and human wellbeing. IIED Issue Paper. London, UK: IIED.

Franks P., R. Small and F. Booker (2018b). Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA). Methodology manual for SAPA facilitators. Second edition. IIED, London https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/14659IIED.pdf

Franks, P., And F. Booker (forthcoming). Governance and Equity Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas: early experience and results of a multi-stakeholder approach. London, UK: IIED.

Game Rangers Association of South Africa (2019). Protected area management effectiveness. (Website). Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: http://www.gameranger.org/what-we-do/projects/157-protected-area-management-effectiveness.html

Garnett, S.T. et al., (2018). "A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation." Nature Sustainability 1, 369-374

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

86

Geldmann J, Barnes M, Coad L, Craigie ID, Hockings M, Burgess ND. 2013Effectiveness of terrestrial protected areas in reducing habitat loss and population declines. Biol. Conserv. 161, 230–238. (doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.02.018)

Graham, J., B. Amos and T. Plumptre (June 2003). Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21st Century. Prepared for the Fifth World Parks Congress Durban, South Africa. In collaboration with Parks Canada and the Canadian International Development Agency.

Granek, E. and M. Brown (2005). Co-Management Approach to Marine Conservation in Mohéli, Comoros Islands. Conservation Biology. Vol. 19, No. 6 (Dec., 2005), pp. 1724-1732

Harrison, M. (2013). Penetrating the Impenetrable: Establishing profiles and motivations of resource users at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science and the Diploma of Imperial College London https://www.iccs.org.uk/wp-content/thesis/consci/2013/Harrison.pdf

Hockings, M., S. Stolton, F. Leverington, N. Dudley, J. Courrau & P. Valentine (2006). WCPA best practice guidelines no. 14 on evaluating effectiveness. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/PAG-014.pdf

Hockings, M., R. James, S. Stolton, N. Dudley, V. Mathur, J. Makombo, J. Courrau, and J. Parrish (2008). Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit Assessing management effectiveness of natural World Heritage sites. UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Hockings, M., F. Leverington & C. Cook (2015). 'Protected area management effectiveness', in G. L. Worboys, M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (eds) Protected Area Governance and Management. ANU Press, Canberra, pp. 889–928. https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/protected-area-governance-and-management

ICCA Consortium, Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas -- ICCAs, ICCA Consortium, 2013.

IUCN, UNEP, and WWF. 1980. World Conservation Strategy.

IUCN (2011). Assessment of Natural Resource Governance in Garba Tula, Northern Kenya - Final Report. A contribution to IUCN's project "Improving Natural Resource Governance for Rural Poverty Reduction". UK AID. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/final__garba_tula_governance_assessment_report_1.pdf

IUCN (2014). IUCN World Heritage Outlook 2014: A conservation assessment of all natural World Heritage sites. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2014-039.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

87

IUCN WCPA (2018). PARKS. The International Journal of Protected Areas and Conservation, Volume 24 Special Issue, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Jones, B.T. B. 2014. Wellbeing Assessment in Namibia Wildlife Conservancies: Results of testing the proposed methodology in Orupupa and Puros conservancies, Kunene Region 21-28 April, 2014. WWF UK/Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation. Windhoek.

Khumalo, C. (no date). Evaluation and monitoring of protected areas management effectiveness using Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT): A South African journey from baseline to a modern web-based tool. Department of Environment Affairs, Republic of South Africa: Pretoria, South Africa.

Knights, K., I. Cuadros, C. Zamora, L. Coad, F. Leverington, B. O'Connor, M. Gonçalves de Lima, N. Kingston, F. Danks, M. Hockings, I. Malugu, P. Scheren, E. Ngoye, P. J. Stephenson & N. Burgess (2014). A preliminary assessment of protected area management within the WWF 'Coastal East Africa' priority place, Eastern Africa. Parks, 20(2).

Kothari, A., C. Corrigan, H. Jonas, A. Neumann, and H. Shrumm (eds) (2012). Recognising and Supporting Territories and Areas Conserved by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities: Global Overview and National Case Studies, Technical Series 64. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, and Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada.

Robinson, L. (2013). Mt. Marsabit, Kenya: An Assessment of the Governance System. Landscape-Level Ecosystem-Based Management Working Paper no. 2. http://sites.viu.ca/landscapelevel/casestudies/

Lake Bogoria National Reserve, Lake Nakuru National Park, and Lake Elmenteita National wildlife Sanctuary (2014). Assessment of management effectiveness using the Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit. Kenya lakes system in the Great Rift Valley (Elmenteita, Nakuru and Bogoria) – World Heritage Site. The Africa Nature Program, World Heritage Convention: Paris, France. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://papaco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/EoH-Rift-Valley-Lakes-Kenya-April-2014.pdf

Lassen, B., Jansen, L., Rasolojaona, J., Githaiga, C., Fey, L. & Bossou, B. (no date). Community Protocols in Africa: Lessons Learned For Abs Implementation. Natural Justice, Cape Town, South Africa. https://naturaljustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2018_Community-Protocols-in-Africa_Lessons-Learned_Natural-Justice.pdf

Leverington, F., M. Hockings, H. Pavese, K. Lemos Costa, and J. Courrau (2008). 'Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – A global study. Supplementary report No. 1: Overview of approaches and methodologies.' The University of Queensland, Gatton, TNC, WWF, IUCN-WCPA, Australia.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

88

Leverington, F., K. Lemos Costa, J. Courrau, H. Pavese, C. Nolte, M. Marr, L. Coad, N. Burgess, B. Bomhard, and M. Hockings (2010). Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – a global study. Second edition 2010. The University of Queensland. Brisbane, Australia.

Lopoukhine N. and F. Ferreira de Souza Dias (2012). 'What does Aichi Target 11 really mean?' Parks 18:5-8

McDermott, M., S. Mahanty, and K. Schreckenberg (2013). Examining equity: A multidimensional framework for assessing equity in payments for ecosystem service. Environmental Science and Policy 33: 416-427

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Somalia (2014). Fifth National Report on the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources: Mogadishu, Somalia https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/so/so-nr-05-en.pdf

MJUMITA and TFCG (2014). Policy Brief: Monitoring village forest governance with the MJUMITA dashboard tool. 4 pp http://www.tfcg.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/MJUMITA-Village-Governance-Dashboard-Policy-Brief-2014-FINAL.pdf

Moreaux, C., N. Zafra-Calvob, N.G. Vansteelante, S. Wicander, N.D. Burgess (2018). Can existing assessment tools be used to track equity in protected area management under Aichi Target 11? Biological Conservation, 224, pp. 242-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.06.005

Mulqueeny, C., S. Rambarath, I. Rushworth (2018). Recent trends in management effectiveness of Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife protected areas. Symposium of Contemporary Conservation Practice: Hide the words, St. Ives, KwaZulu-Natal Midlands, 5-9 November 2018.

Mwima, H.K. (2007). Synthesis of completed management effectiveness tracking tool for protected areas managed by the Zambia Wildlife Authority for the year 2007, The Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Zambia.

NRGF (2017). Natural Resource Governance in Kilombero Cluster and the SAGCOT Initiative: An assessment of key issues and recommendations for action. Report prepared for CEESP and IUCN.

Nyhus, P., Osofsky, S., Ferraro, P., Madden, F., & Fischer, H. (2005). Bearing the costs of human–wildlife conflict: The challenges of compensation schemes. In R. Woodroffe, S. Thirgood, & A. Rabinowitz (Eds.), People and Wildlife, Conflict or Co-existence? (Conservation Biology, pp. 107-121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oldekop J.A., G. Holmes, W.E. Harris & K.L. Evans (2015) A global assessment of the social and conservation outcomes of protected areas. Conservation Biology Vol. 30(1) 133–141. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12568. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26096222

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

89

Osipova, E., P. Shadie, C. Zwahlen, M. Osti, Y. Shi, C. Kormos, B. Bertzky, M. Murai, R. Van Merm, T. Badman (2017). IUCN World Heritage Outlook 2: A conservation assessment of all natural World Heritage sites. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2017-053-En.pdf

Paolini, C., D. Rakotobe and D. Jomha Djossi (2016). Coach Observatory Mission Information Toolkit (COMIT): A toolkit to support coaching missions to improve protected area management and develop the information system of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. 128pp https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/46173

Pascual et al. (2014). Social equity matters in payments for ecosystem services. Bioscience 64(11) 1027-1036

Pedrick, C. (2016). The power of maps - Bringing the third dimension to the negotiation table. Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA): Wageningen, The Netherlands. https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/100802

Pomeroy, R.S., Parks, J.E. and Watson, L.M. 2004. How is your MPA doing? A Guidebook. Biophysical Socioeconomic and Governance Indicators for the Evaluation of Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas. http://effectiveMPA.noaa.gov

Poonian, C., M. Hauzer, and C. Moussa Iboura (2008). Challenges for effective and sustainable co-managed Marine Protected Areas: A case study from the Comoros Islands. Proceedings of the 11th International Coral Reef Symposium, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, 7-11 July 2008. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255670923_Challenges_for_effective_and_sustainable_co-managed_Marine_Protected_Areas_a_case_study_from_the_Comoros_Islands

Raik, D. B., and D. J. Decker. 2007. A multisector framework for assessing community-based forest management: lessons from Madagascar. Ecology and Society 12(1): 14. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art14/

Riggio, J., A. Jacobson, R. Hijmans, and T. Caro (2019). How effective are the protected areas of East Africa? Global Ecology and Conservation. Vol 17, Janary 2019 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2019.e00573

Save Lamu (2018). The Lamu County Biocultural Community Protocol: The Lamu indigenous community and their rights to the preservation of their natural resources, cultures, heritage and management of biodiversity. Save Lamu: Lamu, Kenya. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://naturaljustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Lamu-County-BCP-2018.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

90

Schrekenberg, K., I. Camargo, K. Withnall, C. Corrigan, P. Franks, D. Roe, L.M. Scherl & V. Richardson (2010). Social assessment of conservation initiatives: A review of rapid methodologies. (Natural Resource Issues 22). IIED: London, United Kingdom. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/14589IIED.pdf

Schreckenberg K, P. Franks, A. Martin, et al. (2016). Unpacking equity for protected area conservation. Parks, 22, 11–26.

Seychelles Island Foundation (2002). Aldabra Atoll World Heritage Site. (Initial assessment report). Seychelles Island Foundation: Mahé, Seychelles. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://whc.unesco.org/document/6947

Seychelles Island Foundation (2007). Aldabra Atoll, Seychelles. Enhancing Our Heritage: Monitoring and managing for success in Natural World Heritage Sites. (Final assessment report). Seychelles Island Foundation: Mahé, Seychelles. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/aldabra_eoh_assessment_jan08.pdf

Shepherd, G. (2009). Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit: Parts 1 and 2. Program on Forests (PROFOR), World Bank: Washington D.C. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://www.profor.info/content/poverty-forests-linkages-toolkit-1

Shepherd, G. and J. Blockhus (2007). The PROFOR Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit. Proceedings: International Conference on Poverty Reduction and Forests, Bangkok, 3-7 September 2007. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: http://hdl.handle.net/10625/43521

Sobrevila, C. (2008). The Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation: The Natural but Often Forgotten Partners. World Bank: Washington, DC.

Stevens, S., T. Jaeger and N. Pathak Broome, with contributions from G. Borrini-Feyerabend, C. Eghenter, H. C. Jonas, and G. Reyes (2016). ICCAs and Overlapping Protected Areas: Fostering Conservation Synergies and Social Reconciliation. Policy Brief of the ICCA Consortium, Issue No.4, ICCA Consortium, Tehran, Iran.

Stolton, S., M. Hockings, N. Dudley, K. MacKinnon, T. Whitten & F. Leverington. (2007). Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool: Reporting progress at protected area sites. (Second edition). World Wildlife Fund International: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: http://assets.panda.org/downloads/mett2_final_version_july_2007.pdf

Stolton, S. & N. Dudley (2009). The protected areas benefits assessment tool. World Wildlife Fund International: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: http://www.equilibriumconsultants.com/upload/document/PA_BAT_-_Final_Feb_2008_revised_April_2009.doc

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

91

Stolton, S., K. Redford and N. Dudley (2014). The Futures of Privately Protected Areas. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Stolton, S. and N. Dudley (2015a). Private governance of protected areas in Africa: Case studies, lessons learnt and conditions of success. Equilibrium Research and IIED: Bristol and London, United Kingdom. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://papaco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/PAPACO-study-19_GOVERNANCE-STUDY-2-FINAL-REPORT-PRIVATE.pdf

Stolton, S. and N. Dudely (2015b). "Values and Benefits of Protected Areas". In Protected Area Governance and Management, Worboys, G. L. et al. (eds.). ANU Press, Canberra

Stolton, S. and N. Dudley (2016). METT Handbook: A guide to using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). WWF-UK, Woking, United Kingdom. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://www.protectedplanet.net/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/045/original/WWF_METT_Handbook_2016_FINAL.pdf

Tauli-Corpuz, V. (2016). Conservation and Indigenous Peoples' Rights (A/71/150). Report to the 71st Session of the UN General Assembly.

Travers, H., G. Mwedde, L. Archer, D. Roe, A. Plumptre, J. Baker, A. Rwetsiba & E. Milner-Gulland (2017). Taking action against wildlife crime in Uganda. (Research report). IIED Natural Resources Group: London, United Kingdom.

Uganda Wildlife Authority (2002). Management Effectiveness at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park. (Initial assessment report). Uganda Wildlife Authority Enhancing our Heritage Project: Kampala, Uganda. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://whc.unesco.org/document/6971

UNEP-WCMC (2015). Governance of protected areas in Africa: State governed Protected Areas. News from African Protected Areas, 87, pp. 2-11. Accessed on 2 June at: https://papaco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/lettreNAPA-87-0615-EN.pdf

UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2016). Protected Planet Report 2016. UNEP-WCMC and IUCN: Cambridge UK and Gland, Switzerland

UNEP-WCMC (2017). Protected planet: The global database on protected area management effectiveness. (User Manual 1.0). UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, UK. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: http://wcmc.io/GDPAME_User_Manual_EN

UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS (2018). Protected Planet Report 2018. UNEP-WCMC, IUCN and NGS: Cambridge UK; Gland, Switzerland; and Washington, D.C., USA. https://livereport.protectedplanet.net/pdf/Protected_Planet_Report_2018.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

92

UNEP-WCMC & IUCN (2019). Protected planet: The global database on protected area management effectiveness (GD-PAME). [On-line]. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom. Accessed in April 2019 at: www.protectedplanet.net.

Wildlife Conservation Society (2007). Household surveys – a tool for conservation design, action and monitoring. (Technical Manual 4). Wildlife Conservation Society: Bronx, New York. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: http://s3.amazonaws.com/WCSResources/file_20110518_073650_Manual_ HouseholdSurveys_CxUCh.pdf

Wildlife Conservation Society (no date). The Mamabay landscape/seascape. (Flyer). Wildlife Conservation Society: Antananarivo, Madagascar. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://madagascar.wcs. org/Portals/120/Factsheets/WCS_Mada-factsheet-mamabaie.pdf?ver=2017-11-09-100743-093

Vansteelant, N. G. and N. D. Burgess (no date). Assessment tools for protected areas: Recommended management effectiveness, social, governance and equity tools for WWF in the Miombo ecoregion. Luc Hoffmann Institute: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: http://luchoffmanninstitute. org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Assessment-Tools-for-Protected-Areas.pdf

Vedeld, P., A. Jumane, G. Wapalila & A. Songorwa (2012). Protected areas, poverty and conflicts: A livelihood case study of Mikumi National Park. Tanzania Forest Policy and Economics, 21, pp. 20–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2012.01.008

Ward, C., L. Stringer, and G. Holmes (2018). Protected area co-management and perceived livelihood impacts. Journal of Environmental Management 228 (2018) 1–12

Wells, S. (2004). Assessment of management effectiveness in selected marine protected areas in the Western Indian Ocean. IUCN EARP, UNEP, & ICRAN: Nairobi, Kenya. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5d8a/98543188d10ac63c6219a23d73690553a277.pdf

Wells, S. and S. Mangubhai (2005). Assessing Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas: A Workbook for the Western Indian Ocean. IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, i-viii and 60 pp.

White, S (2009) Analysing wellbeing: a framework for development practice. WeD working paper 44.

Wicander, S. (2015). State governance of protected areas in Africa: Case studies, lessons learnt and conditions of success. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Wildlife Conservation Society (no date). The Mamabay landscape/seascape. (Flyer). Wildlife Conservation Society: Antananarivo, Madagascar.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

93

Wildlife Conservation Society (2007). Livelihood Surveys: A tool for conservation design, action and monitoring. Translinks, August 2007. Wildlife Conservation Society: Bronx New York.

Wilkie, D., M. Wieland & D. Detoeuf (2015). A guide to the modified Basic Necessities Survey: Why and how to conduct BNS in conservation landscapes. Wildlife Conservation Society: Bronx New York.

Woodhouse, E., C. Bedelian, N. Dawson, and P. Barnes (2018). Social Impacts of Protected Areas. Exploring evidence of trade-offs and synergies. In Schreckenberg, K., G. Mace, and M. Poudyal (eds.) Ecosystem Services and Poverty Alleviation: Trade-offs and Governance. Routledge Studies in Ecosystem Services: London and New York.

WPC (2003). The Durban Accord: Our Global Commitment for People and Earth's Protected Areas. Call for action by the participants at the IUCN WPC 2003, Durban.

Zafra-Calvo, N., E. Garmendia, U. Pascual, I. Palomo, N. Gross-Camp, D. Brockington, J. Cortes-Vazquez, B. Coolsaet & N. Burgess (2019). Progress toward equitably managed protected areas in Aichi Target 11: A global survey. BioScience, 69(3), pp. 191-197. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biy143

Zafra-Calvo, N., U. Pascual, D. Brockington, B. Coolsaet, J. Cortes-Vazquez, N. Gross-Camp, I. Palomo & N. Burgess (2017). Towards an indicator system to assess equitable management in protected areas. Biological Conservation, 211 (Part A), pp. 134–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.05.014

Zimsky, M., Ferraro, P., Mupemo, F., Robinson, J. and N. Sekhran (2010). Results of the GEF biodiversity portfolio monitoring and learning review mission, Zambia. Enhancing outcomes and impact through improved understanding of protected area management effectiveness. Global Environment Facility, Washington, D.C.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

94

Annex 1:

Additional Information on Methods and Sources

Annex 1A: Individuals who shared information for report via interview, survey response, or email communication

	Name[59]	Title and organisation
1	Bastian Bertzky	Project Officer - Biodiversity and Protected Areas, BIOPAMA Point of Contact for Southern Africa, European Commission Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC)
2	John Bett	Programme Coordinator, CKP forest programme (WWF Kenya)
3	Nandipha Bhengu	Acting Director : Protected Areas Governance (National Department Environmental Affairs, South Africa)
4	Dominique Bikaba	Executive Director (Strong Roots Congo, Congo DRC)
5	Francesca Booker	Researcher (biodiversity), Natural Resources (IIED)
6	Neil Burgess	Chief Scientist (UNEP-WCMC)
7	Neil Dawson	Research Fellow (University of East Anglia Steering Committee Member, IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy)
8	Marine Deguignet	Programme Officer (UNEP-WCMC)
9	Motuma Didita	Researcher in Range land Plants Biodiversity Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute
10	Zakhe Dlamini	GIS Coordinator Eswatini National Trust Commission
11	Nigel Dudley	Equilibrium Research
12	Zakaria Faustin	Executive Director (Tanzania Natural Resource Forum, Tanzania)
13	Phil Franks	Principal researcher (biodiversity), Natural Resources International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
14	Sandile Gumedze	Senior Ecologist (Eswatini National Trust Commission)
15	Nancy Ingutia	Deputy Manager- Community Development Programs (Ol Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya)
16	Davis Kalima	Principal Parks and Wildlife Officer (Department of National Parks and Wildlife, Malawi)
17	Victor Kawange	Programmes manager (Human Settlements of Zambia)

---

[59] This is a partial list, comprised of those who consented to be acknowledged, listed in alphabetical order by family name

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

96

18	Jennifer Kelleher	Programme Officer - Governance, Equity & Rights IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme (GPAP)
19	Nzigiyimpa Léonidas	Head of "Conservation and Community of Change (3C), Burundi
20	Mzokhona Mabaso	Assistant Director (National Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa)
21	Franklin Masika	Project Coordinator (Lawyer's Environmental Action Team, Tanzania)
22	Thulani Methula	Director of Parks (Eswatini National Trust Commission)
23	Peter John Mills	Chairperson (Game Rangers Association of Africa, South Africa)
24	Barbara Nakagu	Senior Programme Officer (IUCN Global Programme on Governance and Rights)
25	Emmanuel Nuesiri	Social Science Faculty, African Leadership University (ALU), Pamplemousses, Mauritius Visiting Scholar, Center for African Studies (CAS), University of Illinois Urbana Champaign, USA
26	Ramanantsoa Seheno	Head Department of Protected Areas' Creation and Management (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Madagascar)
27	Kate Shreckenberg	Researcher on natural resource governance (Kings College London)
28	Rob Small	Technical Specialist, Livelihoods and Governance (Fauna & Flora International)
29	Jessica Stewart	Associate Programme Officer (UNEP-WCMC)
30	Sue Stolton	Equilibrium Research
31	Arthur Tuda	Assistant Director (Kenya Wildlife Services, Kenya)
32	Gretchen Walters	Asst. Professor, Development Practice (University of Lausanne)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

97

Annex 1B: Survey Content and Questions

BIOPAMA Survey of Protected and Conserved Area Governance, Social, and Management Effectiveness Assessments in Eastern and Southern Africa

1. Introduction and Background Information

Thank you for sharing information about a protected or conserved area governance, social, or management effectiveness assessment that you have been involved in, or are aware of, in Eastern and Southern Africa.

You can:

• Provide a brief response to each question below for which you have information;

• Provide links to documentation that addresses the questions;

• Email documentation; and/or

• Email to arrange a Skype interview to provide in-depth information

Please email Emmanuel Sulle (**sulle.emmanuel@gmail.com**) to share documents, inquire about an interview, or ask any questions you may have. Completing the survey should take between 20 and 45 minutes, depending on the level of detail you provide.

The survey is designed to collect information about a single assessment methodology or tool (used in one or several sites). **If you would like to share information on multiple methodologies / tools**, you can either complete the survey multiple times (once per assessment methodology/tool) and/or email to arrange a Skype call to share information. There is also space towards the end of this survey to list other assessments that you are aware of.

Survey results will be used to prepare a report on assessments in the region. **All responses in this report will be anonymous**. Most results will be aggregated. Where comments are included, they will not be attributed to any individual or organisation.

1. (OPTIONAL) Please provide contact information

Name:

Organisation:

Title / Position:

Email:

Country:

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

98

2. Which type of protected or conserved area assessment have you been involved in, or are you aware of, in Eastern and Southern Africa?

(If you would like to provide information about more than one assessment methodology/tool, you may complete the survey multiple times or email to arrange an interview. You can also briefly list other assessments in question no. 31.)

- Governance assessment (primary focus)
- Social assessment (primary focus)
- Management effectiveness assessment (primary focus)
- Assessment that combines elements of two or more of the above

Other document (e.g., research, situation analysis, sector review, project monitoring and evaluation report, etc.) that includes substantive assessment of protected or conserved area governance, social impact, and/or management effectiveness as a component. (Please describe):

3. Is documentation about the assessment publicly available?

If so, where? *(Please provide link and/or location)*

4. If information about the assessment is not publicly available, please briefly explain why. For example *(please check all that apply)***:**

- Documentation does not exist
- Documentation is confidential
- Resources not available to maintain information online
- Other (please specify)

2. Assessment Site and Context

This page includes questions about where the assessment was conducted.

5. In what country (or countries) was the assessment conducted?*(Please check all that apply)*

- Angola
- Botswana
- Comoros
- Djibouti

- Eritrea
- eSwatini
- Ethiopia
- Kenya

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

99

- Lesotho
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Mauritius
- Mozambique
- Namibia
- Rwanda
- Seychelles
- Somalia

- South Africa
- South Sudan
- Sudan
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe
- Other (please specify)

6. What is the name(s) of the protected or conserved area(s) for which the assessment was conducted?

(For systems-level or regional assessments, please provide system or region name.)

(For assessments focused on areas adjacent to a protected or conserved area, e.g., as in some social impact assessments, please briefly explain assessment location / focus.)

7. Please provide the protected area's WDPA ID if available.

(This is the protected area(s)' unique identifier in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) assigned by UNEP-WCMC. You can search for the correct WDPA ID on the Protected Planet platform.)

(If the assessment was done in multiple protected areas, please provide the WDPA ID for each area, where available.)

8. What is the protected or conserved area (or areas) designation, e.g., Marine Protected Area, Wildlife Management Area, etc.... ?

9. What is the protected or conserved area's primary governance type?

- Governance by government (may be various agencies, levels)
- Governance by various actors working together (shared governance or co-management)
- Governance by private individuals or organisations
- Governance by Indigenous peoples and/or local communities (often referred to as an ICCA)
- Other (please specify)

10. Who are the main actors governing the protected or conserved area (or areas) e.g., the specific agencies, organisations, peoples, communities, etc.?

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

100

3. When and How the Assessment was Conducted

This page includes questions about when and how the assessment was conducted, including the methodologies and tools used.

11. What year was the assessment conducted?

(If assessment was repeated, please list all years.)

(If the assessment was done in multiple areas /site, please list the year it was done for each site.)

12. What was the primary methodology or tool used?

• Governance assessment based on IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidelines no. 20

• Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (GAPA)

• Whakatane Mechanism

• Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA)

• Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET)

• Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)

• Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM)

• Enhancing our Heritage (EoH)

• Green List assessment

• Other (please specify)

13. Why was this methodology or tool selected?

14. If you selected "other" in question no. 12, please provide links to (or email) documentation about the primary methodology or tool used, e.g., handbook, guide, process description.

15. If you selected "other" in question no. 12 and no documentation is available, please briefly describe the methodology or tool. For example:

• Main focus or objectives

• Key steps, including whether and how rightsholders and stakeholders are engaged

• Primary sources of information

• How results are collated and recorded (e.g., narrative description of strengths and weaknesses, scale from 'weak' to strong', numeric score, etc.)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

101

- How results are typically used

- Other information about the methodology or tool

16. Assessments may involve many actors or just a few. Using the relevant prompts below, please describe who participated in this assessment (e.g., protected or conserved area staff / custodians, government representatives, local communities, NGOs, donors, key informants, academic researchers, consultants, etc.) and what roles they played.

- Who initiated or convened the assessment?

- Who facilitated the assessment?

- Who provided technical support (e.g., research, planning, analysis, etc.)?

- Who participated in assessment process (e.g., workshops, focus groups, surveys, etc.)?

- Other role (and key actor)?

- Other role (and key actor)?

- Other role (and key actor)?

17. What were the main sources of information on which the assessment drew (if not already specified above)?

18. Please provide any other details about the assessment area and scope that you would like to, e.g., institutional, geographical, and/or political boundaries of the assessment.

4. Reflections and Lessons

The questions on this page request further details and invite your reflections on the assessment (where possible), including regarding strengths, challenges, and resources required.

19. What were the main motivations or objectives for convening / conducting the assessment?

20. Approximately how long did the assessment take?

(If possible, please note duration of each phase or step.)

21. Approximately how much did the assessment cost?

(Please specify currency.)

(If possible, please note main expenses, e.g., research, travel, meetings, etc.)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

102

22. What technical resources and capacities were required?

(If possible, please provide information about key roles and skills required for each)

For the following questions (on strengths, challenges, benefits, and drawbacks), please consider issues such as:

- Motivation / enthusiasm among conveners and participants for the assessment

- Clarity and feasibility of process and guidance

- Availability and quality of information

- Clarity and action-ability of results

- Perceived validity / acceptance of results (by participants, decision-makers, others)

- Impacts - what has changed as a result of assessment? were objectives met?

- Integration of assessment process and results in site governance / management

- Other reflections and lessons23. What were strengths of this methodology or tool?

23. What were challenges in the use of this methodology or tool?

24. What were the benefits of doing the assessment?

25. Were there any drawbacks of doing the assessment?

26. Have recommendations from assessments been acted upon?

(If so, please note the types of actions taken, e.g., policy changes, capacity building, enhanced information sharing, etc.)

27. If recommendations have not been acted on, please note why.

(Please check all that apply)

- Resource (funding) constraints

- Time constraints

- Lack of capacity (technical skills, human resources)

- Lack of consensus on recommendations

- Other (please specify)

28. Under what circumstances or for what purposes do you think this methodology is most useful?

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

103

29. What 'good practice' tips would you suggest for use of this methodology (including to avoid or overcome challenges)?

5. Wrap Up

30. Please note (and provide links to) other protected or conserved area governance, social, or management effectiveness assessments conducted in Eastern and Southern Africa that you are aware of.

(Alternatively, to provide more detailed information about these, please complete this survey again.)

31. Any other comments?

32. Would you like to receive a copy of the report that will result from this survey?

(If so, please provide a name and email address to which we can send an electronic copy.)

33. Would you like to be acknowledged as a survey respondent in the report?

(If so, please add your name and institutional affiliation / title as you would like them to appear.)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

104

Annex 2:

Summary of Inventoried
Assessments and Other Resources

Annex 2A: Inventoried Assessments and Other Resources by Country[60]

Angola		**5**
	Management Effectiveness	4
	Other (M,G)	1
Botswana		**16**
	Management Effectiveness	9
	Other (G)	2
	Other (M,G)	1
	Other (M,S,G)	1
	Other (S)	1
	Other (S,G)	2
Comoros		**3**
	Other (G)	2
	Other (M,S,G)	1
Djibouti		**2**
	Management Effectiveness	1
	Other (G,M)	1
Eritrea		**1**
	Other (M,G)	1
eSwatini		**7**
	Management Effectiveness	6
	Combination	1
Ethiopia		**34**
	Management Effectiveness	27
	Social	2
	Other	1
	Other (G)	1
	Other (M,G)	2
	Other (S)	1

---

[60] Abbreviations next to "other" resources refer to whether their primary focus is on management effectiveness (M), governance (G), social impacts (S), or combinations of these.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

106

Kenya		**174**
	Management Effectiveness	112
	Governance	7
	Social	16
	Combination	7
	Landscape (Governance)	2
	Landscape (Social)	5
	Other (G - landscape)	1
	Other (G)	5
	Other (G,M)	3
	Other (M)	1
	Other (M,G)	3
	Other (M,S,G)	1
	Other (S)	7
	Other (S,G)	4
Lesotho		**3**
	Management Effectiveness	1
	Other (G)	2
Madagascar		**502**
	Management Effectiveness	476
	Governance	6
	Social	4
	Landscape (Governance)	2
	Landscape (Social)	3
	Other (G)	6
	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (G,S)	1
	Other (M,S,G)	1
	Other (S - landscape)	1
	Other (S)	1
Malawi		**34**
	Management Effectiveness	29
	Social	1

	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (M,G)	2
	Other (S)	1
Mauritius		**13**
	Management Effectiveness	13
Mozambique		**57**
	Management Effectiveness	45
	Social	4
	Other (G)	3
	Other (M,G)	3
	Other (M,S,G)	1
	Other (S)	1
Multiple		**60**
	Governance	3
	Landscape (Governance)	1
	Landscape (Social)	1
	Other (G)	23
	Other (G,M)	2
	Other (M)	3
	Other (M,G)	1
	Other (M,S)	1
	Other (M,S,G)	5
	Other (S)	9
	Other (S,G)	11
Multiple		**8**
	Management Effectiveness	5
	Other (G)	3
Namibia		**81**
	Management Effectiveness	44
	Governance	9
	Social	2
	Other (G)	4

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

108

	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (G,S)	14
	Other (M,G)	2
	Other (S)	4
	Other (S,G)	1
Rwanda		**12**
	Management Effectiveness	5
	Combination	1
	Other (G)	1
	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (M,G)	1
	Other (S - landscape)	1
	Other (S)	1
	Other (S,G)	1
Seychelles		**12**
	Management Effectiveness	12
Somalia		**1**
	Other (G,M)	1
South Africa		**1618**
	Management Effectiveness	1606
	Other (G)	3
	Other (G,M)	5
	Other (M,G)	1
	Other (M,S)	1
	Other (S)	2
South Sudan		**7**
	Management Effectiveness	4
	Other (G)	2
	Other (M,S,G)	1
Sudan		**3**
	Management Effectiveness	2
	Other (G,M)	1

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

109

Tanzania		**741**
	Management Effectiveness	340
	Governance	344
	Social	4
	Combination	19
	Landscape (Governance)	2
	Landscape (Social)	3
	Other (G - landscape)	1
	Other (G)	6
	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (M,G)	9
	Other (M,S,G - landscape)	1
	Other (S)	9
	Other (S,G)	2
Uganda		**90**
	Management Effectiveness	53
	Governance	4
	Social	13
	Combination	3
	Landscape (Social)	2
	Other (G)	3
	Other (G,M)	1
	Other (M)	2
	Other (M,G)	3
	Other (M,S,G)	1
	Other (S - landscape)	2
	Other (S)	1
	Other (S,G)	2
Zambia		**81**
	Management Effectiveness	70
	Governance	3
	Social	2

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

110

	Other (M,G)	5
	Other (S)	1
Zimbabwe		**29**
	Management Effectiveness	14
	Governance	2
	Social	2
	Landscape (Governance)	1
	Other (G)	2
	Other (M,G)	3
	Other (S)	4
	Other (S,G)	1
Grand Total		**3594**

111

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

WELCOME TO
MOSI-OA-TUNYA
VICTORIA FALLS
ZIMBABWE

Annex 2B: Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments by Location, Year

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Angola	2011	ME	METT	Iona National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Angola	2012	ME	METT	Bicuar National Park; Cangandala National Park; Quiçãma National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Botswana	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Central Kalahari Game Reserve; Chobe National Park; Gemsbok National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Botswana	2008	ME	METT	Nata Bird Sanctuary	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Botswana	2010	ME	METT	Gemsbok National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Botswana	2013	ME	METT	Chobe Forest Reserve and National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Botswana	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Okavango Delta World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Djibouti	2009	ME	METT	Haramous Area protected for habitat and species	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
eSwatini	2018	C	FSC	Various (national level)	FSC National Risk Assessment for Eswatini (2019)

---

[61] Management effectiveness (ME), governance (G), social (S), or combined / mixed assessment (C)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

113

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
eSwatini	2014, 2018	ME	METT	Malolotja Nature Reserve; Mantenga Nature Reserve;Mlawula Nature Reserve	Survey response
Ethiopia	1996	ME	BirdLife IBA	Mago National Park; Omo National Park; Yabello Sanctuary	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Ethiopia	2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Abijatta-Shalla National Park; Awash National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Ethiopia	2014	ME	EoH	Simien Mountains National park	
Ethiopia	2004	ME	METT	Bale Mountains National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Ethiopia	2005	ME	METT	Alatish National Park; Awash National Park; Babile Elephant Sanctuary; Chebera Churchura National Park; Gambella National Park; Maze Controlled Hunting Area; Nechisar National Park; Omo National Park; Senkelle Swayne's Hartebeest Sanctuary; Simien Mountains National Park; Yangudi Rassa National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Ethiopia	2011	ME	METT	Alledeghi Wildlife Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Ethiopia	2015+	ME	SMART	Abijata Shalla Lakes National Park; Awash National Park; Bale Mountains National Park; Hartebeest Sanctuary;Kafta Sheraro National Park	SMART webpage
Ethiopia	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Simien National Park World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Ethiopia	2019	S	PA-BAT	Bale Mountains and Gambella National Parks	Bunderforste, 2009

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

114

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Ethiopia	2015	S	SAPA	Awash National Park	Email communication
Global - including ESA	2015	C	GEF Impact Evaluation	Multiple	49th GEF Council Meeting October 20-22, 2015
Kenya	2018	C	Green List	Ol Kinyei Conservancy Community Conservancy	Green List webpage, KII
Kenya	2014, 2018	C	Green List	Lewa Wildlife Conservancy Community Conservancy	Green List webpage, KII
Kenya	2014, 2018	C	Green List	Ol Pejeta Conservancy Community Conservancy	Green List webpage, KII
Kenya	2011	C	Participatory Mapping	Mau Forest	Pedrick, C. (2016)
Kenya	2011	C	Whakatane Mechanism	Mt Elgon	Whakatane Mechanism webpage
Kenya	2017	G	Equity Questionnaire	Tsavo East National Park	Project webpage
Kenya	2017	G	GAPA	Mara North Conservancy Wildlife Conservancy; Kalama Conservancy Wildlife Conservancy; Kanamai Co-management area and Tengefu	Franks and Booker 2018
Kenya	2011	G	ProFor Governance Framework	Forest	Kishor et al., 2012
Kenya	2015	G	RFGI	Kasigau carbon project located in Taita TavetaCounty	

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Kenya	1999	ME	BirdLife IBA	Amboseli National Park; Arabuko Sokoke Forest Reserve; Kikuyu Escarpment Forest Reserve; Lake Naivasha Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance; Lake Nakuru National Park and Ramsar Site; Meru National Park; Mwea National Reserve; Nairobi National Park; Shaba National Reserve; Tsavo East National Park; Tsavo West National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2014	ME	EoH	Kenya Lake System WHS and Mt. Kenya National Park / WHS	EoH Assessment Reports
Kenya	2019	ME	IMET	Kisite Marine Protected Area	
Kenya	2015	ME	METT	Chyulu Hills National Park	KII
Kenya	2015	ME	METT	Tsavo East National Park and Tsavo West National Parks	KII
Kenya	2005, 2006	ME	METT	Arabuko Sokoke Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2006, 2007	ME	METT	Marenji Forest Reserve; Mrima Forest Reserve; Mwachi Forest Reserve; Tana River Primate National Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2013, 2018	ME	METT	Kisite Marine National Park; Malindi Marine parks and reserve; Mombasa Marine National Park; Watamu Marine National Park	Survey response
Kenya	2015, 2018	ME	METT	Kiunga Marine Conservancy Community Nature Reserve	Survey response
Kenya	2005, 2006, 2007	ME	METT	Gonja Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2005, 2006, 2009	ME	METT	Kakamega Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

116

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Kenya	2006, 2007, 2010, 2012	ME	METT	Buda Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2006, 2007, 2015, 2018	ME	METT	Kaya Dzombo Sacred Grove; Witu Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Kenya	2007, 2008, 2015, 2018	ME	METT	Kaya Jibana Sacred Grove; Kaya Ribe Sacred Grove	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Kenya	2013, 2014, 2015, 2018	ME	METT	Dodori National Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Kenya	2004, 2006, 2007, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Shimba Hills National Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Kenya	2006, 2007, 2008, 2015, 2018	ME	METT	Kaya Chonyi Sacred Grove	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Kenya	2006, 2007, 2008, 2015, 2018	ME	METT	Kaya Kambe Sacred Grove	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

117

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Kenya	2015, 2018, 2007, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Boni National Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Kenya	2015+	ME	SMART	Amboseli National Park; Eleria Conservancy; Imbirikani Conservancy; Kimana Conservancy; Lewa Wildlife Conservancy; Mara Triangle; Masaai Mara National Reserve; Mount Kenya Trust; Olgulilui Conservancy; Oloisukut conservancy; Siana Conservancy; Tsavo East National Park; Tsavo West NP (Ngulia Rhino Sanctuary)	http://smartconservationtools.org/smart-partnership/ http://smartconservationtools.org/
Kenya	2003	ME	West Indian Ocean MPA	Kisite Marine National Park/Mpunguti Marine National Reserve; Kiunga Marine Conservancy Community Nature Reserve; Mallindi Marine National Park; Mombasa Marine National Park; Watamu Marine National Park	Wells, S. (2004)
Kenya	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley World Heritage Site; Lake Turkana National Parks World Heritage Site; Mt. Kenya National Park/Natural Forest World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Kenya	1998	S	Livelihoods Impact Assessment	Arabuko Sokoke Forest and Il Ngwesi Lodge (Laikipia District, near Mount Kenya)	Ashley and Hussein, 2000
Kenya	1996	S	PEV	Oldonyo Orok Forest	Emerton, L. (1996)
Kenya	2006	S	PEV and RSIA	Arabuko Sokoke Forest Reserve; Samburu Game Reservation; Lekurruki Conservancy	CARE et al., 2008

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

118

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Kenya	2016	S	Photovoice	Multiple MPAs	Mahajan SL and Daw T. (2016)
Kenya	Planned – 2019/2020	S	SAPA	Amboseli ; Marsabit National Park	Personal Communication
Kenya	2019 (ongoing)	S	SAPA	Kisite Marine Protected Area Marine Protected Area ; Ruma National Park	Personal Communication
Kenya	2014, 2019 (ongoing)	S	SAPA	Ol Pejeta Conservancy Wildlife Management Area	Franks and Small, 2016;
Kenya	2019	G	GAPA	Olderkesi Conservancy Wildlife Conservancy	Personal Communication
Lesotho	2005	ME	METT	Sehlabathebe National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2015	G	Case study	Berenty Private Reserve	Stolton and Dudley, 2015a
Madagascar	2015	G	Case study	Bezà Mahafaly Special Reserve; Nose Ve Androka Marine Park; Tsimanampesotse National Park, Ankodida Protected Area	Franks and Booker, 2015
Madagascar	2001	ME	IEG	Parc national Tsimanampesotse Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2003	ME	IEG	Analamerana Special Reserve; Andohahela National Park; Andranomena Special Reserve; Andringitra National Park; Ankarana Special Reserve; Bezaha Mahafaly Special Reserve; Cap Sainte-Marie Special Reserve; Lokobe National Park; Manongarivo Special Reserve; Tsaratanana Strict Nature Reserve; Tsimanampetsotsa National Park; Zombitse-Vohibasia National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2005	ME	IEG	Manombo Special Reserve; Mikea National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Madagascar	2006	ME	IEG	Mananara Nord UNESCO-MAB Biosphere Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2011	ME	IEG	Ambatovaky Special Reserve; Baie de Baly National Park; Masoala National Park; Ranomafana National Park; Zahamena National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2016	ME	IEG	Ambohitantely Special Reserve, Analamazoatra National Park; Anjanaharibe-Sud Special Reserve; Ankarafantsika National Park; Barrière de Corail Nosy Ve Androka Ramsar Site; Belo-sur-mer Locally Managed Marine Area; Betampona Strict Nature Reserve; Isalo National Park; Kalambatritra Special Reserve; Kirindy Mitea National Park; Mangerivola Special Reserve; Mantadia National Park; Marojejy National Park; Marotandrano Special Reserve; Montagne d'Ambre National Park; Pic d'Ivohibe Special Reserve; Tsingy de Bemaraha Strict Nature Reserve; Tsingy de Namoroka National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2005, 2008, 2016	ME	IEG	Sahamalaza National Park and UNESCO-MAB Biosphere Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2016	ME	IEG and SMART	Nosy Mangabe National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2016	ME	METT	Analalava Special Reserve; Complexe des Zones Humides de Bemanevika Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance; Corridor Marojejy Tsaratanana Proposed Protected Area; Mahavavy Kinkony Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Menabe Paysage Harmonieux Protégé	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2018	ME	METT	125 Sites in PA system	Survey Response

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

120

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Madagascar	2016, 2017	ME	Using variety of PAME methodologies including METT	125 Sites in PA system	Survey Response
Madagascar	2016	ME	PAMETT	Ankodida Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Sud-Ouest Ifotaky New Protected Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2015	ME	SAPM	Andreba Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Anjozorobe Angavo Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Behara-Tranomaro New Protected Area; Bemarivo Special Reserve; Bongolava Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Bora Special Reserve; Kasijy Special Reserve; Velondriake Paysage Harmonieux Protégé	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2016	ME	SAPM	Ankarea Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Le Lac Alaotra: les zones humides et basin Ramsar Site; Mandena Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Maningoza Special Reserve; Marais de Torotorofotsy avec leurs bassins versants Ramsar Site; Montagne des Français Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Ranobe PK 32 New Protected Area; Rivière Nosivolo et affluents Ramsar Site; Site Bioculturel d'Antrema Ramsar Site; Soariake Réserve de Ressources Naturelles; Tampoketsa Analamaitso Special Reserve; Tampolo Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Tsimembo Protected Harmonious Landscape; Zone Humide de Mandrozo Ramsar Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Madagascar	2016	ME	SGBD/SMART	Fandrina Vondrozo Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Zahamena Ankeniheny Reserve de ressource naturel	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

121

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Madagascar	Bewteen 2014 and 2017 (Most in 2016)	ME	SMART	Ambatovaky Special Reserve'; Ambohitantely Special Reserve; Analamazaotra National Park; Analamerana Special Reserve; Andohahela National Park; Andringitra National Park; Anjanaharibe Sud Special Reserve; Ankarafantsika National Park; Ankarana Special Reserve; Baie de Baly National Park; Befotaka Midongy National Park; Bemaraha National Park; Betampona Strict Natural Reserve; Beza Mahafaly Special Reserve; Cap Sainte Marie Special Reserve; CBNRM Ambakivao; CBNRM Andramasay; CBNRM Antanandahy; CBNRM Antsakoamalinika; CBNRM Benjavilo; CBNRM Bevava; CBNRM Kaday; CBNRM Manombo; CBNRM Marofototse; CBNRM Soahany; CBNRM Soarano sur Mer; CBNRM Tsimandrafoza; National Park; Mananara Nord; Mangerivola Special Reserve; Manombo Special Reserve; Manongarivo Special Reserve; Mantadia National Park; Marojejy National Park; Marotandrano Special Reserve; Mikea National Park; Montagne d'Ambre National Park; New Protected Area of Amoron'i Onilahy; New protected Area of Ankodida; New protected Area of North Ifotaky; Nosy Hara National Park; Nosy Ve Androka National Park; Pic d'Ivohibe Special Reserve; Ranomafana National Park; Sahamalaza Iles Radama National Park; Soariake Marine Protected Area; Tsaratanana Strict Natural Reserve; Tsimanampesotse National Park; Tsingy de Namoroka National Park; Zahamena National Park; Zombitse Vohibasia National Park; Ambodivahibe Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Onilahy Paysage Harmonieux Protégé; Parque Nacional do Limpopo; Parque Nacional do Zinave; Ankarea Marine Protected Area; CBNRM Ankitikitike; CBNRM Antenina; CBNRM Antsatrana; CBNRM Beomby; CBNRM Voroja; CBNRM Zamasy; Isalo National Park; Kirindy Mite National Park; Lokobe; Community Based Natural Ressources Management (CBNRM) Ampasivelona; Corridor Marojejy Tsaratanana Protected Area; Makira Natural Park; Marolambo National Park; Masoala National Park	SMART webpage

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

122

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Madagascar	2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Tsingy de Bemaraha Strict Nature Reserve World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Madagascar	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Rainforests of the Atsinanana World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Madagascar	2017	S	Discrete choice experiments	Multiple Sites Forests	Rakotonarivo OS, Jacobsen JB, Larsen HO, et al. (2017)
Madagascar	2015	S	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	Ambatovy Mine biodiversity offsets Forest	Bidaud, C., Schreckenberg, K., Rabeharison, M., Ranjatson, P., Gibbons, J. and Jones, J.P., 2017
Madagascar	2008	S	Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit	Forest	PROFOR (2008)
Madagascar	2018	S		Sustainable Liveihoods Framework	C. Ward, L.C. Stringer, G. Holmes (2018)
Madagascar	2011	G	TAI Analysis	Protected Areas System	TAI webpage
Madagascar	2013	ME	EoH	Atsinanana	PAPACO webpage
Malawi	2001	ME		Lake Chilwa Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

123

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Malawi	2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Dzalanyama Forest Reserve; Ntchisi Forest Reserve; Soche Forest Reserve; Thyolo Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Malawi	2013	ME	EoH	Lake Malawi National Park World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE PROJECT (with support from UNESCO and IUCN) (April 2013)
Malawi	2010	ME	METT	Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve; Vwaza Marsh Wildlife Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Malawi	2012	ME	METT	Liwonde National Park; Mangochi Forest Reserve; Neno Eastern escarpment Forest Reserve; Tsamba Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Malawi	2015, 2017	ME	METT	Londwe National Park	Survey Response
Malawi	2012, 2015, 2017	ME	METT	Lengwe National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Survey Response
Malawi	2006	ME	RAPPAM	Kasungu National Park; Lake Malawi National Park; Lengwe National Park; Liwonde National Park; Majete Wildlife Reserve; Mwabvi Wildlife Reserve; Nkhotakota Wildlife Reserve; Nyika National Park; Vwaza Marsh Wildlife Reserve	WWF (2006)
Malawi	2013+	ME	SMART	Kasungu National Park	SMART webpage
Malawi	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Lake Malawi National Park World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

124

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Malawi	Planned – early 2020	S	SAPA	Majete	Personal Communication, Phil Franks and Francesca Booker
Mauritius	2009	ME	METT	Black River Gorges National Park; Bois Sec Nature Reserve; Bras D'Eau National Park; Cabinet Nature Reserve; Gouly Pere Nature Reserve; Ile aux Aigrettes Nature Reserve; Ile aux Serpents Nature Reserve; Ile D'Ambre Islet National Park; Ile Ronde (Round Island) Nature Reserve; Ilot Gabriel Nature Reserve; Les Mares Nature Reserve; Perrier Nature Reserve; Rivulet Terre Rouge Estuary Bird Sanctuary Ramsar Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (2019)
Mozambique	2010, 2015	ME	METT	Gorongosa National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Mozambique	2014, 2015, 2016	ME	METT	Bazaruto National Park; Gilé National Reserve; Limpopo National Park; Marromeu Game Reserve; Pomene Game Reserve; Zinave National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Mozambique	2006, 2014, 2015, 2016	ME	METT	Maputo Special Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Mozambique	2013, 2014, 2015, 2016	ME	METT	Quirimbas National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Mozambique	1999, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2014, 2015, 2016	ME	METT	Banhine National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

125

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Mozambique	2006	ME	RAPPAM	Banhine National Park; Bazaruto National Park; Gilé National Reserve; Gorongosa National Park; Limpopo National Park; Maputo Special Reserve; Marromeu Game Reserve; Quirimbas National Park; Zinave National Park	Republic of Mozambique (2006)
Mozambique	2014+	ME	SMART	Niassa Game Reserve	SMART webpage
Mozambique	2019	S	SAPA	Chimanimani National Park; Maputo Special Reserve; Marromeu National Park	Personal communicaiton – Rob Small
Mozambique	Unknown	S	SWIFT		SWIFT webpage
Multiple - including Tanzania, Namibia, Madagascar	2015	G	Meta-analyses	Multiple	Wicander, 2015; Stolton and Dudley, 2015a; Franks and Booker, 2015;
Namibia	2015	G	Case study	Bwabwata National Park; Mangetti National Park	Franks and Booker, 2015
Namibia	2015	G	Case study	Gondwana Cañon Park; Namib Rand	Stolton and Dudley, 2015a
Namibia	2015	G	Case study	Etosha National Park; Mudumu National Park; Namibian Islands' Marine Protected Area	Wicander, 2015
Namibia	2007	G	Community Dashboard	Mashi Conservancy; Wuparo Conservancy	Child (2007).
Namibia	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Etosha National Park; Etosha Pan, Lake Oponono & Cuvelai drainage Ramsar Site; Sandwich Harbour Ramsar Site; Tsau // Khaeb (Sperrgebiet) National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

126

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Namibia	2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Namib Sand Sea WHS; Namib-Naukluft National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004	ME	METT	Hardap Recreation Resort National Park; Khaudum National Park; Naute Recreation Resort National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2005	ME	METT	Cape Cross Seal Reserve National Park; Von Bach Recreation Resort National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004, 2009, Not Reported	ME	METT	Bwabwata National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2009, 2011	ME	METT	Waterberg Plateau Park National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004, 2009, 2010	ME	METT	Namib-Naukluft National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004, 2009, 2011	ME	METT	Ai-Ais Hot Springs National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2005, 2009, 2010	ME	METT	Daan Viljoen Game Park National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004, 2009, 2011	ME	METT	Nkasa Rupara National Park; Skeleton Coast Park National Park; Tsau // Khaeb (Sperrgebiet) National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Namibia	2004, 2009, 2010, 2011, Not Reported	ME	METT	Mudumu National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

127

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Namibia	2016+	ME	SMART	Etosha National Park; Kunene region conservencies; Waterburg Plateau National Park	SMART webpage
Namibia	2014	S	Wellbeing Assessment	Orupupa conservancy; Puros conservancy	Jones, B.T. B. 2014.
Namibia	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Namib Sand Sea World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Rwanda	2017	C	FSC	Various (national level)	FSC webpage
Rwanda	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Volcans National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Rwanda	2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Akagera National Park; Nyungwe National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Rwanda	2004	ME	METT	Nyungwe National Park; Volcans National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Seychelles	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Aldabra Atoll WHS and Ramsar Site; Aldabra Special Reserve; Praslin National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Seychelles	2002, 2007	ME	EoH	Aldabra Atoll World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Seychelles	2009	ME	METT	Aldabra Atoll Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Seychelles	2003	ME	West Indian Ocean MPA	Cousin Island Special Reserve	Wells, S. (2004)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

128

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Seychelles	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Aldabra Atoll World Heritage Site; Vallée de Mai Nature Reserve World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
South Africa	1998	ME	BirdLife IBA	De Hoop Nature Reserve; Lake Sibaya Ramsar Site and Freshwater Reserve; Ndumo Game Reserve Ramsar Site and Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2006	ME	BirdLife IBA	Golden Gate Highlands National Park; Itala Nature Reserve; Mkuzi Game Reserve Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007	ME	BirdLife IBA	Chelmsford Public Resort Nature Reserve; Dwesa-Cwebe Nature Reserve; Oribi Gorge Nature Reserve; Umtamvuna Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2008	ME	BirdLife IBA	Kalahari Gemsbok National Park; Pilanesberg National Park Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2009	ME	BirdLife IBA	Ngoya Forest Reserve Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Anysberg Mountain Catchment Area; Camdeboo National Park; Coleford Nature Reserve; Impendle Nature Reserve; Lambert's Bay Penguin Island Provincial Nature Reserve; Pietersburg Nature Reserve; Rietvlei Nature Area Nature Reserve; Songimvelo Game Reserve Nature Reserve; St Lucia System Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance; Umgeni Vlei Nature Reserve Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007, 2013	ME	BirdLife IBA	Karoo National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	Unknown	ME	EoH	iSimangaliso Wetland Park World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

129

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2003	ME	EoH	St. Lucia Game Park Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2009	ME	METT	Groot Swartberg Mountain Catchment Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2010	ME	METT	Anysberg Mountain Catchment Area; Atherstone Private Nature Reserve; Bird Island Group Marine Protected Area; Bosbokrand Nature Reserve; Bracken Nature Reserve; Emakhosini Heritage Park Nature Reserve; Geelkrans Provincial Nature Reserve; Harmony Flats Provincial Nature Reserve; Hlinza Forest Nature Reserve; Malekgalonyane Nature Reserve; Nababiep Nature Reserve, Nature Reserve: Co-operation and Development; Rolfontein Provincial Nature Reserve; S.S. Skosana Nature Reserve; Witsand Provincial Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2012	ME	METT	Mduna Royal Reserve Nature reserve; Thanda Private Game Reserve	Space for Elephants Foundation (2012)
South Africa	2013	ME	METT	Happy Rest Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2016	ME	METT	Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site	GRAA, PARCS
South Africa	2003, 2010	ME	METT	Ngoya Forest Reserve Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007, 2010	ME	METT	Oorlogskloof Provincial Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2009, 2010	ME	METT	iSimangaliso Wetland Park World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

130

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2012, 2013	ME	METT	Kalahari Gemsbok National Park; S. A. Lombard Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2004, 2008, 2010	ME	METT	Agulhas National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2005, 2007, 2010	ME	METT	Verlorenvlei Ramsar Site, Wetland of International Importance	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007, 2009, 2010	ME	METT	Gamka Mountain Provincial Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2005, 2010, 2012	ME	METT	Pondoland Marine Protected Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2010, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Augrabies Falls National Park; Barberspan Nature Reserve; Bontebok National Park; Borakalalo National Park Nature Reserve; Boschkop Private Nature Reserve; Camdeboo National Park; Golden Gate Highlands National Park; Karoo National Park; Kruger National Park; Madikwe Nature Reserve; Mapungupwe National Park; Marakele National Park; Mokala National Park; Molopo Provincial Nature Reserve; Mountain Zebra National Park; Namaqua National Park; Pilanesberg National Park Nature Reserve; Table Mountain National Park; West Coast National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Alice Glöckner Nature Reserve; Anysberg Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Atherstone Protected Natural Environment Protected Environment; Entumeni Nature Reserve; Geelkrans Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Hlathikulu Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Ubombo Mountain Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

131

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2015, 2017, 2019 (may be forthcoming)	ME	METT	294 individual sites in government-governed PA system	Survey Response and KII
South Africa	2005, 2010, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Richtersveld National Park	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2005, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Lambert's Bay Penguin Island Provincial Nature Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

132

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Amatikulu Nature Reserve; Beachwood Mangroves Nature Reserve; Bewerwyk Private Nature Reserve; Blouberg Protea Nature Reserve; Bluff Nature Reserve; Caledon Nature Reserve; Chelmsford Public Resort Nature Reserve; Coleford Nature Reserve; Dassen Island Provincial Nature Reserve; Doornkloof Provincial Nature Reserve; Doreen Clark Nature Reserve; Driftsands Nature Reserve; Dyer Island Provincial Nature Reserve; Enseleni Nature Reserve; Erfenis Dam Nature Reserve; Formosa 203 JT Nature Reserve; Gariep Nature Reserve; Great Fish River Mouth Wetland Nature Reserve; Groendal Wilderness Area Forest Wilderness Area; Grootbosch Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Hans Merensky Nature Reserve; Harold Johnson Nature Reserve; Himeville Nature Reserve; Hluhluwe Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Impendle Nature Reserve; Itala Nature Reserve; Kalkfontein Dam Nature Reserve; Karkloof Nature Reserve; Kenneth Stainbank Nature Reserve; Koppies Dam Nature Reserve; Krantzkloof Nature Reserve; Kruis River Wetland Nature Reserve; Lake Eteza Nature Reserve; Langjan Nature Reserve; Leeuwfontein Private Nature Reserve; Letaba Private Nature Reserve; Loskop Dam Nature Reserve; Mabusa Nature Reserve; Mahushe Shongwe Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Manguzi Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Mantrombi Nature Reserve; Manyeleti Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Maria Moroka National Park Nature Reserve; Marloth Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Mbumbazi Nature Reserve; Mdala Nature Reserve; Midmar Public Resort Nature Reserve; Mkhombo Nature Reserve; Modjadji Nature Reserve; Moletzie Bird Sanctuary Nature Reserve; Mount Currie Nature Reserve; Mthethomusha Nature Reserve; Ncandu Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Nduli Nature Reserve; Ndumu Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Nkandla Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Nooitgedacht Dam Nature Reserve; North Park Nature Reserve; Nsikeni Nature Reserve; Nwanedi National Park Nature Reserve; Nylsvley Private Nature Reserve; Ohrigstad Dam Nature Reserve; Ophathe Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Oribi Gorge Nature Reserve; Oviston Nature Reserve; Percy Fyfe Nature Reserve; Pongola Bush Nature Reserve; Potlake Nature Reserve; Qudeni Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Queen Elizabeth Park Nature Reserve; Richards Bay Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Riverlands Provincial Nature Reserve; Roodeplaat Nature Reserve; Rustfontein Nature Reserve; Salmonsdam Provincial Nature Reserve; Sandveld Nature Reserve; Schuinsdraai Nature Reserve; Seekoeivlei Nature Reserve and Ramsar Site; Sileza Nature Reserve; Soada Forest Nature Reserve; Soetdoring Nature Reserve; Songimvelo Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Spioenkop Public Resort Nature Reserve; Sterkfontein Dam Nature Reserve; Sterkspruit Nature Reserve; Suikerbosrand Nature Reserve; Tembe Elephant Park Nature Reserve; The Swamp Nature Reserve; Thomas Baines Nature Reserve; Tsolwana Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Tugela Drift Nature Reserve; Tussen-die-Riviere Game Farm Nature Reserve; Umhlanga Lagoon Nature Reserve; Umlalazi Nature Reserve; Umtamvuna Nature Reserve; Umvoti Vlei Nature Reserve; Verloren Vallei Nature Reserve; Vernon Crookes Nature Reserve; Vrolijkheid Nature Reserve; Wagendrift Public Resort Nature Reserve; Weenen Nature Reserve; Willem Pretorius Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Wolkberg Wilderness Area Forest Wilderness Area; Wonderkop Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

133

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2005, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2013, unreported	ME	METT	Garden Route National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2005, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Tankwa-Karoo National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2005, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Hluleka Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Groot-Winterhoek Wilderness Area Forest Wilderness Area; Keurbooms River Nature Reserve; Robberg Nature Reserve; Swartberg-Oos Mountain Catchment Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Brenton Blue Butterfly Nature Reserve Special Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2004, 2005, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Dwesa-Cwebe Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2004, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	De Hoop Nature Reserve; De Mond Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Walker Bay Whale Sanctuary Marine Protected Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

134

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2005, 2007, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Matjies Rivier Provincial Nature Reserve; Rocher Pan Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013	ME	METT	Goukamma Provincial Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
South Africa	2001	ME	RAPPAM	Amatikulu Nature Reserve; Beachwood Mangroves Nature Reserve; Bluff Nature Reserve; Chelmsford Public Resort Nature Reserve; Coastal Forest Reserve Nature Reserve;Coleford Nature Reserve; Doreen Clark Nature Reserve; Enseleni Nature Reserve; Entumeni Nature Reserve; False Bay Park Nature Reserve; Giant's Castle Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Harold Johnson Nature Reserve; Himeville Nature Reserve; Hlinza Forest Nature Reserve; Hluhluwe Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Impendle Nature Reserve; Itala Nature Reserve; Kamberg Nature Reserve; Karkloof Nature Reserve; Kenneth Stainbank Nature Reserve; Krantzkloof Nature Reserve; Loteni Nature Reserve; Manguzi Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Maphelane Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve; Matshitsholo Nature Reserve; Mbumbazi Nature Reserve; Midmar Public Resort Nature Reserve; Mkhomazi Wilderness Area Forest Wilderness Area; Mkuzi Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Mount Currie Nature Reserve; Natal National Park Nature Reserve; Ncandu Nature Reserve Forest Nature Reserve;Ndumo Game Reserve Ramsar Site; Ngoya Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Nkandla Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; North Park Nature Reserve; Ophathe Game Reserve Nature ReserveOribi Gorge Nature Reserve; Poccolan Robinson's Bush Nature Reserve; Pongola Bush Nature Reserve; Qudeni Forest Reserve Nature Reserve; Queen Elizabeth Park Nature Reserve; Rugged Glen Nature Reserve; Sileza Nature Reserve; Soada Forest Nature Reserve; Sodwana Bay National Park Nature Reserve; Spioenkop Public Resort Nature Reserve; St Lucia Marine Protected Area; St Lucia System Ramsar Site; Tembe Elephant Park Nature Reserve; The Swamp Nature Reserve; Ubombo Mountain Nature Reserve; Umfolozi Game Reserve Nature Reserve; Umhlanga Lagoon Nature Reserve; Umlalazi Nature Reserve; Umtamvuna Nature Reserve; Umvoti Vlei Nature Reserve; Vergelegen Nature Reserve; Vernon Crookes Nature Reserve; Wagendrift Public Resort Nature Reserve; Weenen Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

135

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
South Africa	2015+	ME	SMART	Mapungubwe National Park	SMART webpage
South Africa	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Cape Floral Region Protected Areas World Heritage Site; iSimangaliso Wetland Park World Heritage Site; Vredefort Dome World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
South Sudan	2009	ME	METT	Badingilo National Park; Boma National Park; Southern National Park; Zeraf Game Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Sudan	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Dinder National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Sudan	2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dungonab Bay - Mukkawar Island Marine National Park World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Tanzania	between 2010-present	C	FSC	17 VLFR sites between 2010 and present	MCDI webpage
Tanzania	2018	C	FSC	Various (national level)	FSC webpage
Tanzania	2019	C	ICCA SSP	ICCAs in Tanzania	https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/2017/
Tanzania	2015	G	Case study	Mbarang'andu Wildlife Management Area; Njianne-Somanga-Pombwe-Jaja Community Fisheries Mgt Area	Franks P and Booker F (2015)
Tanzania	2015	G	Case study	Amani Nature Reserve; Mafia Island Marine Park; Mwambesi Forest Reserve; Ruaha National Park	Wicander, S. 2015.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

136

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2015	G	Case study	Chumbe Island Coral Park MPA; Mwiba Wildlife Ranch	Stolton, S and N Dudley (2015)
Tanzania	2018	G	Community Evaluation	Manyara Region	Mkonyi, F.J., 2018.
Tanzania	2017	G	Equity Questionnaire	Ngorongoro Conservation Area World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	Project webpage
Tanzania	Ongoing	G	Mixed methods	Multiple ICCAs	
Tanzania	between 2011 and 2013	G	MJUMITA Dashboard Tool	75 villages engaged in both PFM and JFM Forest Reserves 186 villages engaged in PFM VLFR 72 villages doing JFM Forest Reserve	MJUMITA and TFCG, 2014 Email communication
Tanzania	Planned 2019 or 2020	G	SAGE (prov. name)	Site(s) to be determined	Personal Communication
Tanzania	Ongoing	G	Best Practice Guidelines no. 20	System of ICCAs	Interview
Tanzania	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Lake Natron Basin Ramsar Site; Maswa Game reserve; Ngorongoro Conservation WHS; Selous Game Reserve and WHS; Serengeti National Park and WHS; Tarangire National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2002	ME	BirdLife IBA	Arusha National Park; Lake Manyara National Park; Mikumi National Park; Ruaha National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

137

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2005	ME	BirdLife IBA	Katavi National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2004	ME	EoH	Serengeti World Heritage Site (natural or mixed)	SERENGETI WORLD HERITAGE SITE INITIAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Tanzania	2003	ME	METT	Zaraninge Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005	ME	METT	Bagai Forest Reserve; Balangai West Forest Reserve; Bombo East II Forest Reserve; Chamanyani Forest Reserve; Chome Forest Reserve; Chongweni Forest Reserve; Dindili Forest Reserve; Gonja Forest Reserve; Kamwalla I and II Forest Reserves; Kankoma Forest Reserve; Kibao Forest Reserve; Kigogo Forest Reserve; Kiranga Hengae Forest Reserve; Kisima Gonja Forest Reserve; Kisiwani Forest Reserve; Kitara Ridge Forest Reserve; Kindoroko Forest Reserve; Koko Hill Forest Reserve; Kwizu Forest Reserve; Mafi Hill Forest Reserve; Mafwomero Forest Reserve; Maganda Forest Reserve; Mahenge Scarp Forest Reserve; Mahezangulu Forest Reserve; Mangalisa Forest Reserve; Mbwegere Forest Reserve; Mfumbia Forest Reserve; Mhulu Forest Reserve; Minja Forest Reserve; Mkongo Forest Reserve; Mkuli Exten. Forest Reserve; Mkungwe Forest Reserve; Mlali Forest Reserve; Mtumbi Forest Reserve; Mufindi Scarp Forest Reserve; Mvuha Forest Reserve; Ndechela Forest Reserve; Ndekemai Forest Reserve; Ndolwa Forest Reserve; Nyaganje Forest Reserve; Pumula Forest Reserve; Rudewa South Forest Reserve; Ruvu Forest Reserve; Sali Forest Reserve; Shagayu Forest Reserve; Shambalai Forest Reserve; Shume Magamba Nature Reserve; Tongwe Forest Reserve; Uponera Forest Reserve; Wotta Forest Reserve;; Wotta Forest Reserve;	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2009	ME	METT	Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

138

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2010	ME	METT	Kitulo Plateau National Park; Rungwe Nature Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2011	ME	METT	Gwami Forest Reserve; Kazimzumbwi Forest Reserve; Kikale Forest Reserve; Kikoka Forest Reserve; Kingoma Forest Reserve; Kipo Forest Reserve; Mangroves-Bagamoyo Forest Reserve; Marenda Forest Reserve; Masanganya Forest Reserve; Masingini Catchment Forest Forest Reserve; Matapwa Forest Reserve; Mchungu Forest Reserve; Mkundi Forest Reserve; Mlola Forest Reserve; Mlungui Forest Reserve; Mohoro Forest Reserve; Mohoro River Forest Reserve; Msumbugwe Forest Reserve; Mtanza Forest Reserve; Mtita Forest Reserve; Ngulakula Forest Reserve; Nyumburuni Forest Reserve; Pugu Forest Reserve; Ras Kiuyu Forest Reserve; Ruhoi River Forest Reserve; Ruvu South Forest Reserve; Saadani National Park; Semdoe/Msige Forest Reserve; Sengoma Forest Reserve; South Gendagenda Forest Reserve; Uzigua Forest Reserve; Vikindu Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2012	ME	METT	Lionja Forest Reserve; Lukwika-Lumesule G.R. Game reserve; Mbagala Forest Reserve; Msanjesi GR/Kipitimbi/Lionja FR Game reserve; Nagaga Forest Reserve; Nyera/Kiperere Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2013	ME	METT	Dodoma Reservoir Forest Reserve; Magombera Forest Reserve; Mbarang'andu WMA Wildlife management area; Mwambesi Forest Reserve and Game Controlled Area; Nandembo Forest Reserve; Salanga/Bereku Forest Reserve; Sasawara Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2015	ME	METT	Mlinga Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2003, 2007	ME	METT	Udzungwa Mountains National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

139

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2005, 2006	ME	METT	Kimboza Forest Reserve; Makonde Scarp II Forest Reserve; Makonde Scarp III Forest Reserve; Nguru North Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2007	ME	METT	Talagwe Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2006, 2007	ME	METT	Mikumi National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2009	ME	METT	Bombo West Forest Reserve; Idewa Forest Reserve; Kiverenge Forest Reserve; Mselezi Forest Reserve; Vumari Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2011	ME	METT	Bamba Ridge Forest Reserve; Kambai Forest Reserve; Kwamgumi Forest Reserve; Kwamrimba Forest Reserve; Kwani Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2012	ME	METT	Kambona Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2013	ME	METT	Dabaga New Forest Reserve; Ikwamba Forest Reserve; Image Forest Reserve; Kiranzi Kitunguu Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2007, 2011	ME	METT	Kiwengwa Pongwe Forest Reserve; Msitu Mkuu Forest Reserve; Rufiji-Mafia-Kilwa Ramsar	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2013	ME	METT	Kwembago Forest Reserve; Mamboto Forest Reserve; Mamboya Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2013	ME	METT	Pala Mountains Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2015	ME	METT	Derema Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

140

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2008, 2013	ME	METT	Mtarure Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2011, 2015	ME	METT	Manga Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2013, 2015	ME	METT	Masagati Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2007, unreported	ME	METT	Mamiwa Kisara South Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2009	ME	METT	Chambogo Forest Reserve; Kanga Forest Reserve; Kilanga (Nilo) Nature Reserve; Mkusu Forest Reserve; Mramba Forest Reserve; Nambinga Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2012	ME	METT	Makonde Scarp I Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2013	ME	METT	Kisinga Lugaro Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2006, 2007, 2011	ME	METT	Ndimba Forest Reserve; Ruawa Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2015	ME	METT	Mtai Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2009, 2013	ME	METT	Ihanga Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

141

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2010, 2011, 2013	ME	METT	Ruaha National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2009, 2013	ME	METT	Kilindi Forest Reserve; Ukwiva Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2011, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Kichi Hills Forest Reserve; Kiwengoma Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2007, 2011, 2012, 2014	ME	METT	Ngezi-Vumawimbi Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2009, 2011, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Mbinga Kimaji / Kimate Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2011, 2013, 2014, 2015	ME	METT	Katundu Forest Reserve; Rupiage Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2003, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2012	ME	METT	Selous Game Reserve and WHS	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011	ME	METT	Rondo Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2006, 2007, 2011, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

142

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2005, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2014	ME	METT	Tongomba New Forest Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2008, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015	ME	METT	Mitundumbea Forest Reserve; Ngarama North Forest Reserve; Rungo Forest Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2009, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015	ME	METT	Malehi Forest Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015	ME	METT	Pindiro Forest Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015, Not reported	ME	METT	Litipo Forest Reserve	UNEP–WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

143

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, Not Reported	ME	METT	Chitoa Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Tanzania	Between 2013 and 2015	ME	SMART	Enduimet WMA; Ruaha National Park; Selous Game Reserve; Katavi National Park; Tarangire National Park	SMART webpage
Tanzania	2003	ME	West Indian Ocean MPA	Mafia Marine Park, Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park Marine National Park	Wells, S. (2004).
Tanzania	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Selous Game Reserve WHS; Serengeti National Park WHS; Kilimanjaro National Park World Heritage Site; Ngorongoro Conservation Area WHS	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Tanzania	2007	S	PA-BAT	Udzungwa Mountains National Park	Dudley et al., 2008
Tanzania	2017	S	Participatory Video	8 villages with CBNRM sites	Gross-Camp N. (2017)
Tanzania	2011	S	Socio-Economic Baseline Survey	10 villages within 20 km of Mahale Mountains National Park	Hess and Leisher, 2011

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

144

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Tanzania	2007-2009	S	Sustainable Liveihoods Framework	Mikumi National Park	Vedeld et al., 2012
Trans-boundary: Lesotho and South Africa	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Maloti-Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Trans-boundary: Uganda and Kenya	2016	ME	IMET	Mt. Elgon Transboundary Protected Area	BIOPAMA and IUCN (2016).
Trans-boundary: Zambia / Zimbabwe	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Uganda	2017	S	BNS	Queen Elizabeth Protected Area and Murchison Falls Protected Area	Travers et al, 2017
Uganda	1998	C	Case study	Mgahinga Gorilla National Park	ADAMS and INFIELD (n.d.)
Uganda	2018	C	Sensemaker	Agoro Agu Central Forest Reserves National park; Mt. Elgon National park	
Uganda	2017	G	Equity Questionnaire	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park	Project webpage
Uganda	2018	G	GAPA	Lake Mburo National Park, Uganda	Franks and Booker 2018

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

145

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Uganda	2011	G	Forest Governance Framework	Forest	Kishsor et al., 2012
Uganda	2012	G	RFGI	Mt. Elgon National Park	RFGI HANDBOOK II
Uganda	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Ajai Wildlife Reserve; Atiya Forest Reserve; Budongo Forest Reserve; Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and WHS; Echuya Forest Reserve; Kibale National Park; Kidepo Valley National Park; Kyambura Wildlife Reserve; Lake Mburo National Park and Ramsar Site; Lake Nabugabo wetland system Ramsar Site; Lake Opeta Wetland System Ramsar Site; Mabira Forest Reserve; Mgahinga Gorilla National Park; Moroto Forest Reserve; Mount Kei Wildlife Sanctuary; Mt. Elgon National Park; Murchison Falls National Park; Otze Forest White Rhino Sanctuary; Rwenzori Mountains National Park and WHS; Semuliki National Park; Toro-Semuliki Wildlife Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2008	ME	BirdLife IBA	Bugoma Forest Reserve; Kasyoha - Kitomi Forest Reserve; Nabajjuzi Wetland System Ramsar Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2002, 2003, 2007	ME	EoH	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park	Uganda Wildlife Authority, 2002 UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2003	ME	METT	Kagombe Forest Reserve; Kibale Forest Reserve; Rwenzori Mountains National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

146

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Uganda	2005	ME	METT	Mpanga Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2012	ME	METT	Budongo Forest Reserve; Kidepo Valley National Park; Nyangea - Napore Forest Reserve; Rom Forest Reserve; Timu Forest Reserve; Zulia Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2003, 2006, 2011, 2012	ME	METT	Bugoma Forest Reserve; Itwara Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Uganda	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park; Rwenzori Mountains National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Uganda	2013	S	Mixed Methods including BNS	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park National park	Harrison, M. 2013.
Uganda	2016	S	Participatory Risk Mapping	Multiple Sites	Ambio. 2016
Uganda	2006	S	PEV and RSIA	Bwindi Impenetrable National Park; Queen Elizabeth National Park	CARE et al., 2008
Uganda	2008	S	Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit	Forest	PROFOR (2008)
Uganda	Planned - 2019/2020	S	SAPA	Murchison Falls National Park	Email communication
Uganda	2015	S	SAPA	Ruwenzori Mountain National Park	Franks and Small, 2016

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

147

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Uganda	2016	S	SAPA	Lake Mburo National Park National Park	Email communication
Uganda	2019	S	SAPA	Kabale Forest Reserve; Mgahinga Gorilla National Park	Email communication
Zambia	2018-2019	G	GAPA	Chiawa GMA; Lower Zambezi NP; Mumbwa GMA; Kafue NP; and Mumbwa GMA	Personal Communication
Zambia	Planned 2019 or 2020	G	SAGE (prov. name)	Various - TBD	Personal Communication
Zambia	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Kafue Flats Game Management Area; Kafue National Park; Kasanka National Park; Liuwa Plain National Park; Lower Zambezi National Park; Lukusuzi National Park; Mitenge FR; North Luangwa NP; Sioma Ngwezi NP; South Luangwa NP	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2005	ME	BirdLife IBA	Lusenga Plain National Park; Nsumbu National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2004	ME	METT	Kafinda Game Management Area; Liuwa Plain National Park; West Zambezi Game Management Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2009, 2012	ME	METT	Bangweulu Game Management Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2004, 2006, 2009	ME	METT	North Luangwa National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2004, 2009, 2012	ME	METT	Chiawa Game Management Area	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2004, 2009, 2013	ME	METT	Lavushi Manda National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

148

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Zambia	2003, 2005, 2006, 2009	ME	METT	Mosi-Oa-Tunya National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2009	ME	METT	Blue Lagoon National Park; Kafue National Park; Lochinvar National Park; South Luangwa National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2013	ME	METT	Kasanka National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2012	ME	METT	Lower Zambezi National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	2001	ME	RAPPAM	Makasa Forest Reserve	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zambia	Between 2014 and 2016	ME	SMART	Kafue National Park; Liuwa Plain National Park; Lower Zambezi National Park; North Luangwa National Park; South Luangwa National Park	SMART webpage
Zambia	2015	S	SAPA	Mumbwa Game Management Area	Franks and Small, 2016

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Country	Year(s)	Type[61]	Methodology	Protected / Conserved Area Name(s)	Source
Zambia	2015	S	SAPA	Mumbwa Game Management Area	Franks and Small, 2016
Zambia	2016	S	SAPA	South Luangwa National Park	Email communication
Zimbabwe	2016	G	Case Study	Six forests in western Zimbabwe	Mutekwa and Gambiza, 2016
Zimbabwe	2017	G	Equity Questionnaire	Gonarezhou National Park	Project webpage
Zimbabwe	2001	ME	BirdLife IBA	Chimanimani National Park; Chirinda State Forest; Chizarira National Park; Hwange National Park; Lake Chivero Recreation Park; Nyanga National Park; Stapleford Forest	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zimbabwe	2014	ME	METT	Hwange National Park	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019
Zimbabwe	Between 2012 and 2014	ME	SMART	Chewore; Nyaminyami; Hwange National Park; Gonarezhou National Park	SMART webpage
Zimbabwe	2014, 2017	ME	WH Outlook Report	Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas World Heritage Site	UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019 Osipova et al. 2017
Zimbabwe	2017	S	Mixed Meth.	Four PAs and adjacent communities	Mutanga et al., 2017
Zimbabwe	Planned – 2019	S	SAPA	Chimanimani National Park	

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

150

Annex 3:

Summary of Methodologies and Tools

BIOPAMA
From Knowledge to Action for a Protected Planet

This Annex provides summary reflections on a handful of the mostly widely used and most promising methodologies used for protected and conserved area management effectiveness, governance, and/ or social assessment in Eastern and Southern Africa. This is an illustrative rather than exhaustive list. Further, the considerations for each methodology are meant only to provide a snapshot. They are not meant to provide a complete understanding of any methodology.

Annex 3A: Management Effectiveness

Enhancing our Heritage (EoH)
Full Name: Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit
(Sources: Hocking et al., 2008 and Leverington et al., 2008)

General Description:

- **Focus / Objectives**: "Assessing various components of World Heritage site management effectiveness that together build a picture of how well a site is being managed and achieving its objectives"[62]
- **Scope / Applicability**: World Heritage sites (and other protected areas, with adaptations)
- **Framework:** Includes and builds on WCPA PAME Framework
- **Process / Method and Tools**: Includes 12 tools and accompanying worksheets to compile the analysis. These can be used to supplement existing assessments or develop a new assessment. Assessment process varies, though including stakeholders is encouraged. The main steps are:[63] Compiling relevant data; Undertaking quick, inexpensive activities to enable the assessment (e.g. threat analysis); Identifying gaps that will require longer-term, more costly activities; Using data, and additional meetings and consultations, to compile and analyse worksheets; Adapt and improve management in response to assessment results. Analysis/ scoring varies by tool, with some worksheets using numerical scoring scales, some using yes/ no questions, some using narrative descriptions, etc. Analysis should be done in workshop with stakeholders, but process not strictly defined.
- **Typical Time Required**: Three to four days for 1st assessment and two to 3 days for subsequent assessments, excluding time to collect information, and noting that tools are meant to be repeated at different intervals[64]
- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Relatively resource intensive, often requiring more than one workshop
- **Key Technical Requirements**: Varies by tool. Includes qualitative analysis and facilitation.
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: Used in Seychelles (2002, 2007), South Africa (2003), Tanzania (2004) and Uganda (2002, 2003, 2007) during EoH development / testing phase and, since then, in Ethiopia (2013-2014), Kenya (2014), Madagascar (2013) and Malawi (2013).

---

[62] Hockings et al. 2008:12
[63] Hockings et al. 2008:13
[64] Bammert 2018

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

152

Key Strengths[65]	Key Limitations / Challenges[69]
- Adaptable - Can be integrated with existing assessment / monitoring systems (Questions from Advanced METT almost all reflected in one EoH worksheet[66]) - In-depth, comprehensive with respect to PAME Framework, with particular attention to assessing outcomes - Process can result in capacity strengthening - Includes user-friendly guidance for completing worksheets[67] -Supports monitorin[68]	- Relatively costly and time consuming - Requires adaptation to context (not an 'off the shelf' methodology) - While multi-stakeholder process is encouraged, in practice inclusiveness varies in region

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

(Source: Hockings et al. 2008: 13)

- "*The assessment tools are generic, and can be adapted to local situations*. Sections that do not apply should be omitted. Indicators are suggested for assessment, but sites are encouraged to develop their own where appropriate. The scale and detail of assessment will vary depending on the time and funds available.
- "*Tools should be chosen to complement current monitoring and assessment systems*, rather than replicating systems that are meeting current assessment needs.
- "*Completing each tool does not have to be a separate exercise*, and in many cases several of the worksheets could be filled in during one workshop.
- *Qualitative and descriptive information should be included in the worksheet* to help new staff understand how the assessment was carried out.
- *Assessors' information is important to record details of who participated and when the assessment was undertaken.* This will help with follow-up to the assessment and is useful for future reference.
- *All the assessment tools include space for further narrative discussion*. This should be used for comments and explanation as to why an assessment was undertaken and sources of information. There is space for analysis and conclusions and comparison with previous assessments. This can help draw out gaps and challenges, opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions."
- "Assessments are most useful if repeated regularly to track changes to threats and help identify progress and improvements. Intervals can vary depending on the management component being assessed... For example, inputs and outputs can be assessed annually (linked with annual reports, work plans and budgets), while context and outcomes might be assessed every 3-5 years, or linked with revisions of the management plan."
- "The tools presented here have been designed to track progress over time in one site, rather than to compare between sites. There is therefore no overall score for effectiveness, although some tools do use rating schemes as an aid to assessment" (Hockings et al., 2008:17)

---

[65] Adapted from Leverington et al., 2008 except where otherwise noted
[66] Bammert 2018
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.

153

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Key Resources

Hockings, M., R. James, S. Stolton, N. Dudley, V. Mathur, J. Makombo, J. Courrau, and J. Parrish (2008). Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit Assessing management effectiveness of natural World Heritage sites. UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Tools in the EoH Toolkit

(Source: Hockings et al. 2008:12,13)

"**Tool 1: Identifying Site Values and Management Objectives** [:] Identifies and lists major site values and associated management objectives. Together, these helps decide what should be monitored and analyzed during the assessment.

"**Tool 2: Identifying Threats** [:] Helps managers to organize and report changes in the type and level of threat to a site and to manage responses.

"**Tool 3: Relationships with Stakeholders** [:] Identifies stakeholders and their relationship with the site.

"**Tool 4: Review of National Context** [:] Helps understand how national and international policies, legislation and government actions affect the site.

"**Tool 5: Assessment of Management Planning** [:] Assesses the adequacy of the main planning document used to guide management of the site.

"**Tool 6: Design Assessmen**t [:] Assesses the design of the site and examines how its size, location and boundaries affect managers' capacity to maintain site values.

"**Tool 7: Assessment of Management Needs and Inputs** [:] Evaluates current staff compared to staff needs and current budget compared to an ideal budget allocation.

"**Tool 8: Assessment of Management Processes** [:] Identifies best practices and desired standards for management processes and rates performance against these standards.

"**Tool 9: Assessment of Management Plan Implementation** [:] Shows progress in implementing the management plan (or other main planning document), both generally and for individual components.

"**Tool 10: Work/Site Output Indicators** [:] Assesses the achievement of annual work programme targets and other output indicators.

"**Tool 11: Assessing the Outcomes of Management** [:] Answers the most important question: whether the site is accomplishing what it was set up to do in terms of maintaining ecological integrity, wildlife, cultural values and landscapes, etc.

"**Tool 12: Review of Management Effectiveness Assessment Results** [:] Summarizes the results and helps to prioritize management actions in response."

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

154

IMET
Full Name: Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool
(Sources: Bammert 2018; BIOPAMA and IUCN, 2016; BIOPAMA
webpage; and Paolini et al., 2016)

General Description:

- **Focus / Objectives**: Contribute to improving protected area management and meeting conservation targets, as a comprehensive tool supporting PA planning, monitoring and evaluation
- **Scope / Applicability**: All protected areas (initially developed for West and Central Africa)
- **Framework:** Consistent with IUCN-WCPA PAME Framework
- **Process / Method and Tools**: Includes three modules: (1) Evaluation of the context, (2) Assessment of PA management effectiveness, and (3) Graphic visualization of data to support decision-making. Modules can be completed online (with internet connection) or offline. Forms with indicators for each element of management effectiveness are completed in workshops (which ideally include stakeholders and rightsholders). Results are analysed statistically, resulting in quantified outcomes, including in graphic visualization (e.g., spider graphs).
- **Typical Time Required**: From 2 to 4 days (plus training)
- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Data collection in advance, meeting / workshop, and training
- **Key Technical Requirements**: Relatively complex – requires a coach and training
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: BIOPAMA

Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: IMET has not yet been widely used in the region (once in Kenya, once in a transboundary setting in Kenya and Uganda) but use is anticipated to increase, including within the BIOPAMA Programme and due to its required use in DG DEVCO funded projects.

Key Strengths[70]	Key Limitations / Challenges[71]
- Supports PA planning and monitoring, in addition to assessing management effectiveness - Draws on other PAME methodologies, including METT and EoH - Graphic visualization is automatically produced, enabling quick overview, including strengths and challenges - Online form allows for centralized collection to enable reporting - Can enable analysis that links between levels of management (site, landscape / ecosystem, regional or national network)	- Modules are not yet publicly available - Due in part to its relative complexity, cannot be used without coaches who train PA managers and help them complete form, which increases costs - Some practitioners have raised questions about whether the statistical results imply a level of objectivity that is not warranted (KII) - While it goes beyond management effectiveness assessment (to planning, monitoring) there are concerns that this planning and monitoring does not sufficiently address non-management issues (including governance) (KII)

---

[70] Adapted from Bammert 2018, except where otherwise cited
[71] Ibid.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

155

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

- Workshops for IMET module completion should be inclusive, with rightsholder and stakeholder participation

Key Resources

Paolini, C., D. Rakotobe and D. Jomha Djossi (2016). Coach Observatory Mission Information Toolkit (COMIT): A toolkit to support coaching missions to improve protected area management and develop the information system of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. 128pp https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/46173

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

156

METT

Full Name: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
(Sources: Bammert 2018; Stolton and Dudley 2016; Protected
Planet METT webpage; Survey Responses; KIIs)

General Description:

- **Focus / Objectives**: Assess current state of management effectiveness and track over time
- **Scope / Applicability**: Site-level terrestrial protected area[72]
- **Framework:** Consistent with WCPA PAME Framework
- **Process / Method and Tools**: Multiple choice (0 to 3 scale) questionnaire with 30 questions. Results in aggregate score but disaggregated scores and details can be made available. Supplemented with guidance on how to understand each question and space to provide comment (e.g. why score is given) and next steps (e.g. how to address challenges). The questionnaire is meant to be completed by PA manager(s), ideally together with PA staff, rightsholders and stakeholders (Stolton and Dudley 2016).
- **Typical Time Required**: Varies from about 1 to 3 days. Subsequent assessments in the same site may be quicker.[73]
- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Relatively low-cost. Costs include assessment meeting / workshop and consultant / staff time, as relevant
- **Key Technical Requirements**: Qualitative analysis, facilitation
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: WWF and World Bank

Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: Mostly widely used tool in region

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Simple - Adaptable - Relatively low cost - Easily replicable over time, which can indicate trends (where process is done well so that scores are reliable) - Questions are fairly comprehensive - Can reveal important strengths and challenges to address - Process itself, if done inclusively, prompts important discussion (around METT questions and often raising issues that go beyond them) - Has evolved over time (e.g. availability of Excel-based 34 question Advanced METT)	- Relatively surface-level assessment - Scoring process fairly subjective, which is a greater concern if not done inclusively - Reliability of scores contingent on the quality of information people bring to process (though this can be supplemented with data if available) - May be substantial incentives to over-score or do assessment in rote/ superficial way (e.g. where scores are reported to funders or central PA authorities) - While multi-stakeholder process is encouraged, in practice inclusiveness varies (KII)

---

[72] A separate tool was developed for application in MPAs. See: World Bank (2004); Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas, Adapted by F Staub and M E Hatziolos, World Bank, Washington DC
[73] METT can sometimes be completed in one day if relevant information as been collected, if it is done solely by managing authorities or another small group (e.g., consultant). However, best practice dictates that it be completed via a more inclusive process, including stakeholders. While the 2016 METT Handbook suggests 1.5 to 2 days, survey responses suggest that METT sometimes takes up to three days in Eastern and Southern Africa. (Stolton and Dudley 2016 and KII).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

157

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

Stolton and Dudley (2016:9) summarise best practice in use of METT as including:

"**Carefully plan the METT implementation**

1. "Plan the implementation process. Review the METT before undertaking the assessment and assess the information available to complete it. Then think about capacity and pre-assessment training needs, adaptation, timing, scope and scale, verification, etc.

2. "Allow enough time to complete the assessment in full. A good METT cannot be done in a quick hour; most questions take serious thought. The first METT is likely to take at least a day, probably two. Subsequent repeat METTS may be a little quicker.

"**Do it properly and do it all**

1. "Complete all the METT including all questions on the datasheets and narrative sections related to the multiple choice questions. The next steps section is essential as the steps identified create a quick check list of needed actions.

2. "Use quantitative data wherever available to support assessment, this is most important of all in the outcomes questions.

"**Adapt and translate**

1. "The METT is a generic tool designed for global use; thus it is unlikely to fit one protected area (or system, type etc) of area perfectly. Adaptation is encouraged; ideally by keeping the basic format of the METT the same and adding to, rather than changing, the wording of the METT (e.g. providing additional advice on interpretation for local conditions or by additional questions).

"**Repeat the assessment**

1. "The METT is designed to track progress over time. Sites/networks planning to implement the METT should thus aim to repeat the assessments every few years; ideally the METT should be an automatic part of annual planning.

"**Consultate and get consensus**

1. "The implementation of the METT should wherever possible include a wide range of rightsholders and stakeholders to aid insight in the assessment results; including people outside the protected area, such as local communities, will bring richer insights.

"**Build capacity and guidance**

1. "Although designed as a simple tool, implementing the METT may be the first time protected area staff and other rightsholders and stakeholders have been involved in assessing protected area management effectiveness (PAME). Thus some capacity building is advisable so that all participants understand PAME.

2. "As a generic tool the METT questions can be interpreted differently in different situations/ jurisdictions. Thus developing a better understanding of the METT and how it can be implemented in a specific jurisdiction will help ensure valid results.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

158

"**Verify results**

1. "Although designed as a self-assessment tool, METT implementation can involve verification processes; from simple checking of completed METTs by external assessors to more detailed field verification exercises involving data collection.

"**Implement recommendations**

1. "Completing the METT is only the first step of the assessment; the implementation process should include adaptive management (e.g. a plan of action to implement results) and communications process to share results locally and globally."

Key Resources

Stolton, S. and N. Dudley. 2016. METT Handbook: A guide to using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), WWF-UK, Woking

WWF and World Bank (2007). Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Second Edition.

https://www.protectedplanet.net/c/protected-areas-management-effectiveness-pame/management-effectiveness-tracking-tool

https://www.protectedplanet.net/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/057/original/METT.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

159

RAPPAM

Full Name: Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management
(Sources: Bammert 2018; Leverington et al., 2008; Ervin, 2003; and WWF 2006)

General Description:
- ***Focus / Objectives***: Identify major trends and prioritize issues and allocate resources to improve management effectiveness in a system or group of protected areas - ***Scope / Applicability***: Protected areas systems or groups - ***Framework:*** Consistent with WCPA PAME Framework - ***Process / Method and Tools***: Five step process: "[1] Determine the scope of the assessment; [2] Assess existing information for each protected area; [3] Administer the RAPPAM questionnaire; [4] Analyse the findings; and [5] Identify next steps and recommendations.")[74] Most questions in the questionnaire use a 0 to 5 scale. This process is carried out primarily in a workshop. Outputs include lists and graphs of threats, management strengths, management challenges, etc.[75] Stakeholder participation is encouraged but not strictly required by the methodology. - ***Typical Time Required***: About three days, excluding preparation and reporting writing - ***Typical Cost Drivers***: Relatively low-cost. Costs include assessment meeting / workshop - ***Key Technical Requirements***: Qualitative analysis, facilitation - ***Developer/ Organisational Affiliation***: WWF
Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: Not widely used in recent years but used in 4 countries between 2001 and 2006

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Adaptable - Relatively simple, rapid and low cost - Enables systems-level assessment with some details on individual sites within system - Provide information above macro-level trends/ threats in the system - Helps identify strategic interventions	- Not designed to provide in-depth outcome measures - Not designed to provide detailed site-level information that could be used for adaptive management - While multi-stakeholder process is encouraged, in practice inclusiveness varies with some in region being done without community inputs

---

[74] Adapted from Higgins¬Zogib and Lacerda (2006:.59), as cited in Leverington et al. 2008
[53] Ibid.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

160

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

 - Best if done through interactive, multi-stakeholder workshop(s), including at least the manager of each PA and other stakeholders, including community members, to extent possible, noting that "the broader the stakeholder group present, the more true the results" and that points on which there is not consensus (e.g., between park managers and community members) can be reflected in RAPPAM report[76]

- Best to do with relatively large group of PAs to ensure most meaningful trends

- Best used as complement, rather than replacement for, more detailed site-level assessments

Key Resources

Ervin, J. (2003) WWF: Rapid Assessment and prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology. WWF Gland, Switzerland

[Portuguese] WWF (no date) "Metodologia para Avaliação Rápida e a Priorização do Manejo de Unidades de Conservação (RAPPAM)". WWF.

https://www.protectedplanet.net/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/056/original/RAPPAM.pdf

---

[76] Adapted from Higgins–Zogib and Lacerda (2006:.59), as cited in Leverington et al. 2008

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

161

West Indian Ocean MPA
Full Name: West Indian Ocean Marine Protected Area toolkit
(Sources: Pilot testing report (Wells, 2004), methodology
workbook (Wells and Mangubhai, 2005),
and Leverington et al., 2008)

NB: West Indian Ocean MPA was developed in parallel to and complements the more comprehensive 'How is your MPA doing?" methodology (see Pomeroy et al., 2004), which was developed by WCPA-Marine and IUCN. Both methodologies were tested in Mafia Island in Tanzania. For this report, we focus on West Indian Ocean MPA because it has been more widely used in the region (based on the inventory for this report). However, as noted by Wells (2004) the more comprehensive approach is also useful.

General Description:

- **Focus / Objectives**: Improve MPA management effectiveness, with a focus on adaptive management, and raise awareness about importance of effective management[77]
- **Scope / Applicability**: MPAs in region
- **Framework:** Considers the six elements of WCPA PAME Framework
- **Process / Method and Tools**: Based on a flexible, step-wise[78] process supported by adaptable tools (worksheets and questionnaire). While 'implementation team' (core team of management and stakeholders) can do an initial draft, worksheets (/questionnaire) should be completed in a group setting (workshops or consultative meetings).
- **Typical Time Required**: Completed over course of 3 to 6 months (inclusive of planning)
- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Relatively low cost (exact figures not available), varying depending on size of site and design of process.
- **Key Technical Requirements**: Will vary, but include knowledge of context, (quantitative and/or qualitative) analysis, facilitation, and writing
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Office (ESARO)

Where and When Used in ESA[79]

- Kenya (2003): Kiunga Marine National Reserve, Malindi Marine National Park & Reserve, Watamu Marine National Park & Reserve, Mombasa Marine National Park and Reserve, Kisite Marine National Park/Mpunguti Marine National Reserve
- Tanzania (2003): Mafia Marine Park, Mnazi Bay-Ruvuma Estuary Marine Park
- Seychelles (2003): Cousin Island Special Reserve
- Further assessments may have been done in Kenyan MPAs between 2003 and 2005[80]

---

[77] See steps at (Wells and Mangubhai, 2005:4-6), noting that "[t]hese do not have to be undertaken chronologically, but need to be well coordinated so that they feed into each other".
[78] Based on inventory compiled for this report. As noted in methods section, while aiming to be as complete as possible, there may be methodology or tool applications in ESA that were not identified.
[79] Analysis suggests that further assessments were done in Kenya MPAs between 2003 and 2005. Methodology for these is not specified in the analysis because more research is needed to clarify whether this was done with WIO MPA framework or the more expansive WCPA-Marine methodology. Leverington et al. 2008 note that: "Management effectiveness assessments were subsequently carried out in all Kenyan MPAs (except the Diani-Chale MPA) between 2003 and 2005. The findings of the MEAs of the Malindi and Watamu MPA complex and the Mombasa MPA have been reported in Muthiga (2006, and 2007 respectively)."
[80] Analysis suggests that further assessments were done in Kenya MPAs between 2003 and 2005. Methodology for these is not specified in the analysis

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

162

Key Strengths and Benefits[81]	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Focused on identifying changes to improve management - Adaptable to variety of WPAs[82] - While management focused, includes some socio-economic and governance (participation, conflict resolution) - In pilot testing, participants found each stage of process useful	- Worksheets found to be complicated (though a simpler questionnaire provides an alternative[83]) - Results rely heavily on quality of current information and on participant knowledge, perceptions - While it inquires about social benefits (which is a strength), does not appear to ask about social costs

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

- Follow guidelines for assessment,[84] including:
- being participatory at all phases, transparent and open, and focused on key issues,
- having clear management objectives and criteria for judging performance,
- considering the range of factors that contribute to management, using criteria that "relate to social, environmental and management issues, both within and outside the boundaries of the MPA",
- using sound biophysical and socioeconomic science,
- in the final report, including strengths and weaknesses (differentiating between which are within and outside of managers' control)
- making clear recommendations for improving management
- Re-assessing periodically to track change and continue learning
- Seek technical advice and review guidelines before starting to understand and adapt methodology to context
- Take measures to maintain quality of information collected
- Ensure process is accessible to all relevant staff and stakeholders
- As a rapid assessment, it is useful to use it as a complement to more in-depth / rigorous PAME assessments using full "How is your MPA doing" assessment (Pomeroy et al., 2004)

Key Resources

A Workbook for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas in the Western Indian Ocean (Wells and Mangubhai, 2005)

---

because more research is needed to clarify whether this was done with WIO MPA framework or the more expansive WCPA-Marine methodology. Leverington et al. 2008 note that: "Management effectiveness assessments were subsequently carried out in all Kenyan MPAs (except the Diani-Chale MPA) between 2003 and 2005. The findings of the MEAs of the Malindi and Watamu MPA complex and the Mombasa MPA have been reported in Muthiga (2006, and 2007 respectively)."

[81] See also the section on cross-cutting strengths and limitations/ challenges below
[82] different sizes and governance types, and whether or not they include terrestrial components
[83] Implementation team must then transfer results to worksheets
[84] These Guidelines are provided by Wells and Mangubhai (2005:6), modified from Hockings et al. 2000

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

163

Annex 3B: Governance Assessment

GAPA
Full Name: Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas
(Sources: Franks and Booker 2018; KII)

General Description:

- ***Focus / Objectives***: Assess strengths and challenges in the quality of governance of a particular protected or conserved area to promote stronger and fairer governance, including understanding of the causes for these strengths and challenges
- ***Scope / Applicability***: Site-level protected or conserved area under any governance type
- ***Framework:*** Framework of 11 principles and related elements, initially distilled from the principles and considerations in WCPA Guidelines no. 20, and refined to reflect learning during assessment and to align with a framework of principles for PA/ CA equity. For any assessment, key actors discuss the 11 principles and prioritise five or six for in-depth assessment, in all cases including participation and either accountability or transparency
- ***Process / Method and Tools***: Multi-stakeholder methodology focused on enabling stakeholders and rightsholders to assess governance together. As summarized by Franks and Booker (2018:7) "GAPA has five phases: preparing, scoping, information gathering, assessing and taking action. Implementing an assessment involves four key roles: convener, host — both of whom must be identified before embarking on a GAPA — facilitator and notetaker. Facilitators work as a team, should be experienced, have good facilitation skills and be perceived as neutral and unbiased. The notetakers capture the information. Facilitators use open questions in workshops, key informant interviews and focus group discussions to gather information, asking what is working, what is not and why, for each good governance principle. Each method concludes with a discussion of ideas for actions to improve the situation. GAPA's multi-stakeholder approach fully engages actors in designing the assessment, interpreting and validating results, generating ideas for action and reviewing progress. This is key to transparency and ownership of the process, accuracy and credibility of results and buy-in for actions". Each phase is enabled by supporting methods and tools (see Table 2 in Franks and Booker 2018:19)

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

164

- **Typical Time Required**: Generally takes place over the course of two months, plus follow-up action:
- Phase 1 (Preparation): About six weeks including feasibility check, review of existing information, review of existing information, and facilitator training
- Phase 2 (Scoping): About 1 week, including stakeholder analysis and principles prioritization
- Phase 3 (Information Gathering): About 2 weeks, including focus groups, key informant interviews, and data analysis
- Phase 4 (Assessing): About 1 week, including a stakeholder workshop
- Phase 5 (Taking Action): Ongoing process, including communicating results, planning action, and monitoring and reviewing progress

The GAPA process, with specific outputs and timeframes, are summarised in Table 1 in Franks and Booker, 2018:18)

- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Information collection, workshops
- **Key Technical Requirements**: Qualitative analysis and facilitation of participatory processes.
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: IIED, GIZ and IUCN

Where and When Used in ESA: GAPA has been used in four sites in Kenya, one site in Uganda, and two sites in Zambia (ongoing) since 2017, across a range of governance types

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Simple (relative to many governance assessments) - Relatively short and low cost - Highly participatory – provides space for rightsholders and stakeholders to directly share perspectives on governance and enables and encourages in-depth discussion - Strong focus on supporting and training facilitators, including a simple process to help them analyse qualitative data from focus groups and key informant interviews - Designed to reveal root causes of governance concerns (therefore more likely to identify practical action) - Dialogue / qualitative assessment focused approach largely avoids risk of 'box-ticking' - Includes explicit 'taking action' phase (to be done as follow up) - "Open-ended question approach reduces the risk of bias caused by pre-selecting issues or asking leading questions." (Franks and Booker 2018:9)	- Governance itself is complex and contested concept – poor (or conflicting) understandings of governance concept makes assessment challenging - Selection of sub-set of principles for each assessment (which makes the process far more practical within timeframe[85]) raises some risk of overlooking issues - Subjectivity of results has been raised a concern, though steps are built into process with aim of addressing this, including triangulation - Actions that are called for in response to findings, while not expensive, may be politically difficult (e.g., requires shift in power). Doing so requires significant political will (and time) - Types of changes that may arise from governance assessment (e.g., shifting demands, perspectives) are difficult to attribute (Booker and Franks, 2018:6,7)

[85] Franks and Booker (2018:10) note that "A fundamental takeaway from this work is that there is little understanding of good governance beyond jargon. Although our framework with just 11 principles helps unpack the key concepts, it still has too many aspects of governance for a process that seeks to fully engage the key actors. So, scoping is a crucial element of GAPA".

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

165

Other Considerations

- Good facilitation is key, including ensuring that facilitators understand governance well (including in relation to the local context) and are able to help participants 'dig deep' on the issues
- GAPA is not appropriate for all PA / CA contexts and, when not used appropriately, raises risks of exacerbating existing tensions/ conflicts. (See feasibility criteria in Franks and Booker 2018 and forthcoming Handbook)
- "Stakeholder analysis [at the start of the process] helps prioritise actors and ensure that the more powerful actors do not overwhelm the process" (Franks and Booker 2018:9)
- "Given the time constraints, there is a trade-off in balancing the time spent digging down on one issue, the number of issues that can be explored and the need to keep the length of discussions within acceptable limits" though this challenge gets somewhat easier to resolve as facilitators gain experience (Franks and Booker 2018:9)
- GAPA process is closely aligned with process in WCPA Guidelines no. 20 with some key differences. As summarized by Franks and Booker (2018:9): "The GAPA process is closely aligned with the process outlined in the IUCN guidelines on governance for PAs with two main differences: a) we limit the duration of stakeholder workshops to one day and b) we conclude the assessing phase with ideas for action rather than action planning. At the three sites in Kenya the assessment would have ground to a halt at this point. This is a risk with any kind of assessment or evaluation and emphasises the need for the GAPA convenor to commit to at least six months support for the final 'taking action' phase."

Key Resources

Franks, P and Booker, F (2018) Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (GAPA): Early experience of a multi-stakeholder methodology for enhancing equity and effectiveness. IIED Working Paper, IIED, London. http://pubs.iied.org/17632IIED

Forthcoming GAPA handbook

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

166

MJUMITA Community Forest Governance Dashboard
(Sources: MJUMITA and TFCG 2014; Franks and Booker 2018;
Email communication[86])

General Description:

- ***Focus / Objectives***: "[A]ssist villages engaging in participatory forest management (PFM) to adopt best practices in relation to village forest governance" by "assess[ing] governance in the context of participatory forest management" and "provid[ing]… a framework for communities to plan for improved governance" (MJUMITA and TFCG 2014:1).
- ***Scope / Applicability***: Forest reserves sites being governed / managed under PFM in Tanzania
- ***Framework:*** Good governance principles (accountability, transparency, and participation)
- ***Process / Method and Tools***: "Two independent community members (i.e. not members of the Village Council or Natural Resource Committee) are elected as focus group leaders to undertake data collection through interviews. MJUMITA Zonal Coordinators analyse the result and prepare village reports, comparing different villages governance status and best practice. MJUMITA provides training to village focus group leaders for results sharing at the Village Assembly. The Village Assembly are tasked with agreeing solutions and action plans" (as summarized by Franks and Booker 2018:62)
- ***Typical Time Required***: Typically involves 2 days for training, 2 days for data collection, and 1 day for returning results to Village Assembly   Phase 1 (Preparation): About six weeks including feasibility check, review of existing information, review of existing information, and facilitator training
- ***Typical Cost Drivers***: Knowledge of the tool (provided during training), basic (qualitative and quantitative) analysis skills, and organisation and facilitation
- ***Developer/ Organisational Affiliation***: MJUMITA and TFCG

Where and When Used in ESA: Used in 333 total villages circa 2013 to 2015 in Tanzania. These included:
- 72 villages participating in joint forest management (JFM) (shared governance /co-management)
- 186 villages participating in community-based forest management (CBFM) (community governance)
- 75 villages participating in both JFM and CBFM

---

[86] This email was part research on governance assessments undertaken by IIED in 2015. Responses regarding the Community Dashboard are used here with permission of the original respondent.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

167

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Designed together with communities by a community-based network - Relatively simple and low cost - Enables monitoring if repeated over time - Highly tailored to the context, enabling contextually meaningful / actionable results	- Specific to PFM in Tanzania - Would require substantial adaptation for use in other contexts - Relatively narrow scope of governance principles considered - In practice, degree of interest from wider community and degree to which results were shared varied - Perception-based questions rely on results of only one focus group

Other Considerations
- This methodology was developed for use in the specific context of PFM in Tanzania. It would require adaptation for use in other PA / CA in the region. At the same time, it serves as an example of how context-specific assessment methodologies can be developed.

Key Resources
- MJUMITA and TFCG. 2014. Policy Brief: Monitoring village forest governance with the MJUMITA dashboard tool. 4 pp
- MJUMITA and TFCG (2012) Training of trainers manual for the implementation of the community forest governance dashboard. pp 1 - 20.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

168

WCPA Guidelines no. 20
(Full Name: Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action –
WCPA Best Practice Guidelines no. 20)
(Sources: Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013; Vansteelant and Burgess, n.d.; and KII)

General Description:

- **Focus / Objectives**: Enhance understanding of protected and conserved areas governance and enable site- and systems-level governance assessment and evaluation
- **Scope / Applicability**: Protected and conserved areas at site- and systems level
- **Framework:** Considers two key aspects of protected and conserved areas governance:
• Governance diversity – including recognition of diverse and appropriate governance types (governance by government, by Indigenous peoples and local communities, by private actors, and by combinations of these actors)
• Governance quality – assessed with respect to good governance principles (legitimacy and voice, direction, performance, accountability, and fairness and rights) and 40 related 'considerations'. An extensive set of suggested indicators are provided in a separate Annex
- **Process / Method and Tools**: While not a simple 'out-of-the-box' resource, the Guidelines provide detailed information about a number of assessment approaches and methods, with simple template/ worksheets to support analysis and record outcomes, aligned with CBD reporting requirements. There are separate sections for assessment of a protected and conserved area system and an individual site. In both cases, assessment integrates historical, legal, socio-cultural, and other factors. The Guidelines recommend a broad, four-phased, inclusive process (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013:69):
• "Phase 1: a preparatory workshop;
• "Phase 2: a period of gathering and analysing information, identifying technical expertise and support, communicating with rightsholders and stakeholders, and, as necessary, helping them to organise;
• "Phase 3: a main "core workshop" dedicated to assessing and evaluating governance, and planning for action on the basis of the evaluation results
• "Phase 4: taking action according to the plan"
A suggested "group exercise" to help facilitate participatory assessment is described in a separate Annex, together with indicators (see above) and a set of "Do's and Don'ts" for the appropriate recognition and support of ICCAs. The Guide places strong emphasis on the importance of the process itself (in addition to actionable outcomes)
- **Typical Time Required**: Varies considerably between site and/or systems level assessment and by process / method chosen, noting that "assessing governance properly takes time, and …. ideal time and resources will not always be available and shorter and simpler assessments can still yield valuable results" (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013:70)
- **Typical Cost Drivers**: Required skills will vary by assessment approach, but will generally require qualitative (and some quantitative) analysis (including legal, historical, socio-cultural factors) and good facilitation of participatory processes.
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: IUCN, WCPA, GIZ, CBD Secretariat, and BIOPAMA

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

169

Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: Being used for systems-level assessment in Tanzania (KII), was used for basis of framework and aspects of process in GAPA (see above), and will be used to guide Green List assessment processes in the region going forward (KII).

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Starts with guidance to help understand concept and importance of governance - Enables comprehensives assessment of both governance diversity (at systems-level) and governance quality and appropriateness of type (at site-level) - Flexible, adaptable process - Aligns with / enables reporting to CBD under PoWPA and Aichi Targets, particularly with respect to governance participation, and equity - Is informing development of other assessment guidance and practice	- Governance itself is complex and contested concept – poor (or conflicting) understandings of governance concept makes assessment challenging - For site-level assessment in particular, Guidelines are quite broad and require more detailed assessment plans to be developed by conveners - The 40 considerations (and over 100 indicators) make framework relatively complex to address in full

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance

- Start with sharing key content from the "Understanding Governance" section of the Guidelines, e.g., as part of training / preparation for assessment… Lack of common and sufficient understanding of governance has been highlighted as a key obstacle to effective governance assessment (KII). The Guidelines provide detailed guidance on key protected and conserved areas governance concepts before delving into assessment processes.
- Adapt the process to the content
- Consider both systems-level and site-level assessment

Key Resources

- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., N. Dudley, T. Jaeger, B. Lassen, N. Pathak Broome, A. Phillips and T. Sandwith (2013). Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xvi + 124pp
- Annexes to Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013
- Both available at : https://www.iucn.org/content/governance-protected-areas-understanding-action

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

170

Annex 3C: Social Assessment

Social Assessment of Protected and Coserved Areas (SAPA)
(Sources: Franks et al., 2018b; Bammert 2018; KII, survey responses)

General Description:

- **Focus**: Understanding "the impacts of conservation on human wellbeing at a local level [and] the distribution of these social impacts" and generating "ideas for improving the situation"[87]
- **Framework**: Multi-dimensional framework for human wellbeing, with some links to governance
- **Process / Methods and Tools**: Multi-stakeholder process that includes a series of community and wider stakeholder workshops and a household survey, culminating in a process of sharing results, developing recommendations, and assigning responsibility for carrying them out. The process is coordinated by a facilitation team. Assessment is supported by a user-friendly manual with supporting tools and templates. Assessment questions in SAPA (in updated version) address:[88]
- **Social impact**: "overall contribution to human wellbeing of the PA/CA and related … activities"; "significant negative impacts of the PA/CA and related conservation and development activities"; and "significant positive impacts of the PA/CA and related conservation and development activities"
  - Governance: Extent to which "PA/CA-related rights of local women and men recognised and respected"; "women and men able to participate in PA/CA-related decision making"; "local women and men have timely access to relevant information"; "effective measures to mitigate negative impacts on local women and men"; "PA/CA-related benefits equitably shared within and between local communities…"
- **Applicability**: Site-level
- **Typical Time Required**: Implemented over the course of a few months (part-time)
- **Typical Costs**: From "US$5,000–15,000 per site, depending on the size of the area and the relative cost of working in that country… excludes the time costs for members of the SAPA facilitation team, which are assumed to be an in-kind contribution"[89]
- **Estimated Technical requirements**: Facilitation, survey design and administration, data analysis, planning
- **Developer/ Organisational Affiliation**: IIED and Fauna and Flora International (FFI)

Where and When Used in ESA: Nineteen SAPA assessments across 18 sites in Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe

---

[87] Franks et al., 2018b:14
[88] Franks et al., 2018b:17
[89] Franks et al., 2018b:26

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges[90]
- Provides nuanced information about nature and extent of (positive and negative) impacts of PAs on monetary and non-monetary wellbeing - Asks about current situation and last five years - Includes some questions about, and provides some information about, state of governance (and how it relates to social impacts) - Supported by clear, user-friendly manual with tools	- May not be feasible where there are high levels of distrust / conflict between PA management and communities [though can be used in some sites where GAPA is not feasible] - Usually requires support from external organisation(s) or individual(s) with social research expertise - Staged approach means SAPA is carried out over few months rather than being a quick process

Other Considerations:

- Can be used as 'stepping stone' to address social and some governance issues in areas where full governance assessment (e.g. with GAPA) is not feasible[91]
- Designed as one-time assessment but can be repeated if desired (as in Uganda, currently)
- More useful in sites that have been in existence (with functioning management and governance systems) for at least two years

Key Resources:

Franks P, Small R and Booker F (2018) Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA). Methodology manual for SAPA facilitators. Second edition. IIED, London.

---

[90] Adapted from Bammert 2018
[91] Franks and Booker, 2018

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

172

Annex 3D: Combined Assessment

Green List
Full Name: IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas
(Sources: Bammert 2018 ; IUCN Green List webpage; and KII)

General Description:

- *Focus / Objectives*: Global standard to recognise well-managed and well-governed protected and conserved areas
- *Scope / Applicability*: Primarily designed for individual protected and conserved areas but sites in a system can apply collectively
- *Framework:* "The IUCN Green List Standard addresses four themes: good governance, sound design and planning, effective management, and positive conservation outcomes"
- *Process / Method and Tools*: The process begins with self-assessment by managing/ governing authorities, followed by an in-depth analysis undertaken with a body of independent experts who typically consult with local stakeholders. The Standard includes principles, criteria, and generic indicators, the latter of which are adapted to the context.
- *Typical Time Required*: Varys by site but generally takes between a few months and one year
- *Typical Cost Drivers*: Establishing process for Green List in the country (up front), data collection needed for self-assessment, independent review process, including consultations, costs of addressing any concerns that are keeping site from meeting Standard
- *Key Technical Requirements*: Independent review team selected to have range of requisite skills
- *Developer/ Organisational Affiliation*: IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme

Scope of Use in Eastern and Southern Africa: Used only in three sites in Kenya. Plans are underway for expansion (to Tanzania) (KII).

Key Strengths	Key Limitations / Challenges
- Fairly integrated assessment of management effectiveness, governance and social impacts - Focuses on recognising good practice and enables those who don't yet meet standard to works towards doing so. Overtime, this can create powerful, positive incentives for improving management and governance - Independent verification widely viewed as credible - Sites can access expert guidance and engage in exchange and shared learning	- Initially establishing Green List process in a country requires substantial time and resources - Relatively time-consuming and costly process for the site - Assessment of some elements, including governance is not as in-depth / comprehensive as more governance-focused assessments

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

173

Other Considerations and Best Practice Use Guidance[92]

- Based on internationally agreed Standard

- Can draw on inputs of PA experts from different regions ('WCPA Green List Specialist Group')
- Protected areas in a system can apply as a group
- All data collected in a central platform to enable information sharing and reporting, e.g. to CBD
- Green List status lasts for 5 years (with mid-term review) after which sites must be re-assessed

Key Resources

IUCN and World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) (2017). IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: Standard, Version 1.1. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

IUCN, World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and Assurance Services International (ASI) (2019). IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: User Manual, Version 1.2. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

---

[92] Adapted from Bammert 2018

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

174

Annex 4:

Academic Studies and Other Resources in Inventory

Abachebsa, A. (2017). Review on impacts of protected area on local communities' livelihoods in Ethiopia. Journal of Resources Development and Management 39, pp. 8-13. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c4f2/1509a5fb11b1d3f6ace23eac85a75fd48044.pdf

Abunge, C., S. Coulthard and T. Daw (2013). Connecting marine ecosystem services to human well-being: insights from participatory well-being assessment in Kenya. Ambio 42:1010–1021.

Adams, B., & M. Infield (1998). Community conservation at Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Uganda. Institute of Development Policy and Management: Antwerp, The Netherlands.

Aldrich, M. and J. Sayer (2007). In Practice – Landscape Outcomes Assessment Methodology "LOAM". WWF Forests for Life Programme. http://assets.panda.org/downloads/loaminpracticemay07.pdf

Almeida, F., G. Borrini-Feyerabend, S. Garnett, H. Jonas, H. Jonas, A. Kothari, E. Lee, M. Lockwood, F. Nelson, & S. Stevens (2015). Collective land tenure and community conservation (Policy Brief 2). ICCA Consortium and Maliasili Initiatives and Cenesta, Tehran, Iran. https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/2015/10/19/icca-brief-no-2/

Andrade, G., & J. Rhodes (2012). Protected areas and local communities: An inevitable partnership toward successful conservation strategies? Ecology and Society 17(4), pp. 14. http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05216-170414

Archambault, C. (2014). Young perspectives on pastoral rangeland privatization: Intimate exclusions at the intersection of youth identities. Eur J Dev Res 26(2), pp. 204. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2013.59

Arntzen, J.W., D.L. Molokomme, E.M. Terry, N. Moleele, O. Tshosa. & D. Mazambani (2003). Final report of the review of community-based natural resource management in Botswana. Centre for Applied Research: Gaborone, Botswana.

Avdibegović, M. Buttoud, G. Marić, B. & Shannon, M. (eds) (2012). Assessing forest governance. Proceedings of Abstracts from the IUFRO Seminar Assessing Forest Governance in a Context of Change Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Baldus, R., B. Kibonde and L. Siege (2003). Seeking conservation partnerships in the Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania. PARKS, 13(1).

Bandyopadhyaya S, M N Humavindu, P Shyamsundar and L Wang (2004). Do households gain from community-based natural resource management? An evaluation of community conservancies in Namibia. World Bank: Washington DC, USA.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

176

Barr, J. R., E. Kironde (2018). South Sudan: First state of environment and outlook report. United Nations Environment Programme: Nairobi, Kenya.

Bedelian, C. & Ogutu, J. (2017). Trade-offs for climate-resilient pastoral livelihoods in wildlife conservancies in the Mara ecosystem, Kenya. Pastoralism 7, pp. 10.

Belle, E., S. Wicander, H. Bingham, and Y. Shi (2015). Governance of protected areas in Africa: A global review. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Beltrán, J. (ed.) (2000). Indigenous and traditional peoples and protected areas: Principles, guidelines and case studies. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK and WWF International, Gland, Switzerland. xi + 133pp. [Pre-publication]

Bidaud, C., K. Schreckenberg & J. Jones (2018). The local costs of biodiversity offsets: Comparing standards, policy and practice. Land Use Policy, 77, pp.43-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.05.003

Bizoza, Alfred and Madina Ndangiza (2013). Contested claims over protected area resources in Rwanda (LAND Project Policy Research Brief 1). USAID LAND Project: Kigali, Rwanda.

Bleher B, D. Uster, T. Bergsdorf (2006). Assessment of threat status and management effectiveness in Kakamega forest, Kenya. Biodiversity and Conservation, 15: 1159-1177.

Bluwstein J, F. Moyo and R. Kicheleri (2016). Austere conservation: understanding conflicts over resource governance in tanzanian wildlife management areas. Conservation and Society 14: 218–231.

Bluwstein, J. and J. F. Lund (2018). Territoriality by conservation in the Selous–Niassa Corridor in Tanzania. World Development 101: 453–465.

Bluwstein, J., K. Homewood, J. Lund, M. Nielsen, N Burgess, M. Msuha, J. Olila, S.S. Sankeni K.M. Supuku, H. Laizer, F. Elisante & A. Keane (2018). A quasi-experimental study of impacts of Tanzania's wildlife management areas on rural livelihoods and wealth. Scientific Data. 5. 10.1038/sdata.2018.87

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Kothari, A., & Oviedo, G. (2004). Indigenous and local communities and protected areas: towards equity and enhanced conservation. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. (ed.) (2008). Recognising and supporting indigenous and community conservation: Ideas and experiences from the grassroots (CEESP Briefing Note 9). ICCA Consortium.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

177

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., et al. (2012). Bio-cultural diversity conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities— examples and analysis. Tehran: Cenesta for the ICCA Consortium, IUCN, UNDP GEF SGP and GIZ on behalf of BMZ.

Boudreaux, K. C. (2010). Community conservation in Namibia: Devolution as a tool for the legal empowerment of the poor (Working paper 10-64). https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/wp1064-community-conservation-in-namibia.pdf

Buckham-Walsh, L. and C. Mutambirwa (2014). Strengthening communal rangelands managemnet in Botswana: Legal and policy opportunities and constraints. In Herrera, P., J. Davies, & P. Baena (eds). The Governance of Rangelands: Collective action for sustainable pastoralism. Routledge: London, UK.

Büscher, B. and T. Dietz (2005). 'Conjunctions of governance: The state and the conservation-development nexus in Southern Africa'. The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies 4(2).

Campbell, B. et al. (2000). Forging New Institutional Arrangements for Common Property Resource Management - A Case Study from Southern Zimbabwe

Carter, E., W. M. Adams & J. Hutton (2008). Private protected areas: Management regimes, tenure arrangements and protected area categorization in East Africa. Oryx, 42(2), pp. 177–186. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605308007655

Carter, S. (2009). Socio-economic benefits in Plan Vivo projects: Trees for global benefits, Uganda. Plan Vivo Foundation and ECOTRUST Uganda: Edinburgh, United Kingdom.

Chao, F., B. Yunli, Z. Linxiu, W. Shuai & Y. Xue (2018). Coupling conservation and livelihoods for sustainable management of protected areas in East Africa. Journal of Resources and Ecology 9(3), pp. 266–272. https://doi.org/10.5814/j.issn.1674-764x.2018.03.006

Chhetri, P., A. Mugisha and S. White (2003). Community resource use in Kibale and Mt Elgon National Parks, Uganda. Parks 13(1): 28-38.

Chircop, A., J. Francis, V. Der Elst, H. Pacule, J. Guerreiro, C. Grilo, and G. Carneiro (2010). Governance of marine protected areas in East Africa: A comparative study of Mozambique, South Africa, and Tanzania". Ocean Development and International Law 41(1), pp. 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320903285398

Conservation Development Centre (2007). Case Study: Lewa wildlife conservancy project (Impact Evaluation Information Document 8). GEF Evaluation Office and the Conservation Development Centre https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/ieo-documents/ie-lewa-wildlife.pdf

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

178

Conservation Development Centre (2007). GEF Evaluation: Case study: Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation Project (Impact Evaluation Information Document 7). GEF Independent Evaluation Office and the Conservation Development Centre. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/ieo-documents/ie-bwindi-mgahinga-parks.pdf

Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat (2018). Protected and conserved areas governance in the convention on biological diversity: A review of key concepts, experiences, and sources of guidance SBSTA, Twenty-second meeting, Montreal, Canada, 2-7 July 2018. CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). (2016). Report on Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE). CoP17 Doc. 57.5. https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/17/WorkingDocs/E-CoP17-57-05.pdf

Cousins, J.A., J.P. Sadler, J. Evans (2008). Exploring the role of private wildlife ranching as a conservation tool in South Africa: Stakeholder perspectives. Ecology and Society 13(2), p. 43.

Davies, J. and R. Hatfield (2007). The economics of mobile pastoralism: a global summary. Nomadic Peoples 11(1), pp.91-116. https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-182124937/the-economics-of-mobile-pastoralism-a-global-summary

Davies, J., C. Ogali, L. Slobodian, G. Roba, and R. Ouedraogo (2018). Crossing boundaries: Legal and policy arrangements for cross-border pastoralism. FAO and IUCN: Rome and Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: http://www.fao.org/3/ca2383en/CA2383EN.pdf

Daw, T., S. Coulthard, W. Cheung, K. Brown, C. Abunge, D. Galafassi, G. Peterson, T. McClanahan, J. Omukoto, and L. Munyi (2015). Evaluating taboo trade-offs in ecosystems services and human well-being. PNAS 112 (22) 6949-6954. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414900112

Dawson, N. and A. Martin (2015). Assessing the contribution of ecosystem services to human wellbeing: a disaggregated study in western Rwanda. Ecological Economics 117, pp. 62–72.

De Georges, P., and B. Reilly (2009). The realities of community based natural resource management and biodiversity conservation in sub-Saharan Africa. Sustainability, 1, pp. 734-788. https://doi.org/10.3390/su1030734

Dearden, P., M. Bennett and J. Johnston (2005). Trends in global protected area governance, 1992–2002. Environmental Management 36(1), pp. 89–100.

Derman, B. (1995). Environmental NGOs, dispossession, and the state: The ideology and praxis of African nature and development. Human Ecology, 23(2), pp. 199-215. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01191649

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

179

Dudley, N., S. Mansourian, S. Stolton and S. Sukauwan (2008). Safety net protected areas and poverty reduction. Arguments for Protection series. WWF/Equilibrium. https://www.iucn.org/content/safety-net-protected-areas-and-poverty-reduction

Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (2017). Realising the promise of Tanzania's Wildlife Management Areas (Policy and Practice Briefing). ESPA: London, UK. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at:

Erasmus, Y. and L. Langer (2017). Does governance type in protected areas matter for poverty? A rapid assessment of the evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. Africa Centre for Evidence: Johannesburg, South Africa.

Flintan, F. (2012). Making rangelands secure: Past experience and future options (Working document v 1.0). International Land Coalition: Rome.

Flintan, F. (2014). "Plotting progress: integrated planning in the rangelands of Kenya, Ethiopia, and Uganda". Issue Paper. International Land Coalition

Franks, P. (2017). An analysis of non-state protected area governance in Kenya. PAPACO, IUCN: Gland, Switzerland.

Franks, P., X. Hou-Jones, D. Fikreyesus, et al. (2017) Reconciling forest conservation with food production in sub-Saharan Africa: Case studies from Ethiopia, Ghana and Tanzania (Research Report). IIED: London.

Galafassi, D., T. Daw, L. Munyi, K. Brown, C. Barnaud, and I. Fazey (2017). Learning about social-ecological trade-offs. Ecology and Society 22(1), p. 2. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08920-220102

Galvin, K. A., T. A. Beeton, and M. W. Luizza (2018). African community-based conservation: a systematic review of social and ecological outcomes. Ecology and Society 23(3), p. 39.

Gardner, C. J., M.E. Nicoll, C. Birkinshaw, A. Harris, R. E. Lewis, D. Rakotomalala, A. N. Ratsifandrihamanana (2018). The rapid expansion of Madagascar's protected area system. Biological Conservation 220, pp. 29-36.

GEF International Waters Learning Exchange and Resources Network (No date). Systematic consideration of the economic valuation of natural resources into the TDA/SAP process (GEF Guidance Documents to Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services in IW Projects).

German, L., A. Ruhweza, Alice and R. Mwesigwa with C. Kalanzi (2010). Social and environmental footprints of carbon payments: A case study from Uganda. In Payments for Environmental Services,

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

180

Forest Conservation and Climate Change: Livelihoods in the REDD?, pp. 160-184. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK.

Glew, L., M.D. Hudson and P.E. Osborne (2010). Evaluating the effectiveness of community-based conservation in northern Kenya: A report to The Nature Conservancy. Centre for Environmental Sciences, University of Southampton. Southampton, UK.

Goldman M. (2003). Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: community-based conservation in Tanzania. Development and Change 34, pp. 833–862.

Granek, E. and M. Brown (2005). Co-management approach to marine conservation in Mohéli, Comoros Islands. Conservation Biology, 19(6), pp. 1724-1732. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00301.x

Guerbois, C., A. B. Dufour, G. Mtare and H. Fritz (2013). Insights for integrated conservation from attitudes of people toward protected areas near Hwange National Park, Zimbabwe. Conservation Biology, 27(4), pp.844-855.

Hall, J., N. Burgess, S. Rantala, H. Vihemäki, G. Jambiya, R. Gereau, F. Makonda, F. Njilima, P. Sumbi & A. Kizaji (2014). Ecological and social outcomes of a new protected area in Tanzania. Conservation Biology, 28(6), pp. 1512-1521.

Hess, S. & C. Leisher (2011). Baseline Study for the Tuungane Health and Conservation Project. The Nature Conservancy: Arlington, Virginia.

Homewood, K., A. Keane, J.F. Lund, N. Burgess, M. Msuha, J., Bluwstein, M. Nielsen, J. Olila & A. Dancer (2017). Realising the promise of Tanzania's Wildlife Management Areas. (ESPA Policy and Practice Briefing). ESPA: London, United Kingdom.

Hulme, D., & M. Murphree (1999). Communities, wildlife and the `new conservation' in Africa. Journal of International Development 11, pp. 277-285.

IUCN (2011). Assessment of Natural Resource Governance in Garba Tula, Northern Kenya - Final Report. A contribution to IUCN's project " Improving Natural Resource Governance for Rural Poverty Reduction". UK AID.

IUCN (2012). Supporting sustainable pastoral livelihoods: A global perspective on minimum standards and good practices. IUCN ESARO office: Nairobi, Kenya.

IUCN (2013). Making Rangelands Secure (Quarterly Bulletin 4).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

181

Jonas, H., A. Kothari and H. Shrumm (2012). Legal and institutional aspects of recognizing and supporting conservation by indigenous peoples and local communities: An analysis of international law, national legislation, judgements, and institutions as they interrelate with territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities. Natural Justice and Kalpavriksh: Bangalore, and Pune and Delhi.

Jones, B. (2015). Community conservation in Africa: Successes and failures – lessons for the current poaching crisis. Nova Africa 32.

Kairu, A., C. Upton, M. Huxham, et al. (2018). From shiny shoes to muddy reality: Understanding how meso-state actors negotiate the implementation gap in participatory forest management. Society and Natural Resources 31, pp. 74–88.

Kasthala, G., A. Hepelwa, H. Hamiss, E. Kwayu, L. Emerton, O. Springate-Baginski, D. Allen and W. Darwall (2008). An integrated assessment of the biodiversity, livelihood, and economic value of wetlands in Mtanza-Msona Village, Tanzania. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland. Accessed on 1 June 2019 at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/9294

Kaswamila, A. and N. Songorwa, A. (2009). Participatory land-use planning and conservation in northern Tanzania rangelands. African Journal of Ecology 47, pp. 128 - 134. 10.1111/j.1365-2028.2008.01059.x.

Kazoora, C., C. Asiimwe, and I. Kasozi (2011). "Towards pro-poor REDD in Uganda Findings from the Application of Forestry-Poverty Linkages Toolkit". Final Report. IUCN and ProFor.

Kijazi, M. (2015). Resources, rents, representation and resistance: The struggle for just conservation on Mount Kilimanjaro (Working paper 30). Responsive Forest Governance Initiative (RFGI). CODESRIA: Dakar, Senegal.

Kingdom of Lesotho (2010). Maloti-Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation and Development Project (Report). Environment and Natural Resource Management Unit: Maseru, Lesotho.

Kishor, N., T. Oksanen, K. Rosenbaum and M. Gachanja (2012). Forest governance: Lessons from three African countries. In Broekhoven, G., He. Savenije and S. von Scheliha (eds.). (2012). ETERN News: Moving Forward with Forest Governance, 53.

Knights, K., I. Cuadros, C. Zamora, L. Coad, F. Leverington, B. O'Connor, M. Gonçalves de Lima, N. Kingston, F. Danks, M. Hockings, I. Malugu, P. Scheren, E. Ngoye, P. J. Stephenson & N. Burgess (2014). A preliminary assessment of protected area management within the WWF 'Coastal East Africa' priority place, Eastern Africa. Parks 20(2).

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

182

Kothari, A., C. Corrigan, H. Jonas, A. Neumann, and H. Shrumm (eds). (2012). Recognising and supporting territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities: Global overview and national case studies (Technical Series 64). Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, and Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada.

Lassen, B., L. Jansen, J. Rasolojaona, C. Githaiga, L. Fey and B. Bossou (No date). Community protocols in Africa: Lessons learned for abs implementation. Natural Justice: Cape Town, South Africa.

Lisle, A., et al. (2004). Are protected areas working?: Analysis of forest protected areas. WWF: Gland, Switzerland.

Luckett, S., T. Mkhize and D. Potter (2003). The experience of Local Boards in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Parks 13(1).

Lynch, O. (2011). Mandating recognition: International law and native/ aboriginal title. RRI: Washington DC, USA.

Mandondo, A. and P. Jusrut (2015). Supporting Resilient Forest Livelihoods through Local Representation: Waiting for Democratic Representation in Africa's Social Forests. RFGI Working Paper No. 24. Responsive Forest Governance Initiative

Martin, A., N. Gross-Camp, B. Kebede, S. McGuire & J. Munyarukaza (2014). Whose environmental justice? Exploring local and global perspectives in a payments for ecosystem services scheme in Rwanda. Geoforum, 54, pp. 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.02.006

Mary Lepper, C., and J. Goebel (2010). Community-based natural resource management, poverty alleviation and livelihood diversification: A case study from northern Botswana. Development Southern Africa 27, pp. 725-739. doi: 10.1080/0376835X.2010.522834

Matose, F. and S. Watts (2010). Towards community-based forest management in Southern Africa: Do decentralization experiments work for local livelihoods? Environmental Conservation, 37(3), pp. 310-319. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892910000639

Matseketsa, G., B. Mukamuri, N. Muboko and E. Gandiwa (2019). An assessment of local people's support to private wildlife conservation: A case of Save Valley Conservancy and fringe communities, Zimbabwe. Scientifica, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/2534614

Matseketsa, G., G. Chibememe, N. Muboko, E. Gandiwa and K. Takarinda (2018). Towards an understanding of conservation-based costs, benefits, and attitudes of local people living adjacent to Save Valley Conservancy, Zimbabwe. Scientifica, 2018.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

183

Matsue, N., T. Daw and L. Garrett (2014). Women fish traders on the Kenyan coast: livelihoods, bargaining power, and participation in management. Coastal Management 42: 531–554

McConnell, W.J. and S. P. Sweeney (2005). Challenges of forest governance in Madagascar. The Geographical Journal 171(3).

Metcalfe, S. (2005). Transboundary protected area impacts on communities: Case study of three Southern African transboundary conservation initiatives (Working Paper). AWF, Nairobi, Kenya.

Ministry of Environment, South Sudan (2015). Fifth national report to the convention on biological diversity, Republic of South Sudan: Juba, South Sudan. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/ss/ss-nr-05-en.pdf

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Somalia (2014). Fifth National Report on the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources: Mogadishu, Somalia.

Moyo, F., J. Ijumba and J. Lund (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. Conservation and Society 14, pp. 232–242.

Muchapondwa, E. and J. Stage (2015). Whereto with institutions and governance challenges in African wildlife conservation? Environmental Research Letters, 10(9), p.095013.

Mufune, P. (2015). Community based natural resource management (CBNRM) and sustainable development in Namibia. Journal of Land and Rural Studies, 3(1), pp.121-138.

Mugisha, A. and S. Jacobson (2004). Threat reduction of conventional and community-based conservation approaches to managing protected areas in Uganda. Environmental Conservation 31, pp. 233-241.

Naidoo, R., D. Gerkey, D. Hole, A. Pfaff, A. Ellis, C. Golden, D. Herrera, K. Johnson, M. Mulligan, T. Ricketts and B. Fisher (2019). Evaluating the impacts of protected areas on human well-being across the developing world. Science Advances 5(4). DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aav3006

Namara, A. and X. Nsabagasani (2003). Decentralization and wildlife management: Devolving rights or shedding responsibility? Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda (Working paper 9). WRI-Environmental Governance in Africa: Washington DC.

Namara, A. (2006). From paternalism to real partnership with local communities? Experiences from Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (Uganda). Africa Development 31(2), pp. 39–68.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

184

Namara, A. (2015). At the expense of democracy: Payment for ecosystem services in Hoima District, Uganda (Working paper 14). Responsive Forest Governance Initiative (RFGI), CODESRIA: Dakar, Senegal. Accessed on 2 June 2019 at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/RFGI-WP-014.pdf

NRGF. 2017. Natural Resource Governance in Kilombero Cluster and the SAGCOT Initiative: An assessment of key issues and recommendations for action. Report prepared for CEESP and IUCN.

Nunan, F., M. Hara and P. Onyango (2015). Institutions and co-management in East African inland and Malawi fisheries: A critical perspective. World Development 70: 203–2014.

O'Connell-Rodwell, C., T. Rodwell, M. Rice, and L. Hart (2000). Living with the modern conservation paradigm: Can agricultural communities coexist with elephants? A five-year case study in East Caprivi, Namibia. Biological Conservation, 93(3).

Oba, G. (2011). Indigenous rangelands monitoring: Harnessing pastoralist knowledge in the Horn of Africa (Briefing Note). WISP, IUCN and FAO: Gland, Switerland and Rome, Italy.

Ogutu, Z. (2002). The impact of ecotourism on livelihood and natural resource management: Eselenkei, Amboseli ecosystem, Kenya. Land Degradation and Development, 13(3), pp. 251-56. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.502

Okello, M., S. Ole Seno and B. Wishitemi (2003). Maasai community wildlife sanctuaries in Tsavo-Amboseli, Kenya Parks 13(1).

Ongugo, P., J. Njguguna, E. Obonyo and G. Sigu (2002). Livelihoods, natural resources entitlements and protected areas: The case of Mt Elgon Forest in Kenya. (Unpublished paper.) Kenya IFRI Collaborative Research Centre: Nairobi.

Orr, A. and B. Mwale (2001). Adapting to adjustment: Smallholder livelihoods strategies in southern Malawi. World Development 29(8), pp. 1325-43.

Pailler, S., R. Naidoo, N.D. Burgess, O.E. Freeman, B. Fisher (2015). Impacts of community-based natural resource management on wealth, food security and child health in Tanzania. PLoS ONE, 10(7), e0133252.

Patenaude, G. and K. Lewis (2014). The impacts of Tanzania's natural resource management programmes for ecosystem services and poverty alleviation. International Forestry Review 16, pp. 459–473.

Paterson, A. R. (2009). Legal Framework for Protected Areas: South Africa. IUCN-EPLP No. 81

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

185

PCLG International (2012). Namibian insurance scheme – HACSIS (Case study 3). PCLG International: London, UK.

PCLG International (2012). The Kenyan compensation experience (Case study 2). PCLG International: London, UK.

Petursson, J. G., P. Vedeld, and A. Vatn (2013). Going transboundary? An institutional analysis of transboundary protected area management challenges at Mt Elgon, East Africa. Ecology and Society, 18(4), pp. 28.

Phuthego, T. and R. Chanda (2004). Traditional ecological knowledge and community-based natural resource management: Lessons from a Botswana wildlife management area. Applied Geography, 24(1), pp. 57–76.

Plumptre, A., A. Kayitare, H. Rainer, M. Gray, I. Munanura, N. Barakabuye, S. Asuma, M. Sivha, and A. Namara (2004). The socio-economic status of people living near protected areas in the Central Albertine Rift. (Technical Reports 4). WCS, IGCP, CARE: Kampala, Uganda.

Poonian, C., M. Hauzer, and C. Moussa Iboura (2008). Challenges for effective and sustainable co-managed Marine Protected Areas: A case study from the Comoros Islands. Proceedings of the 11 International Coral Reef Symposium, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, 7-11 July 2008 Session number 23.

Poudyal, M., B. Ramamonjisoa, N. Hockley, O. Rakotonarivo, J. Gibbons, R. Mandimbiniaina, A. Rasoamanana and J. Jones (2016). Can REDD+ social safeguards reach the 'right' people? Lessons from Madagascar. Global Environmental Change 37, pp.31-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.01.004

Poudyal, M., J. Jones, O. Rakotonarivo, N. Hockley, J. Gibbons, R. Mandimbiniaina, A. Rasoamanana, N. Andrianantenaina & B. Ramamonjisoa (2018). Who bears the cost of forest conservation? PeerJ, 6, p.e5106.

Raik, D. and D. Decker (2007). A multisector framework for assessing community-based forest management: lessons from Madagascar. Ecology and Society 12(1): 14. [online] URL:

Rakotoson, L. (2011). Accès à la justice: Cas du braconnage d'Angonaka dans le Parc.National Baie de Baly District Soalala -Région Boeny. Development and Environmental Law Center : Antananarivo, Madagascar.

Rakotoson, L. (2011). Construction d'un complexe hôtelier à Nosy Hao sur une zone sensible – site d'une nouvelle aire marine protégée. Development and Environmental Law Center : Antananarivo, Madagascar.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

186

Rights and Resources Initiative (2014). Lots of words, little action: Will the private sector tip the scales for community land rights? Rights and Resources Initiative: Washington DC, USA.

Rights and Resources Initiative. 2015. Who owns the world's land? A global baseline of formally recognized indigenous and community land rights. Rights and Resources Initiative: Washington DC, USA.

Rantlo, A. (2014). The role of property rights to grazing lands in resource use and management: Case of Taung in Mohale's Hoek. The Lesotho National Conference on Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa: Increasing Land Productivity, Maseru, Lesotho, June 2014.

Roba, G. (2014). Strengthening communal governance of rangeland in Northern Kenya. In Herrera, P., J. Davies, and P. Baena (eds). The Governance of Rangelands: Collective action for sustainable pastoralism. Routledge: London, UK.

Robinson, L. (2013). Mt. Marsabit, Kenya: An Assessment of the Governance System. Landscape-Level Ecosystem-Based Management Working Paper no. 2. http://sites.viu.ca/landscapelevel/casestudies/

Roe D., F. Nelson, C. Sandbrook (eds.) (2009). Community management of natural resources in Africa: Impacts, experiences and future directions. (Natural Resource Issues 18). IIED: London, United Kingdom.

Rohit Jindal, R. (2010). Livelihood impacts of payments for forest carbon services: Field evidence from Mozambique. In Tacconi, L., S. Mahanty and H. Suich (eds.) Payments for Environmental Services, Forest Conservation and Climate Change: Livelihoods in the REDD? Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK.

Rosendo, S., K. Brown, A. Joubert, N. Jiddawi & M. Mechisso (2011). A clash of values and approaches: A case study of marine protected area planning in Mozambique. Ocean & Coastal Management, 54(1), pp. 55-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.10.009

Runsten, L., C. Ravilious, A. Kashindye, R. Giliba, V. Hailakwahi, L. R. A. Kashaga, S. Khalid, B. Mbilinyi, Y. Mwampashi, M. Pastory, R. Mant, M. Osti, P. Crête, A. Pekkarinen, M. Leppanen and L. Miles (2013). Using spatial information to support decisions on safeguards and multiple benefits for REDD+ in Tanzania. UN-REDD: New York, USA.

Rutten, M. (2004). Partnerships in community-based ecotourism projects: Experiences from the Maasai Region, Kenya (Volume 1) (ASC Working Paper 57/2004). African Studies Centre: Leiden, The Netherlands.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

187

Sandbrook, C., and D. Roe (2010). Linking conservation and poverty alleviation: The case of Great Apes - An overview of current policy and practice in Africa. IIED, London. https://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G02770.pdf

Save Lamu (2018). The Lamu County Biocultural Community Protocol: The Lamu indigenous community and their rights to the preservation of their natural resources, cultures, heritage and management of biodiversity. Save Lamu: Lamu, Kenya.

Schreckenberg K., D. Mwayafu and R. Nyamutale (2013). Finding equity in carbon sequestration. A case study of the Trees for Global Benefits Project, Uganda. Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development: Kampala, Uganda.

Schus, C. (2012). Community forestry: A Namibian case study. In Broekhoven, Guido, Herman Savenije and Stefanie von Scheliha (eds.). (2012). Moving Forward with Forest Governance. Tropenbos International: Wageningen, The Netherlands

Schusser, C., M. Krott, R. Devkota, M. Maryudi, M. Salla and M. Yufanyi Movuh (2012). Sequence design of quantitative and qualitative surveys for increasing efficiency in forest policy research. Allgemeine Forest und Jagdzeitung 83(3/4), pp.75-83.

Sebotho, D.L. and E. N. Toteng (2010). Exploring Prospects for Enhancing Community Participation in Protected Area Management: A Case Study of the Moremi Game Reserve Area. Botswana Notes and Records 42, pp. 100-111.

Shepherd, G. and J. Blockhus (2007). "The PROFOR Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit " Proceedings: International Conference on Poverty Reduction and Forests, Bangkok, September 2007

Silva, P. (2006). Exploring the linkages between poverty, marine protected area management, and the use of destructive fishing gear in Tanzania (Policy Research Working Paper 3831). World Bank: Washington DC, USA.

Sims-Castley, R., G. Kerley, B. Geach, and J. Langholz (2005). Socio-economic significance of ecotourism-based private game reserves in South Africa's Eastern Cape Province. PARKS 15(2).

Songorwa, A. (1999). Community-based wildlife (CBW) management in Tanzania: Are the communities interested? World Development 27(12): 2061-79.

Sowman, M., M. Hauck, L. van Sittert and J. Sunde (2011) Marine protected area management in South Africa: New policies, old paradigms. Environmental Management 47, pp. 573–583.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

188

Springer, J. and F. Almeida (2015). Protected areas and the land rights of indigenous peoples and local communities: Current issues and future agenda. Rights and Resources Initiative: Washington DC, USA.

Sainsbury, K., N. Burgess, F. Sabuni, C. Howe, E. Puis, R. Killenga & E. Milner-Gulland (2015). Exploring stakeholder perceptions of conservation outcomes from alternative income generating activities in Tanzanian villages adjacent to Eastern Arc Mountain forests. Biological Conservation, 191, pp. 20-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.06.001

Stellmacher, T., E. Winter and U. Grote (2012). Protected areas in Tanzania: From ineffective management to PA certificates? Proceedings of the Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change. Berlin, 5-6 October 2012.

Stoll-Kleeman, S., A. De La Vega-Leinart and L. Schultz (2010). The role of community participation in the effectiveness of UNESCO Biosphere Reserve management: Evidence and reflections from two parallel global surveys. Environmental Conservation, 37(3), pp. 227-238. doi: 10.1017/S037689291000038X

Stoll-Kleemann, S., M. Bertzky, A. C. de la Vega-Leinert, N. Fritz-Vietta, N. Leiner, M. Hirschnitz-Garbers, M. Mehring, T. Reinhold and R. Schliep (No date). A vision for protected area management and governance. Governance of Biodiversity (GoBi) Project: Greifswald, Germany.

Stolton, S., Redford, K.H. and Dudley, N. 2014. The futures of privately protected areas. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland.

Struhsaker, T., P. Struhsaker and K. Siex (2005). Conserving Africa's rain forests: Problems in protected areas and possible solutions. Biological Conservation 123(1), pp. 45-54.

Suich, H. (2010). The livelihood impacts of the Namibian community based natural resource management programme: A meta-synthesis. Environmental Conservation, 37(1), pp. 45-53. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892910000202

Suich, H and F. Maganga. 2017. The People in Nature situation analysis. Kilombero Valley, Kilombero Cluster, Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania. Report prepared for CEESP and IUCN.

Suzuki, Y. (2001). Drifting rhinos and fluid properties: The turn to wildlife production in western Zimbabwe. Journal of Agrarian Change 1, pp. 600–625.

Twyman, C. (2000). Livelihood opportunity and diversity in Kalahari wildlife management areas, Botswana: Rethinking community resource management. Journal of Southern African Studies 26(4): 783-806.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

189

Twyman, C. (2001). Natural resource use and livelihoods in Botswana's Wildlife Management Areas. Applied Geography, 21(1)

UNEP (2007). Sudan Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment. UNEP.

Van Bodegom, A., S. Wigboldus, A. Blundell, E. Harwell and H. Savenije (2012). Strengthening effective forest governance monitoring practice (Forestry Policy and Institutions Working Paper 29). FAO: Rome, Italy.

Van Rooyen, C. and N. Tannous (2017). What is the impact of marine resources management on multi-dimensional poverty in sub-Saharan Africa? A rapid evidence assessment report. Africa Centre for Evidence: Johannesburg, South Africa.

Vedeld, P., Jumane, A., Wapalila, G., Songorwa, A. (2012) 'Protected areas, poverty and conflicts A livelihood case study of Mikumi National Park'. Tanzania Forest Policy and Economics 21 (2012) 20–31.

Vedeld, P., C. Cavanagh, J.G. Petursson, C. Nakakaawa, R. Moll, E. Sjaastad (2016). The political economy of conservation at Mount Elgon, Uganda: Between local deprivation, regional sustainability, and global public goods. Conservation and Society, 14(3), pp. 183-94. http://www.conservationandsociety.org/text.asp?2016/14/3/183/191155

Ward, C., L. Stringer and G. Holmes (2018). Changing governance, changing inequalities: Protected area co-management and access to forest ecosystem services: A Madagascar case study. Ecosystem Services 30(Part A), pp. 137-148.

Wels, H. (2004). Private wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe: Joint ventures and reciprocity. Afrika Studie Centrum series 2. Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands.

Wildlife Conservation Society (2018). Tracking progress towards the MacArthur Foundation's 10 Year coastal and marine strategy global monitoring report. WCS: Bronx, New York.

Witsen, D. (USDA, US Forest Service, Virginia Tech) (2012). Djibouti Biodiversity and Tropical Forests: 118/119 Assessment. USAID.

World Tourism Organization (2014). Towards measuring the economic value of wildlife watching tourism in Africa. (Briefing paper). World Tourism Organization: Madrid, Spain.

Ykhanbai, H., R. Garg, A. Singh, S. Moiko, C. Enawgaw Beyene, D. Roe, F. Nelson, T. Blomley & F. Flintan (2014). Conservation and "land grabbing" in rangelands: Part of the problem or part of the solution? (Issue paper 5). International Land Coalition: Rome, Italy.

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

190

About BIOPAMA

The Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) programme aims to improve the long-term conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, in protected areas and surrounding communities. It is an initiative of the ACP Group of States financed by the European Union's 11th European Development Fund (EDF), jointly implemented by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC). Building on the first five years of activities financed by the 10th EDF (2012-2017), BIOPAMA's second phase provides tools for data and information management, services for improving the knowledge and capacity for protected area planning and decision making, and funding opportunities for specific site-based actions." www.biopama.org

About the Africa, Caribbean, Pacific Group of States

The African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) is the largest trans-national intergovernmental organisation of developing countries in the international system, with 79 member countries from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. Today, the main goal of the Group is to drive South-South solidarity and North-South cooperation for the sustainable development of ACP countries and their successful integration into the world economy. http://www.acp.int/

About the European Union

The European Union is made up of 28 Member States who have decided to gradually link together their know-how, resources and destinies. Together, during a period of enlargement of 50 years, they have built a zone of stability, democracy and sustainable development whilst maintaining cultural diversity, tolerance and individual freedoms. The European Union is committed to sharing its achievements and its values with countries and peoples beyond its borders. http://europa.eu/

About IUCN

IUCN is a membership Union composed of both government and civil society organisations. It harnesses the experience, resources and reach of its more than 1,300 Member organisations and the input of more than 10,000 experts. IUCN is the global authority on the status of the natural world and the measures needed to safeguard it. www.iucn.org

About the Joint Research Centre and the European Commission

The European Commission (EC) is the executive body of the European Union (EU), which is the world's largest donor of official development assistance. As the in-house science service of the EC, the Joint Research Centre (JRC) provides EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support, including policies and programmes at global level and specifically those focusing on the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP). https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en

Management Effectiveness, Governance, and Social Assessments of Protected and Conserved Areas in Eastern and Southern Africa

191

BIOPAMA

From Knowledge to Action for a Protected Planet

www.biopama.org