Enhancing our Heritage

Written with assistance/comments from Sue Stolton

Organisation

UNESCO, IUCN, and the University of Queensland

Primary reference

Hockings M, Stolton, S, Courrau, J, Dudley, N, Parrish, J, James, R, Mathur, V and Makombo, J (2007) 'The World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook: 2007 Edition.' UNESCO, IUCN, University of Queensland, The Nature Conservancy.

Hockings, M., Stolton, S., Courrau, J., Dudley, N., Parrish, J., James, R., Mathur, V. and Makombo, J. (2007) 'Libro de trabajo para la efectividad del manejo del Patrimonio Mundial: Edición 2007: 2007 Edition.' UNESCO, IUCN, University of Queensland, The Nature Conservancy.

Purposes

- ✓ **to improve management (adaptive management)**
- ✓ to raise awareness and support
- ✓ for accountability/ audit
- ✓ for prioritisation and resource allocation

As this is a toolkit, it can be adapted for multiple purposes

Brief description of methodology

The Enhancing our Heritage (EoH) project is developing and testing a toolkit of methodologies, detailed in the *World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook* (Hockings *et al.* 2007)*,* which help managers and stakeholders assess current activities, identify gaps and discuss how problems might be addressed. The IUCN-WCPA Framework is the unifying theme around which the Workbook is structured. Indicators and tools for assessing each component of the Framework are suggested to build up a picture of the adequacy and appropriateness of management and the extent to which objectives are being achieved.

The workbook includes 12 tools (see the indicator list) which are based on a variety of best practices in protected area, and in particular World Heritage, assessment. The assessment tools centre on identifying the main values (biodiversity, social, economic and cultural) which the World Heritage Site was set up to protect (and other important values), ensuring that appropriate objectives based on these values have been set, and then assessing the effectiveness of management in achieving these objectives.

Important values are used because, just as it is impossible to manage every species, hectare or social interaction in a protected area, it is impossible to monitor and assess everything that happens there. World Heritage sites vary in their objectives, management approaches, and capacity for assessment and monitoring; so various different tools are provided. The assessment tools can be used either to supplement existing assessment activities, helping to ensure all components of the management cycle are assessed, or to build a complete assessment system from the start' (Hockings *et al.* 2004). The scale and detail of the assessment are likely to vary, depending on available financial and human resources.

Objectives and application

The objectives of EOH are to provide site managers and stakeholders with a tested set of tools for developing and implementing a site-based management effectiveness monitoring and evaluation system which:

- focuses on the most important values and objectives of the site;
- addresses key threats to these values and objectives;
- is flexible and enables incorporation of existing monitoring and assessment systems into the overall evaluation; and
- provides for in-depth participatory assessment of important aspects of management for all six of the IUCN-WCPA Framework elements (context, planning, inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes) but pays particular attention to assessing outcomes of management.

It is also valuable for donor/ treasury evaluation, especially to improve the comprehensiveness and usefulness of reporting to the World Heritage Committee.

The EoH methodology is being designed for World Heritage Sites but it has proven to be applicable to other protected areas. 'The UNESCO/IUCN *Enhancing our Heritage* (EoH) project, funded by the United Nations Foundation, is aiming to improve monitoring and evaluation in natural World Heritage sites. The project team, from Europe and Latin America and managed by the University of Queensland, Australia, is working with staff and partners in nine pilot World Heritage sites in Africa, Asia and Latin America to develop and test management assessment methods'(Stolton *et al.* 2006).

Projects currently in development will increase the application of this methodology through awareness raising and capacity building at national and regional levels, training for regionally-based mentors to help guide evaluations and support for extending application of the system to a wider range of countries and sites.

Origins

'The EOH project has been in progress since 2001 and the first draft of the manual was published in that year. Many of the tools used in the methodology draw from the experiences in Fraser Island World Heritage site, Australia and from a joint WWF and IUCN project to develop assessment methods in Central Africa, in particular at the Dja World Heritage site, Cameroon. Tools for identifying objectives are based on those developed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) for use in the USA, the Caribbean and Central and South America. The threat assessment also draws on work by TNC and the Biodiversity Support Program. The methodology developed for assessing ecological integrity (an outcome measure) was inspired by existing systems used by Parks Canada, TNC and Kruger National Park in South Africa' (Stolton *et al.* 2006).

The tools in the workbook have been field-tested and revised, in co-operation with managers and partners, in the nine sites participating in the Enhancing our Heritage project. The insights of those using the tools in these sites (which vary greatly biologically and in their size, level of funding and staffing and knowledge base) were incorporated into in the latest draft of the workbook. The final version of the workbook will be published by UNESCO in 2008.

Strengths

The approach provides guidance for an integrated in-depth evaluation of all six elements of the IUCN Management Effectiveness Framework. As it uses a number of different 'tools', it is flexible and can be adapted to suit the local situation, needs and level of resources. Other systems of evaluation, such as questionnaires already developed to assess inputs, processes or context issues, could be fed into this system if desired.

Unlike many other systems, it places emphasis on the measurement of outcomes of management and assists in both the reporting of monitoring activities and in the development of monitoring priorities and procedures.

It encourages stakeholder participation in both the design and evaluation phases and has resulted in some improved communication in the field. The process can result in considerable capacity strengthening

Constraints and weaknesses

The EOH methodology is not a simple 'off-the-shelf' methodology and must be adapted to the individual situation. The system as a whole is relatively time-consuming and expensive, and its implementation requires continuing resourcing and some training and assistance.

How the methodology is implemented

The implementation process includes the following steps:
- Training for protected area managers;
- Desktop literature surveys, data collection and review;
- Workshops with staff;
- Workshops with stakeholders;
- Compilation of existing monitoring results; and
- Development of enhanced, values-based monitoring program.

The need for partnerships and local capacity building during the process is stressed: 'The underlying premise of the EoH Project is that World Heritage sites undertake assessment of their own management effectiveness. For the self-assessment process to be rigorous it is essential that site managers assemble a team of stakeholder representatives to work with them to develop and support the monitoring and assessment process. …. The project requirement for site implementation teams to undertake the project, who then work with a wider group of stakeholders to develop and ratify the initial assessment, reinforces this need to build strong and coherent local teams to work together to assess management' (Stolton et al., 2006, p.69).

Elements and indicators

The workbook provides worksheets for each tool. The worksheets and accompanying text provide indicators for assessment, but sites can adapt these criteria and indicators to suit local circumstances if required.

Table 1: Indicators for the EOH methodology

Tool	Indicators
1. Management values and objectives	Biodiversity values Other natural values Cultural, social and economic values Principal management objectives
2. Identifying threats - stress, source (potential and current), status of threat (area, intensity, action, urgency of action)	Threats to biodiversity Threats to other natural values Threats to cultural and socioeconomic values
3. Relationships with stakeholders and partners	Identify all the stakeholders and partners Details of the stakeholder and the issue being assessed Nature of the relationship between this stakeholder and the issue Economic dependency Impacts – Negative impacts Impacts – Positive contributions Willingness to engage Political/Social influence Organisation of stakeholders Opportunities stakeholders/partners have to contribute to management the Level of

	engagement of the stakeholder/partner Overall adequacy of stakeholder engagement
4. Review of national context	How adequate is the legislation? To what extent is the legislation used/useful? Is the legislation effective? How high does conservation rank relative to other government policies? Does other government policy relevant to this site contradict or undermine conservation policy? Is there a conscious attempt to integrate conservation within other areas of government policy? Are policies implemented i.e. has the necessary legislation been enacted? International conservation conventions and treaties Are these conventions and treaties reflected in national law? How willing is government to fund the World Heritage site? Does government have the capacity to match its willingness? What is the relationship between site level and agency level staff– e.g. money, staff, training, equipment? What proportion of the agency's budget goes to field operations?
5. assessment of management planning	Name of plan; Level of approval of the plan (L,G,A, S/A,D); Year of preparation, likely completion or most recent review; Year specified for next review of plan Comments (comments should concentrate on the adequacy, currency, and integration of the plan with other planning instruments) Does the plan establish a clear understanding of the desired future for the site? Does the plan provide sufficient guidance on the desired future for the site? Does the plan provide for a process of monitoring, review and adjustment? Does the plan provide an adequate and appropriate policy environment? Is the plan integrated/linked to other significant national/regional/sectoral plans? Is the plan based on an adequate and relevant information base? Does the plan address the primary issues? Are the objectives and actions specified in the plan represented as adequate and appropriate response to the issues? Does the plan take account of the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities? Does the plan take account of the needs and interests of other stakeholders? Does the plan provide adequate direction on management actions? Does the plan identify the priorities?
6. Design assessment	List objectives for biodiversity and other natural values Key habitats Size External interactions Connectivity List community objectives for cultural, social and economic values Key area legal status and tenure List management issues related to legal status, access and boundary issues with neighbours Legal status and tenure Access points Neighbours
7. Management needs	Assessing management needs Assessing whether the inputs available match the management needs
8. Assessment of management processes	Management planning: Is there a plan and is it being implemented? Planning systems: Are the planning systems appropriate i.e. participation, consultation, review and updating? Regular work plans: Are there annual work plans or other planning tools? Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained? Management staff facilities: Are the available facilities suitable for the management requirements of the site? Staff/management communication: Do staff have the opportunity to feed into management decisions? Staff training: Are staff adequately trained? Personnel management: How well are staff managed? Financial management: Does the financial management system meet the Critical management needs? Managing resources: Are there management mechanisms in place to control inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching)? Law enforcement: do staff have the capacity to enforce legislation? Monitoring and assessment: Are management activities monitored against performance? Resource inventory: Is there enough information to manage the World Heritage site? Research: Is there a programme of management- orientated survey and research work? Reporting: Are all the reporting requirements of the World Heritage site fulfilled?

Extracted from Leverington, F., M. Hockings, H. Pavese, K.L. Costa and J. Courrau (2008) Management effectiveness in protected areas – a global study. Supplementary Report no. 1: Overview of approaches and methodologies.

	Ecosystems and species: Is the biodiversity of the World Heritage site adequately managed?
	Cultural/ historical resource management: Are the site's cultural resources adequately managed?
	Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) adequate?
	Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?
	Have plans been developed to provide visitors with the most appropriate access and diversity of experience when visiting the World Heritage site?
	Is there a planned education programme?
	Access Is visitor access sufficiently controlled?
	Local communities Do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage site have input to management decisions?
	Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident in or regularly using the site have input to management decisions?
	Local, peoples welfare Are there programmes developed by the World Heritage managers which consider local people's welfare whilst conserving the sites resources?
	State and commercial neighbours: Is there cooperation with neighbouring land/sea users?
	Conflict resolution: If conflicts between the World Heritage site and stakeholders arise, are mechanisms in place to help find solutions?
9. Assessment of management plan implementation	Achievement of management plan actions
10. Output assessment	Numbers of users (e.g. numbers of visitors, numbers of people using a service, numbers of inquiries answered)
	Volume of work output (e.g. numbers of meetings held with local communities, number of patrols undertaken, extent of area surveyed in a research programme, numbers of prosecutions instigated)
	Physical outputs (e.g. length of site boundary delineated and marked, numbers of brochures produced or distributed, number and value of development projects completed)
11. Outcomes of management (suggested)	Size of protected area
	Ecosystem functioning
	Renewal of ecosystem
	Uniqueness
	Diversity
	Human well-being
	Cultural values
	Recreation management objectives
	Economic objectives
	Stresses
12. Achievement of principal objectives	

Scoring and analysis

Many of the indicators in the workbook use a four-point scale. In many of these, a description is provided for each of these levels. However, other questions have qualitative and descriptive answers only, or yes/no answers. As this is a toolkit rather than a definitive system, other systems of scoring and analysis could be fed into different aspects if desired.

Outcome indicators depend on data from monitoring programs and are reported in quantitative terms against nominated target conditions, in a system similar to that used by Parks Canada and the TNC CAP methodology.

Reports are prepared structured around the results from the 12 assessment tools with additional commentary, supporting information and analysis as required. Reports are designed to identify any corrective actions or other responses to the evaluation findings. The goals are to use results for adaptive management measures.

References

Dudley, N. and S. Stolton (2003) Forest Innovations Project: Developing a Protected Area Effectiveness Methodology for Africa.

GEF Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One.

Hockings, M., S. Stolton, J. Courrau, N. Dudley and J. Parrish (2004) The World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook: How to build monitoring, assessment and reporting systems to improve the management effectiveness of natural World Heritage sites Revised Edition. . University of Queensland.

Hockings, M., S. Stolton, J. Courrau, N. Dudley, J. Parrish, R. James, V. Mathur and J. Makombo (2007) The World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook: 2007 Edition. UNESCO, IUCN, University of Queensland, The Nature Conservancy.

Stolton, S., J. Courrau and M. Mapesa (2006) Case Study IV: Enhancing our Heritage: monitoring and managing for success in natural world heritage sites. In 'Evaluating effectiveness: a framework for assessing the management of protected areas second edition'. (Eds Hockings, M., S. Stolton, N. Dudley, F. Leverington and J. Courrau). (IUCN Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK).

Stolton, S., M. Hockings and N. Dudley (2003) The Enhancing our Heritage Project.