



## PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE SCORECARD: PURPOSE & PROTOCOL



**Task no.:**  
**USAID Contract no.: 388-C-00-03-00050-00**



## PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE SCORECARD: PART ONE - PURPOSE & PROTOCOL

Prepared By:

Nasim Aziz  
Ecological & Social Monitoring Specialist  
Nishorgo Support Project

© NACOM 2007



With Partners: CODEC, NACOM & RDRS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Forest cover in Bangladesh has reduced more than 50 percent since 1970 and is degrading day by day. Many of these degraded areas are part of the Protected Areas (PAs) under the jurisdiction of Forest Department (FD) which are representative samples of ecosystems, habitats of our wildlife resources and also provide subsistence to the rural livelihood.

Due to degradation process & limited focus with regard to development interventions even from the Forest Department, the PAs are failing to meet the objectives for which they are established i.e., conservation, protection and sustainable management of our tropical forest resources. Protected Areas in recent times have gained more attention, importance and are viewed as nexus for local or regional socio-economic development.

With a similar view, recently FD has initiated Nishorgo Support Project at five pilot PAs under Nishorgo Program, a long term protected area management program of the Department. While at five pilot sites, NSP has been trying for 4 years to improve management capability, time has come to see how much progress has been made and also where other PAs situate themselves within a similar assessment framework i.e. **“Protected Area Management Performance Scorecard”**.

The objective is - what we need to know and report regularly in order to properly assess the overall situation, to take judicious decision and to allocate resource properly to increase capacity of management. The concept of the proposed Scorecard is based on two methodologies (WWF and TNC), however differs in terms of scope & according to local situations.

The Scorecard is divided into three parts, i.e., 1) **Purpose & Protocol** which entails the concept, objective and methodology, 2) **Guidance Notes** to understand the questions to be filled up by the PA managers, and lastly 3) the **Questionnaires** set itself.

The Scorecard is developed for PA managers (ACFs, ROs, BO and others) of Forest Department. The method relies on the experience of PA managers 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 requested that Assistant Conservator of Forest in charge of a Protected Area should read the first two parts initially. Then bring his RO, BO and others on a separate day (to the extent possible) to mark the answers of the questionnaires set by taking collective decision. A copy of the answered questionnaires be kept with the ACF and the original copy be mailed to Project Director, Nishorgo Support Project, Bana-Bhaban, Agargoan. The collected data will be analyzed, reported and presented in front of all ACFs participated and others Officials concerned at Dhaka for assessing usefulness and subsequent revision of the Score card (if deemed necessary) and to take strategic decisions accordingly later on.

# Contents

## Page Number

**Executive Summary**

**Content**

**Objectives of Management Performance Scorecard** 1

**Background of Management Performance Scorecard** 1

**The Concept of Management Performance Scorecard** 1

**Framework and Methodology** 2

**Analyzing the Findings** 2

**Administering the Monitoring Questionnaire** 4

**Reference** 6

## **1. Background of Management Performance Scorecard**

Forest Department, under the Wildlife Act (Preservation) (Amendment) 1974 declares an areas as National Park, Wildlife Sanctuary or Game Reserve in order to protect, conserve and manage country's representative ecosystems, critical national or international habitats, or areas rich with diversity. These three categories are collectively known as Protected Areas (PAs).

Despite having specific Acts and rules to protect such areas and a apparatus to execute policies, the PAs are themselves threatened or in critically engendered state due to economic, social, institutional and political pressure. The legislation was created in 1973 and the power was vested with the Forest Department and new Wildlife Circle was created, which however, was abolished in 1983.

Thus the PAs remained in the paper, lost sight of management, in the dark, endured pressures and degraded to a state like other forested areas that some today do not qualify to be a PA. A critical reason in addition to mentioned above was major focus, attention and sustained support from the Department for forested areas set aside for production purposes. Protected Areas were only for protection purpose.

In the mean time, the pressures on PAs were mounting decade by decade for increased demand of fuelwood, timber and land. It is in this context the Department revamped its Wildlife Circle in 2001, developed a new vision for Protected Areas in 2003 (Called Nishorgo Vision 2010), and simultaneously launched the new Nishorgo Program.

The comprehensive program for improving the management of PAs across the country is called "Nishorgo". Under the Nishorgo Program, the Department has taken a series of initiative at five (5) PAs of the country as a test basis known as Nishorgo Support Project. The main assumption of the project is that a Protected Areas can only be protected and managed only when surrounding people sees sustained economic benefits by keeping its existence through a collaborative approach.

While at five pilot sites, NSP has been trying for 4 years to improve management capability, time has come to see how much progress has been made and also where other PAs situate themselves within a similar assessment framework i.e. "**Protected Area Management Performance Scorecard**".

Basically the scorecard allows management to know what is the current management status and from where the improvement should start.

## **2. Objectives of Management Performance Scorecard**

The Performance Management Scorecard has been developed basically to help track and monitor progress of the Nishorgo Support Project working in the five pilot protected areas (PAs). However, in a recent decision the Department wanted to apply the tool in all PAs of Bangladesh.

The Management Performance Scorecard system has the following objectives:

- To initiate (propose) 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 protected area managers;
- 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;

### **3. The Concept of Management Performance Scorecard**

Protected Areas in other developed countries of the world faced similar situation like Bangladesh. The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) in 1995 thus established a task force to explore issues related to effective PA management. Based on the Task force’s findings the WCPA has developed an overall assessment framework (Hockings et al 2000) in order to provide a consistent approach to assess management effectiveness. The framework was field tested and later version was developed in order to speed up assessment known as “Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management Methodology (Ervin 2003).

This report is based on the above methodology (Ervin 2003) and also Site Consolidation Scorecard developed by The Nature Conservancy (1999) where adjustment has been made to match local condition or reality to the extent possible.

The WWF’s assessment framework deals comprehensively with issues related to the overall situation analysis, to how far the entire management is effective for managing the entire systems of PAs, and also Policies, etc, at local, regional, and national level.

The Site Consolidation Scorecard measure progress (of a project or program) towards bringing basic resources that need to be strengthened to manage protected areas. These resources include financial resources, technical resources, human resources, adequate infrastructure, and a supportive local constituency, a strong capacity for strategic planning, political support, and ecological information.

### **4. Framework and Methodology**

The framework for assessment is divided into two parts (Table 1). The first one tries to capture information on ecological and socio-economic importance of PA, pressures and threats its facing, effectiveness of site design and legal context concerning the PA. The second part tries to capture improvements in physical infrastructure, personnel development, securing budget and development of management plan of PA.

The contextual analysis will help decision makers to understand how vulnerable a protected area (or a group of PAs) is (or are) and accordingly allocate resources (for physical, personal, management plan and budget development).

Accordingly, the protected areas will be considered to be “improved” or “functional” or “consolidated” when they have developed physical infrastructure, institutional capacity (personnel), management plans and have a secure budget (The Nature Conservancy 1999). 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 optimal management and protection conditions.

**Table 1: Framework of Assessment**

Priority	Context					Outputs	Management			
	Ecological	Socio-economic	Threats and pressure	PA site design	Legal		Physical	Personnel	Budget	Plan
Top						Adequate				
High						Progress made				
Medium						Work initiated				
Low						Not functional				
<b>WWF’s RAPPAM methodology</b>						<b>TNC’s SCS methodology</b>				

**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’ the score of which is 5, 3, 1, 0 respectively. Notes are provided for each question 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 judgement, and the lack of data should be noted in the comments section.

The higher the scores for a particular context (questions 1-5), the higher the priority it will get to trigger management actions. Again, the lower the scores under management issues (questions 6-9), the lower functional capacity of the PA to handle the context issues:

- ‘y’ - 5 = Adequate/excellent – protected area is functional
- ‘m/y’ - 3 = Progress made – PA is becoming functional, but not fully.
- ‘m/n’ - 1 = Work initiated – little or initial progress has been achieved
- ‘n’ - 0 = Not functional – protected area completely non-functional

Scoring method for pressures and threats (question 5) is as follows:

<b>Extent</b>	<b>Damage</b>	<b>Permanence</b>
Throughout = 4	Severe = 4	Permanent = 4
Widespread = 3	High = 3	Long term = 3
Scattered = 2	Moderate = 2	Medium term = 2
Localized = 1	Mild = 1	Short term = 1

The degree of each threat and pressure is the factor of all three elements. For example, a pressure that is throughout (4), severely destroyed the system (4), and is permanent in nature (4), would have a degree of 64 (4 x 4 x 4). So total value for pressure and threat range from 2-168.

### **Analyzing the Findings**

Adding the scores for question 1 - 4 and 6 - 9 gives values ranging from 0 – 239 (as there are 35 questions X 5, highest score = 175; again 35 X 0, lowest score = 0) & for question 5 values can range from 2-128. Thus each protected area receives a score from 2 – 303.

### **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 protected area managers and administrators.
- It depends on trust and transparency to obtain reliable information.
- It assumes that managers and administrators have adequate knowledge to provide sufficient and reliable data.
- 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**

- At each PA level, the ACF/Range Officer/Beat Officer will sit with other managers (RO, BO, AO & forest guards) and discuss the objective of this scoring method and discuss the questions and guidance note.
- As per their collaborative discussion and agreement – a score for each question will be given in the Part 3 provided along with Protocol and Guidance Note.
- After completion, a photo copy is requested to be kept at local office for future reference. Another copy be sent to Conservator of Forest, Wildlife Management and Nature Conservation Division, Bana Bhaban, Agargon Dhaka.
- The finding will be analyzed at Dhaka Office with the help from Nishorgo Support Project and a draft report will be produced.
- To achieve best results a participatory national workshop will be held involving protected area managers (ACFs) of all PAs of the Country (19 PAs) where findings (draft report) will be presented.
- At the workshop, more correction will be made as per discussion of the methods, the questionnaires, and the draft results when comparing all PAs. Such an approach is likely to generate more accurate, thorough and consistent data, and will be more widely accepted by protected area managers.
- The PA managers 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 output of the workshop is a nation wide protected area management-tracking tool.
- Once the questionnaire and interpretations are developed and standardized, the tool will be edited and distributed to managers of all PAs for regular reporting.

## **Frequency of Assessment**

- The findings of the first year will act as a baseline condition prevailing in the PAs.
- The assessment will be conducted as per the discussion of the national workshop.

## **Supporting Organization**

- Nishorgo Support Project with support from Wildlife & Nature Conservation Circle will provide all logistic support in this regard.

## **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.

Hockings, M, Stolton, S and Dudley, N. 2000. Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing Management of Protected Areas. IUCN Cardiff University Best Practice Series. IUCN, Cambridge, UK and Gland, Switzerland.