



Nishorgo Support Project

## FINAL REPORT

# PROTOCOL FOR PARTICIPATORY SELF ASSESSMENT THROUGH COMMUNITY SCORECARD

(Protected Area Community Monitoring Tool)

Performance Monitoring Part-2

Prepared for:

International Resources Group (IRG)

Prepared by:

Nasim Aziz

Nature Conservation Management (NACOM)

© NACOM 2004



With Partners: CODEC, NACOM & RDRS

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

---

Protection, conservation and sustainable management of our forested areas under the current population pressure will require local people's involvement in a collaborative manner. This realization has led the FD in collaboration with the USAID to jointly develop a project namely 'Nishorgo Support Project' in selected PAs of Bangladesh to support the 'Co-management of Tropical Forest Resources' program of USAID.

Under the project, performance indicators have already been proposed by USAID and IRG to monitor success of the undertaking. This draft report on '**Community Scorecard**' is a rapid assessment tool to measure the effectiveness of the protected area management to deal with the current challenges.

It is based on two methodologies (1) WWF's Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology and (2) Site Consolidation Scorecard developed by The Nature Conservancy.

The Community Scorecard covers four aspects to be evaluated by local communities – (1) co-management policies and model, (2) institutional capacities of local people to carry out co-management plan, and (3) improvement in economic status of local people, and lastly, (4) improved practices that help to restore biodiversity or health of the PAs.

Developments in these four aspects will be measured individually and as a whole on a predetermined scale from 1-4, where 1- represent the minimum and 4- represent prevalence of optimal conditions.

The method relies on community members for information. The analysis is simple, quick and qualitative in nature and has limitations as well. Nevertheless, it can detect trends in development.

It is assumed that this document will be revised and enriched based on experience gained by the participating organizations. Such participation will ensure improvement of the tool and implementation of this simple method even after the project ends.

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Content</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Objectives of Community Scorecard</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Concept of Scorecard</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Framework and Methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Analyzing the Findings</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Administering the Monitoring Questionnaire</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaire and Guidance Notes</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Reference</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Sample Questionnaire Format</b>	<b>16</b>

## **Objectives of Community Scorecard**

The Community Management Scorecard has been developed generally to help track and monitor progress of the Nishorgo Support Project working in the five pilot protected areas (PAs). However, it is also hoped that the Community Scorecard will be used more specifically by Forest Department to guide in improving policy and management effectiveness in the pilot PAs.

More specifically this draft report has the following objectives:

- To provide a harmonized reporting system for protected areas assessment;
- To provide consistent data to allow tracking of progress over time;
- To provide a relatively quick and easy tool to complete by participating people in the protected areas;
- To provide a scoring system that has four alternative text answers to each question, each of which signifies a level of achievements or problems;
- To provide a “score” to ease in assessment and to prioritize issues among PAs;

## **The Concept of Scorecard**

Community Scorecard is a participatory monitoring tool, where the members of the community assess the intervention of the project. This draft report is based on two methodologies designed for assessing PA management. The first one is WWF’s Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPAM) Methodology (Ervin 2003) and Site Consolidation Scorecard developed by The Nature Conservancy (1999).

## **Framework and Methodology**

The Community Scorecard covers four components under five **Intermediate Results** (IRs) of the Performance Monitoring Plan. These are – (1) co-management policies and model, (2) institutional capacities of local people to carry out co-management plan, and (3) improvement in economic status of local people, and lastly, (4) biodiversity or forest health of the PAs (Table 1).

Developments in these four aspects will be measured individually and as a whole on a predetermined scale from 1-4, where 1- represent the minimum and 4- represent prevalence of optimal policy, institutional and socio-economic conditions.

## **Interpretation of “yes”, “mostly yes”, “mostly no”, and “no”**

To capture information the format of the questionnaire provides a statement with four options: ‘yes’, ‘mostly yes’, ‘mostly no’, or ‘no’ and will be scored from 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively. Notes are provided for questions to serve as a guideline in response to the four options. In cases where the respondent is unable to decide the correct option, the answer should be based on best available information and professional experience.

**Table 1: Monitoring components.**

Strategic Objective 6	Improved management of open water and tropical forest resources				
Components	Co-management			Socio-economic	Biodiversity / Forest health
	Policy	Institutions	Management		
Intermediate Results	IR 6.3	IR 6.4 IR 6.5	IR 6.1	IR 6.2.2	IR 6.2
Indicators	6.3c 6.3d 6.3.1	6.5a, 6.5c	6.1e	6.2.2a 6.2.2b 6.2.2c	6.2c, 6.2d, 6.2e
Verifiers	1-3	4-8	9	10-12	13-18
	Community Scorecard		Management Scorecard	Community Scorecard	Community Scorecard Verifier-14

The higher the scores for a particular verifier, the higher the priority it will get to trigger management actions:

- ‘y’ - 4 = Adequate/excellent
- ‘m/y’ - 3 = Progress made
- ‘m/n’ - 2 = Work initiated
- ‘n’ - 1 = No progress

### Analyzing the Findings

Adding the scores for question 1-5 except 3C gives values ranging from 19-76. Scores for question 3C will vary depending upon the situation.

### Results

The method is simple and only requires a calculator. Results will be presented by simply plotting one variable on one axis and another variable on the other axis. Scores for different context and management capabilities will be shown for individual or among protected area for comparison. Analysis method like multivariate analysis will also be done.

### Assumptions / Limitations

- The methodology assumes willingness and active participation of the local people.
- It depends on trust and transparency to obtain reliable information.

- The assessment process focus more on collecting and interpreting qualitative data, less on quantitative data.
- It is some times difficult to arrive at any of the four choices of score (y; m/y; m/n; n).
- This format can help to detect general trends, rather than ascertain the exact degree of fulfillment.
- The scoring method is a quick overview of progress or pitfalls rather than detailed evaluation.

### **Administering the Assessment Questionnaire**

- To achieve best results data will be collected through group discussions.
- Such an approach is likely to generate more accurate, thorough and consistent data.
- With the help from a facilitator (from NACOM), participants will discuss the questions and modify if necessary according to the circumstances of the PA.
- The participants will negotiate a common interpretation of each question, as well as thresholds for determining a “yes”, “mostly yes”, “mostly no”, or “no” response thereby providing a more consistent and standardized approach.
- The finding will be analyzed and the report will be send to concerned.

### **Frequency of Assessment**

- The findings of the first year will act as a baseline condition prevailing in the PA(s).
- The assessment will be conducted once a year for the entire duration of the NSP.

### **Reporting Organization**

- NACOM will administer the assessment and submit report to Forest department (each five PA), USAID, and IRG.

### **Sustainability of Monitoring**

- Once CBOs/RMOs will become familiar and accustomed to Community Scorecard, it will be easy for them to continue even after the tenure of NSP.

## Questionnaire and Guidance Notes

### 1. Co-management agreement ensures active participation

Co-management agreement ensures active participation					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) The co-management agreement provides ample room for active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Tenure of agreement ensures long-term participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Local people actively participate in core zone management.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Benefit sharing mechanism assures active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e) Benefit inheritance procedure ensures active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	f) Conflict resolution mechanism(s) is fair.	

*a) The agreement provides ample room for active participation.*

People's involvements in the past social forestry projects were in the form of - passive participation, e.g., collaboration in implementing specified programs in return for specified benefits. Active participation would require involvement in all activities like planning, decision-making, implementing, management, protection and benefit sharing etc of government programs.

**Note: Where - 'n' - Local people are assigned tasks with incentives but PA managers decide agenda and direct management activities; 'm/n' – local people are asked for their opinions & input, PA managers analyze information and decide course of action; 'm/y' - local people work together with PA managers to determine priorities, PA managers direct the process; 'y' – local people and PA managers share their knowledge to create new understanding and work together to form action plans. PA Managers facilitate.**

*b) Tenure of agreement ensures long-term participation.*

Temporal scale of co-management contract with the CBOs/RMOs should be clear and extend over longer period. Short-term tenure or shorter renewal period, or species rotation based land tenure create complexity and confusion, as generally, there are several species. Such uncertainty in agreement was found to make preference towards short-rotation species and to lower participation.

**Note: Where - 'n' – duration of agreement is not sufficient enough (short-term, i.e., 10 years) to make long-term investment of labor & time; 'm/n' – duration of agreement is 25 years (mid-term) to encourage investment of labor & time; 'm/y'- duration of agreement is long-term (40-60 years), but renewal period is short to make long-term investment; 'y'– duration of agreement is sufficient enough to make long-term investment of labor & time.**

*c) Local people actively participate in core zone management.*

Spatial scale of tenure should not only be limited to buffer zone but also to core areas if long-term protection is sought from the local people. Experience in showed that buffer zones were better protected than that of core forestland. Involving local people in management of core areas would increase/develop interest in protection.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ - Local people are assigned tasks with incentives but PA managers decide agenda and direct management activities in core zone; ‘m/n’ – local people are asked for their opinions & input, PA managers analyze information and decide course of action in core zone; ‘m/y’ - local people work together with PA managers to determine priorities, PA managers direct the process in core zone; ‘y’ – local people and PA managers share their knowledge to create new understanding and work together to form action plans in core zone.**

*d) Benefit sharing mechanism assures active participation.*

This verifier assumes that revenue/produce generated through activities in buffer zone is sufficient enough to meet the need of the local people. The higher the incentive allocated for local people the higher will be participation. The aim of the government should not be to get a share of the tree crops rather than initiate a self sustained resource generation process with the participation of the local people.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ – Share of benefit is too low to meet the need; ‘m/n’ – Share of benefit is medium to meet the need; ‘m/y’ - Share of benefit is moderate to meet the need; ‘y’ – Share of benefit is adequate to meet the need.**

*e) Benefit inheritance procedure ensures active participation*

This indicator assumes that if co-management agreement is made with individual or at household level, then the rights is either sub-divided or is subject to dispute among legal heirs upon death of a participants. Such problem can be avoided if agreements are made with groups. However, conflict may also arise if benefit is either unequal or less upon termination of agreement or contract within groups or between groups and FD.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ – agreement is made with individual and rules do not define division of rights or inheritance procedure clearly; ‘m/n’ – although agreement is made with individual, rules clearly defined division of rights or inheritance procedure; ‘m/y’ - agreement is made with groups but distribution of benefit is unequal and may arise problems; ‘y’ – agreement is made with groups and benefit is distributed equally.**

*f) Conflict resolution mechanism(s) is fair.*

This indicator assumes that dispute settlement procedure is impartial and fair, if arise, between FD and local people (CBOs/RMOs).



**Note: Where - ‘n’ – dispute settlement procedure is partial and unfair; ‘m/n’ – dispute settlement rules are impartial and fair, but investigation is biased; ‘m/y’ - disputes are settled in collaboration with FD and CBOs/RMOs, but the process can be improved further; ‘y’ – dispute settlement procedure is impartial and fair.**

## **2. Composition and number of local partners in co-management.**

Local Partners are active in Co-management of PA.					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) Composition of local partners enhances active participation.	Provide group composition in terms of economic class or ethnicity.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Local participants are aware on key co-management issues.	

*(a) Composition of local partners enhances active participation.*

Successful social forestry program has one characteristic in common – the local people/groups involved in the program is similar either in terms of ethnicity, economic class, or people with common economic interests or from the same locality, or presence of female co-partners or involvement of illegal fellers. Heterogeneity in the group may lead to decrease in efficiency, creation of distrust and development activities may not reflect interest of poor people. Hence, may lead to decrease in the number of communities and resource management organizations and affect active participation.

**Note: – ‘n’ – Composition of CBO (s) is too heterogeneous to enhance active participation; ‘m/n’ – Composition is less heterogeneous and elite group leader influences decisions on his favor; ‘m/y’ – Group composition is homogenous but, takes time to reach a decision; ‘y’ – Group composition is homogenous, and decisions reflect interest of group members.**

*(b) Local participants are aware on key co-management issues.*

This indicator assumes that participating groups have clear prior knowledge (before signing the agreement) and thorough understanding about technical, financial and legal implication of their co-management agreements and activities. Key co-management issues are – objectives of Co-management through NSP, objectives of PA(s), the co-management agreement, benefit sharing mechanism, and conflict resolution mechanism.

**Note: – ‘n’ – are not aware on key co-management issues; ‘m/n’ – are aware on key co-management issues, but do not understand thoroughly; ‘m/y’ – are aware on key co-management issues and have more or less understanding; ‘y’ – are fully aware on key co-management issues.**

### 3. Local partners have increased institutional capacity

Local partners have increased institutional capacity.					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) CBOs/RMOs have legal recognition.	Total number of CBOs/RMOs – Number of CBOs/RMOs with legal recognition -
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Role of CBOs & RMOs are defined and recorded.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Number of decisions undertaken jointly by FD and CBOs/RMOs.	See below
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) CBOs/RMOs and FD jointly allocate funds.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e) Local partners received training.	Number of training received = Number of partners trained =

*(a) CBOs/RMOs have legal recognition.*

Formal recognition of the CBOs/RMOs by the government or FD is necessary for improving institutional capacity of the local people. Formal recognition (e.g. through Societies Registrations Act, 1960 or Cooperative Societies Act, 1940) of the CBOs/RMOs will give them legal footing to enforce the contracts made with the FD or held liable in case of breach of trust in the court of law or vice versa.

**Note:** – ‘n’ – CBOs/RMOs do not have any kind of recognition; ‘m/n’ – Forest Department recognized CBOs/RMOs under the co-management agreement, but have the power to dissolve the CBOs/RMOs any time they deem necessary; ‘m/y’ – some CBOs/RMOs have recognition under existing acts of the GOB; ‘y’ – all CBOs/RMOs have legal recognition under existing acts of the GOB.

*(b) Role of CBOs & RMOs are defined and recorded.*

This indicator assumes that after signing the co-management agreement, the CBOs/RMOs will define their role as an organization, and delegate duties to each members of the group. Duties may include, patrolling of the core area and other management activities, co-ordination between FD and CBOs/RMOs, bookkeeping etc.

**Note:** – ‘n’ – Roles of members under CBOs/RMOs are yet to define; ‘m/n’ – Process of defining roles of members under CBOs/RMOs are on going; ‘m/y’ – Roles of members under CBOs/RMOs have been defined, but activities are yet to be carried out; ‘y’ – Role of CBOs, RMOs are defined and activities are carried out regularly.

*(c) Number of decisions undertaken jointly by FD and CBOs/RMOs.*

Effective co-management will require involvement of participants at all stages. For example at the planning stage CBOs/RMOs should have a voice on selection of site,

nursery raising, tree species/agri-crop selection, module development, input delivery, marketing etc.

	Name of Activities / agenda	Raised by			Decision jointly taken by			
		CBOs/RMOs	Forest Dept.	CBOs & FD.	n	m/n	m/y	y
1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Total number of activities	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

**Note: Where - ‘n’ - Decisions taken by PA managers; ‘m/n’ – CBOs/RMOs are asked for their opinions & input, PA managers decide course of action; ‘m/y’ - local people work together with PA managers to determine priorities, PA managers direct the process; ‘y’ – local people work together with PA managers to determine priorities, and both direct the process.**

*(d) CBOs/RMOs and FD jointly allocate funds.*

This indicator assumes that FD and CBOs/RMOs jointly take the decision on funds allocation to various co-management activities identified previously. Such mechanism of funds allocation may result in active participation in decision-making and management of natural resources.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ - PA managers/FD allocate funds, and is not sufficient to carry out co-management activities; ‘m/n’ – CBOs/RMOs are asked for their opinions & input, PA managers decide on fund allocation; ‘m/y’ – CBOs/RMOs work together with PA managers to determine fund allocation, but fund is not sufficient; ‘y’ CBOs/RMOs work together with PA managers to determine fund allocation, which is sufficient.**

*(e) Local partners received training.*

This indicator assumes that the participants will receive training both in production and socio-economic activities. Training may include field level technical knowledge like nursery raising, plantation modules, silviculture, harvesting procedures, value addition techniques and alternative income generating activities (AIGs).

**Note: Where - ‘n’ – no training so far for partners; ‘m/n’ – training needs assessment has been done, training yet to start; ‘m/y’ – some CBOs/RMOs received training; ‘y’ – all CBOs/RMOs have received training.**

#### 4. AIG activities are improving socio-economic status of local partners

Local partners have increased institutional capacity.					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) AIGs having a positive impact on economic status of local people.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Pricing pattern of products is fair.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) AIG activities meet immediate requirements.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Credit facilities are sufficient.	

##### *(a) Income from AIGs.*

This indicator assumes that the number of AIGs introduced by the project and the number of households implementing those AIGs will have a positive impact on the economic life of the partners.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ – AIGs have not made any positive economic impact at all; ‘m/n’ – economic return from AIGs are too little to sustain immediate needs; ‘m/y’ – economic return from AIGs are meeting immediate needs; ‘y’ – economic return from AIGs are meeting all needs.**

##### *(b) Pricing Pattern of Products*

It has been seen that in general, the producers/farmers do not get fair price for their products. The middleman manipulators dictate the process. Pricing pattern will indicate whether the middlemen are depriving the local participants.

**Note: Where - ‘n’ – the price paid, do not even cover the cost of raw materials, and labor; ‘m/n’ – the price paid, do cover the cost of raw materials, but not labor; ‘m/y’ – the price paid, cover little profit; ‘y’ – the price paid covers a handsome benefit.**

##### *(c) AIG activities meet immediate requirements*

While the numbers of AIG activities and household implementing those can indicate success but do not depict whether these are meeting the needs of local poor. Immediate requirements of the participants are generally the subsistence requirements.

**Note, where: - ‘n’ – do not meet; m/n – not enough even for family needs; m/y – mostly meets the demand; ‘y’ – meets demands fully.**

#### **Typology of Non-timber Forest Product:**

**Subsistence:** Noncommercial harvesting for food, fruits, building materials and for other purposes from the PA to meet the needs of the family.

**Commercial:** Harvesting of forest products to exchange or trade for any form of payment, especially cash to meet the needs of the family. Some forest

products may be harvested to meet the subsistence purposes as well as to generate cash (e.g. fuel wood). In such cases, register AIGs that meet both these two purposes.

**Spiritual:** Harvesting as a spiritual practice and/or viewing plants and harvesting locations as sacred.

**Medicinal:** Harvesting for the purpose of curing illness and maintaining health.

*(d) Availability of Credit facilities*

The project realizes that local people would need additional credit facilities to nurse the planted tree or crops (e.g. for insecticide, fertilizers) and also for alternative income generating activities. If such financial support is not ensured through easily available and collateral free loans, then the poor local people would lose much of their strength to continue in development activities.

**Note, where:** - ‘n’ – did not receive any credit; m/n – credit are available but is not collateral free loans; m/y – received collateral free loans but at a higher rate of interest; ‘y’ - received collateral free loans at a lower rate of interest.

**5. AIG activities are reducing pressure in core zone of PA.**

<b>AIG activities are reducing pressure in core zone of PA</b>					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) Pressure for forest products is decreasing in the core zone.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Sustainable Harvesting Practices are being used.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Conservation Practices are being adopted.	

*(a) Pressure for forest products is decreasing in the core zone*

This indicator assumes that sustainable activities/practices in the buffer zone through AIGs like farming of vegetables or fruits, growing of fuelwood, timber or medicinal plants, will reduce the pressure on the core zone.

**Note, where:** - ‘n’ – we are still heavily dependent on core zone for forest resources; m/n – dependency is decreasing but not at a good rate; m/y – dependency on forest resources has decreased a lot, but there is still avenue for further improvement; ‘y’ – not dependent on forest resources from core zone now.

*(b) Sustainable Harvesting Practices are being used*

An important aspect of sustainable harvesting practices is the amount of NTFPs collected as well as methods and timing of extraction. Collection of NTFPs before its optimal

harvesting season may lead to resource depletion. An example of unsustainable methods may be – growing of betel leaf by lopping the branches of trees.

**Note, where: - ‘n’ – the amount, methods and timing of NTFPs extraction are causing negative impacts; m/n – either the amount, methods or the timing of NTFPs extraction is causing negative impacts; m/y – the amount is sustainable, but methods and timing of NTFPs extraction are causing negative impacts; ‘y’ – NTFPs extraction is not causing negative impacts.**

*(c) Conservation Practices are being adopted*

Adoption of conservation practices may be:

- Reduced pasture or burning in the major NTFP collection areas.
- Implementation of rotational harvesting
- Enforcement of group collection practices at the village level.
- Institutionalization of rules and regulations and effective policing by CBOs/RMOs.

**Note, where: - ‘n’ – conservation practices have not been identified; m/n – conservation practices are identified with the help of FD, but yet to apply; m/y – conservation practices are being applied, but results are yet to show positive signs; ‘y’ – conservation practices are showing positive results.**

## **Reference**

Ervin, J. 2003. **WWF: Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology**. WWF International, Gland, Switzerland. 52p.

The Nature Conservancy 1999. **Measuring Success: The Parks in Peril Consolidation Scorecard**. 13p.

USAID-IRG 2003. **Performance Monitoring Plan - Strategic Objective 6: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets**. USAID/Bangladesh. Proposed revisions from International Resource Group (IRG) - December 2003.



**NISHORGO SUPPORT PROJECT**

**COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE SCORECARD  
(Protected Area Community Monitoring Tool)**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Name of the protected area		
Group Number		
Type of agreement		
Number of members	Male	
	Female	
Date survey completed		

- 1. Co-management agreement ensures active participation**



Co-management agreement ensures active participation					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) The co-management agreement provides ample room for active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Tenure of agreement ensures long-term participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Local people actively participate in core zone management.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Benefit sharing mechanism assures active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e) Benefit inheritance procedure ensures active participation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	f) Conflict resolution mechanism(s) is fair.	

## 2. Composition and number of local partners in co-management.

Local Partners are active in Co-management of PA.					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) Composition of local partners enhances active participation.	Provide group composition in terms of economic class or ethnicity.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Local participants are aware on key co-management issues.	

## 3. Local partners have increased institutional capacity

Local partners have increased institutional capacity.					
y	m/y	m/n	n	Verifiers	Notes/comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) CBOs/RMOs have legal recognition.	Total number of CBOs/RMOs – Number of CBOs/RMOs with legal recognition -
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Role of CBOs & RMOs are defined and recorded.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Number of decisions undertaken jointly by FD and CBOs/RMOs.	See below
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) CBOs/RMOs and FD jointly allocate funds.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	e) Local partners received training.	Number of training received = Number of partners trained =

(c) Name of Activities / agenda	Raised by			Decision jointly taken by			
	CBOs/RMOs	Forest Dept.	CBOs & FD.	n	m/n	m/y	y
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Total number of activities	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

## 4. AIG activities are improving socio-economic status of local partners

<b>Local partners have increased institutional capacity.</b>					
y	m/y	m/n	n	<b>Verifiers</b>	<b>Notes/comments</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) AIGs having a positive impact on economic status of local people.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Pricing pattern of products is fair.	
				c) AIG activities meet immediate requirements.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	d) Credit facilities are sufficient.	

**5. AIG activities are reducing pressure in core zone of PA.**

<b>Local partners have increased institutional capacity.</b>					
y	m/y	m/n	n	<b>Verifiers</b>	<b>Notes/comments</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	a) Pressure for forest products is decreasing in the core zone.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	b) Sustainable Harvesting Practices are being used.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	c) Conservation Practices are being adopted.	