Belize National Report on Management Effectiveness

1.1   Organisation
Forest Department Belize

1.2   Primary methodology reference
Young R, Wolfe, L and Mc.Farlane, V (2005), 'Monitoring Management Effectiveness in Belize's Protected Areas System. Report prepared for the National Protected Areas Policy & System Plan Task Force (NPAPSP).' University Research and Evaluation and Galiano Institute for Environmental and Social Research.

Wildtracks (2006) 'National report on management effectiveness: management effectiveness in Forestry Department administered protected areas in Belize.'

1.3   Brief description of methodology
The protocol developed under the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan – the Monitoring Package for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (Young et. al, 2005) – provides a framework to report on progress of protected area management towards achieving the national objective of a functional protected area system, through effective management of the protected areas.

Young et. al. suggest that management effectiveness can be assessed at two levels – outcomes and management functions:

1. Outcomes: Achieving management goals towards the broad goals of Belize's protected areas:
- ✓   the conservation of biodiversity (species, ecological communities, ecosystems, environmental services);
- ✓   the preservation of cultural assets (archaeological sites); and
- ✓   the provision of sustainable socio-economic benefits.

2. Management Functions: Getting the work done that is necessary to achieve the desired outcomes.

'Young *et. al.* (2005) make the assumption that if an organization achieves all management functions, this will automatically result in the desired outcomes (barring unforeseen problems), and that strengthening management functions should improve effectiveness, and therefore the possibility of achieving the desired outcomes. He does, however, acknowledge that many external factors may also affect management effectiveness, over which managers have no control, such as the size and location of the protected area and its vulnerability to hurricanes'(Wildtracks 2006).

1.4   Purposes
- ✓   **to improve management (adaptive management)**
- ✓   for prioritisation and resource allocation

1.5   Objectives and application
To assess all parks in Belize national system of protected areas for management effectiveness.

1.6   Origins

The methodology was developed in a consultancy under the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan - the Monitoring Package for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas (Young *et al.*, 2005). The developers reviewed other methodologies including PROARCA, the PIP Site Consolidation Scorecard, and WWF-CATIE, How is Your Marine Park Doing, TNC-CAP, and the IUCN-WCPA Framework and incorporated aspects of these methodologies. It was then trialled through another consultancy working with the Forest Department in 2006 in 44 of the 48 protected areas in Belize (Wildtracks 2006).

1.7   How the methodology is implemented

The methodology has been implemented once, in 2006, through three workshops, which were organised to ensure as much participation as possible from the Forest Department and partners. The monitoring package was distributed to participants in advance. Six potential co-management organisations participated in the assessment, but as they are not yet directly involved in management, their assessments were not included in the analysis (Wildtracks 2006).

The authors of the 2006 study (Wildtracks 2006) make numerous comments and recommendations for improvement of the system, including adjustments to many indicators.

1.8   Elements and indicators

The management effectiveness assessment is structured in two sections. The first provides the background information on the protected area (establishment details, biodiversity importance etc.) and outlines threats to the biodiversity.
The second section is divided into seven distinct categories:
• Resource Information
• Resource Administration, Management and Protection
• Participation, Education and Socio-Economic Benefits
• Management Planning
• Governance
• Human Resources
• Financial and Capital Management
Each has a series of indicator areas and a total of 58 indicators.

Indicators for the Belize MEE methodology

Category	Indicator
1. Resource Information	1.1 Inventory: Physical Environment
	1.2 Inventory: Biotic Environment
	1.3 Inventory: Cultural and Archaeological Resources
	1.4 Inventory: Social, Cultural, and Economic Context
	1.5 Inventory: Resource Use and Occupancy
	1.6 Inventory: Tenures and Claims
	1.7 Site Assessment: Conservation Target
	1.8 Site Assessment: Systematic Threat Assessment
	1.9 Traditional Knowledge
	1.10 Information Management Systems
	1.11 Environmental Monitoring Activities
	1.12 Functional Research Activities

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

Category	Indicator
2. Resource Administration, Management and Protection	2.1 Legal: Legal Status 2.2 Legal: Boundary Survey and Demarcation 2.3 Legal: Registration, Permit, and Approval Processes 2.4 Tenure and Claim Conflict Resolution 2.5 Guidelines and Best Management Practices 2.6 Protection: Surveillance Activities 2.7 Protection: Enforcement Activities 2.8 Visitor and Tourism Management Activities 2.9 Visitor and Tourism Monitoring Activities
3. Participation, Education, and Socio-Economic Benefits	3.1 Communication Activities 3.2 Educational Activities 3.3 Dissemination of Knowledge and Information 3.4 Participation: Level of Participation in Management 3.5 Participation: Local Actors Leading Management 3.6 Participation: Volunteer Activities 3.7 Participation: Strength of Social Capital 3.8 Participation: Capacity Building Work 3.9 Benefits: Socio-Economic Benefits Program 3.10 Benefits: Extent of Local Economic Benefits 3.11 Benefits: Recognition of Protected Area Benefits
4. Management Planning	4.1 Management Plan Implementation 4.2 Operational Plan Implementation 4.3 Regulation and Zoning Implementation 4.4 Guidelines and Best Management Practices 4.5 Long Term Management Needs Identification 4.6 Program Monitoring and Evaluation
5. Governance	5.1 Protected Areas Objectives 5.2 Co-Management Arrangements 5.3 Administrative Autonomy 5.4 Operating Procedures: Advisory Committee 5.5 Operating Procedures: Board 5.6 Interorganizational Mechanisms
6. Human Resources	6.1 Site Manager Preparation 6.2 Site Manager Availability 6.3 Admin Staff Availability 6.4 Technical, Scientific, and Professional Staff Availability 6.5 Operations Staff Availability 6.6 Human Resource Surveys 6.7 Training and Development
7. Financial and Capital Management	7.1 Funding Adequacy 7.2 Revenue Generation 7.3 Financial Management 7.4 Infrastructure Adequacy 7.5 Equipment Adequacy 7.6 Internal Access Adequacy 7.7 Signage Adequacy 7.8 Maintenance Adequacy

1.9   Scoring and analysis

In the study by Wildtracks (2006), each indicator was scored from zero to four, and the results were then grouped and analysed in a number of different ways, both for individual protected areas and for the protected area system as a whole. Groupings were:
- The original categories proposed in the methodology;
- WCPA elements; and
- "Categories' or management dimensions:
  - Socio-economic indicators

Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Information Module

Methodology Description

- Administrative indicators
- Biophysical indicators

The results for each WCPA evaluation element and indicator group were then analysed using the following scale:

Very poor management effectiveness	<25%
Poor management effectiveness	25% - 50%
Moderate management effectiveness	51% - 75%
Satisfactory / Good management effectiveness	76% - 100%

Results are presented as tables and graphs comparing across parks and across different aspects of management, and areas of greatest strength and weakness are recorded.

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.