Peru MEE

Extracted from information provided by Juan Chang and Cynthia Cespedes and from Chang et al. (2006) and Vásquez (2006)

1.1 Organisation

Peru National Insitute for Natural Resouces (Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales - INRENA) with assistance from USAID

1.2 Primary reference

Vásquez, P. (2006) Un poco de historia: Efectividad de manejo en Peru. In 'Fortalecimiento de la Efectividad de Manejo en los Andes. Análisis comparativo de herramientas existentes'. (Eds M. Cracco, J. Calvopiña, J. Courrau, M.M. Medina, I.Novo, I. Oetting, J. Surkin, R. Ulloa y P. Vásquez.). (UICN: Quito, Ecuador.)

Chang, J. and Workshop participants (2006) 'Fortalecimiento de la Efectividad de Manejo de Áreas Protegidas en los Andes MEMORIAS DEL TALLER NACIONAL DE PERU "Desarrollo participativo de una caja de herramientas para la evaluación de la efectividad del manejo de las áreas naturales protegidas en Perú".' CI, CDC/UNALM, INRENA, IUCN-SUR.

1.3 Brief description of methodology

1) Matriz de Monitoreo de la Gestión de las Áreas Naturales Protegidas
2) Matriz de monitoreo de manejo efectivo de las ANP del SINANPE: Updated version developed by INRENA, based on the IUCN-WCPA Framework. It includes one indicator from RAPPAM about pressures and threats.

Two types of monitoring and evaluation are recognised: those related to management of the system and of each national park, and those relating to the status of biodiversity.

1.4 Purposes

✓ **to improve management (adaptive management)**
▪ for prioritisation and resource allocation
▪ for accountability/ audit

1.5 Objectives and application

- To monitor the current conditions of a natural protected area and its changes on time in order to improve decisions and to reach an effective management.

- It guides SINANPE and protected area administration thorough an effective management.

- It identifies the needs and priority actions, specially of a protected area without management plan.

- Determines the current conditions of a natural protected area.

- Helps to elaborate operational plans with a better approach.

1.6   Origins

Management effectiveness in Peru has been evolving since the mid-1990s, especially in conjunction with the assistance from USAID to the protected area system. The critical tool 'Plan Director' was formulated between 1993 and 1995 and recognised that the processes of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation must be integrated and that feedback was essential to improve management. A matrix of indicators was developed and applied to 14 protected areas on four occasions between 1996 and 2000, with the process led by international agencies and consultants.

This work served as a basis for INRENA to develop its own system of MEE in cooperation with WWF. A matrix of management requirements was developed and indicators developed, improved and validated by protected area managers between 2001 and 2003. This methodology is known as the 'Matriz de Monitoreo de la Gestión de las Áreas Naturales Protegidas'. It has been applied across the protected area system every year since 2001.

This methodology is now being updated and will be known as 'Matriz de monitoreo de manejo efectivo de las ANP del SINANPE'.

1.7   Elements and indicators

Three scopes are used:
- Administrative,
- Legal/Institutional, and
- Protected area management.

All of them have the same weight.
There are 10 variables and 26 sub-variables: based on the idea of defining an expected situation with indicators as verification instruments.

1.8   Scoring and analysis

Each expected situation has four alternatives (0-3).

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