

**Tracking Tool for
GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
“Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas”**

Section One: Project General Information

1. Project name: *Effective Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangrove Ecosystems in Brazil*

2. Country: *Brazil*

National Project: X Regional Project: _____ Global Project: _____

3. Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ana Rose Araujo • Dana Frye • Helen Negret <p>Completed March 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Expert • Project Design Consultant • Regional Technical Adviser -Biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MMA/PDFB/ UNDP Consultant • MMA/PDFB/ UNDP Consultant • UNDP GEF LAC
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

4. Funding information¹

GEF support including PDF B: *US\$ 5,330,000*
Co-financing including PDF B: *US\$ 15,465,692*
Total Funding: *US\$ 20,795,692*

5. Project duration: **Planned:** *5 years* **Actual:** _____ years

6. a. GEF Agency: *UNDP*

6. b. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies): *Brazilian Ministry of the Environment (MMA)*

7. GEF Operational Program:

- drylands (OP 1)
X coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
 forests (OP 3)
 mountains (OP 4)
 agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
 integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
 sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above: _____

¹ Includes PDF B funding

8. Project Summary (one paragraph):

Mangrove ecosystems are among the most productive on earth, supporting globally significant biodiversity and providing resources and environmental services that underpin economic activities and ensure the environmental integrity of coastal areas. Moreover, their role in increasing the resilience of coastal ecosystems, communities and economic activities to climate change is increasingly recognized. While Brazil has put in place a comprehensive framework for ensuring that mangrove ecosystems are conserved, there are a number of weaknesses in the systems which undermine the delivery of effective protection. The result is the loss of mangrove habitats and the provision of resources on which many communities and sectors depend. This project will directly address this problem by tailoring existing protected area management tools in the National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) to address the specific characteristics of mangrove ecosystems and increase capacities for their implementation, thus establishing minimum standards and improved approaches to mangrove conservation and sustainable use across the country. In doing so it would provide the operational consolidation of a sub-set of mangroves PA based on field tested innovative management approaches in both sustainable use and strict conservation categories thus advancing the maturation of the SNUC. The result would be direct conservation benefits to 568,000 ha of globally significant mangroves, positive impacts on the livelihoods of some of the poorest segments of Brazilian society and a framework through which lessons learnt could be replicated to all of Brazil's mangrove ecosystems and others globally.

9. Project Development Objective:

To achieve the conservation and sustainable use of mangrove ecosystems in Brazil to conserve globally significant biodiversity and key environmental services and functions important for national development and the well-being of traditional and marginalized coastal communities.

10. Project Purpose/Immediate Objective:

A field tested protected area management approach is adopted for the effective conservation of a representative sample of mangrove ecosystems in Brazil.

11. Expected Outcomes (GEF-related):

Outcome 1: The enabling environment for a sub-system² of mangrove ecosystem protected areas is in place, including policy, regulatory, and financial mechanisms.

Outcome 2: Replicable models are in place for the management of mangrove resources in SNUC sustainable-use protected areas

Outcome 3: Conservation of mangroves is improved by piloting the alignment of UC management with sectoral and spatial planning

Outcome 4: Mangrove-related outreach, dissemination and adaptive management increased.

12. Types of Protected Area Activities Supported:

12. a. Please select all activities that are being supported through the project.

Enabling Environment (please check each activity below)

² This sub-system will be referred to as a "malha" or "rede" in Portuguese inline with Brazilian PA terminology,.

- Policy, legislation, regulation
- Capacity building

Capacity building budget: Total USD \$3,804,300 of which GEF contributes \$921,000 and co-funding \$2,883,300. A further \$1,146,500 will be channeled to dissemination and outreach components of which GEF contributes \$357,500 and co-funding \$789,000

Comments on Capacity Building: The Project strategy includes several components as follows:

- 1) Capacity components for the enabling environment targeting (i) State and municipal environmental agencies, (ii) managers of federal, state and municipal PA and (iii) sectoral agencies on updated regulatory and institutional procedures for mangrove management including PA management tools and environmental licensing tailored to mangrove characteristics.
- 2) Capacity building for local communities in mangrove PA for improving the skills and knowledge of sustainable use approaches to mangrove resources. Communities in many mangrove areas include some of the poorest segments of Brazilian society from agricultural communities, fishing communities, traditional communities including agro-extractive populations, Afro-descendants (*quilombolas*) and indigenous groups, among others. Elements for capacity building at this level include training in small business management, sustainable methods of capture of fisheries resources, tourism management, access to and management of funding, etc. Special attention will be given to incorporating women and youth to ensure economic benefits are fairly distributed since they form the majority of underemployed or unemployed and as fishing activities often involve the entire family.
- 3) Capacity building at the PA cluster and PA level for community, government and sectoral stakeholders and UC authorities for effective participation in PA management councils including legal political and institutional aspects of respective UC category, training in conflict resolution, participation of municipalities in UC management; liaison with other institutions, including those outside UC boundaries; socio-economic and environmental importance of mangroves, the role of traditional activities and sustainable alternatives in the conservation and use of mangrove areas.
- 4) Also at the PA cluster level in specific interventions sites another capacity building component will focus on the landscape level planning authorities, including large scale PA, water resource and municipal authorities, linking their management tool to conservation and management of mangroves.
- 5) To mainstream an awareness of the ecological and economic values and functions of mangroves throughout relevant sectors and to the broad public, the Project will implement dissemination and outreach programmes including a) mangrove awareness campaigns, b) outreach activities to key sectors that impact mangroves, including especially fisheries, aquaculture and tourism.

- Education and awareness raising
- Institutional arrangements
- Finance and incentives
- Replication and scaling up
- Management practices related to status of biodiversity

12. b. Is carbon sequestration an objective of the project (This question is included for purposes related to the GEF-3 targets for the Climate Change focal area)

Yes No

The estimated amount of carbon sequestered is: _____

13. Project Replication Strategy

13. a. Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes

X No ___

Replication is addressed as a cross cutting issue and is built around three primary elements to ensure replication at local, state, national and international levels. These are summarized below, more detailed information on Replication per Outcome and Output is provided in Prodoc Section IVe Annex 4.

(i) targeted capacity building to relevant institutions, authorities, sectors and resource users *to enable the replication of the Project strategy, and its sustainable use and management approaches, to other mangrove PAs, Brazil's wider PA system and to other countries with similar resources and barriers. Many of the Project's capacity building modules will be built into existing capacity building programs to ensure this knowledge is transferred to the next generation of PA and environmental authorities.*

(ii) an improved regulatory framework and implementation environment. *Pilots in Outcomes 2 and 3 are designed as replicable demonstrations which will test and validate guidelines and management and sustainable use practices which will feed into the Outcome 1 regulatory frameworks and mangrove network and strategy. This includes a National Plan for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Mangroves which will include a range of specific policies, regulatory mechanisms, management approaches, tools and guidelines to orient the planning and implementation of mangrove conservation and sustainable use and to ensure replication of lessons learned and best practices for mangrove PAs as well as PAs with other coastal ecosystems.*

(iii) a National Coordination Center for Mangrove Ecosystems *to be established in exiting IBAMA structure and supported in the long term through co-funding will facilitate scaling-up and replication of the Project strategy acting as a national forum for the coordination of mangrove-related conservation activities and the base for mangrove awareness campaign and for dissemination of both the Project approach and lessons learned.*

13. b. For all projects, please complete box below. An example is provided.

Replication Quantification Measure	Replication Target Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Replication of Project pilot demonstrations to other PA either in same cluster of other clusters	2 PA per pilot demonstration		
Scaled-up capacity building in Output 1.2 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # Project states ▪ # UC managers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8 states ▪ 132 		
PA replicating financing strategies those developed in the Project	>3		

14. Scope and Scale of Project:

Please complete the following statements.

14.a. The project is working in:

___ a single protected area

- multiple protected areas
- national protected area system – mangrove PA within National System of Conservation Units SNUC

14.b. The level of the intervention is:

- global
- regional
- national
- subnational

14. c. Please complete the table below.

Targets and Timeframe	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Project Coverage			
Extent in hectares of protected areas in SNUC targeted <u>directly</u> and in <u>short term</u> by the project	568,000ha in 35 PA		
Extent in hectares of PA targeted <u>indirectly</u> and in the <u>short- medium</u> term in SNUC by the project – ie those PA within clusters	Approx 746,300 ha in 132 PA		
Extent in hectares of PA targeted in the <u>long term and indirectly</u> (this includes all mangroves in Brazil as they are afforded protected area status as Areas of Permanent Preservation although they are not all in PAs in the SNUC)	Approx 1,340,000		

Name of Protected Area And Administrative Level (Federal or State)	Is this a new protected area?	Area in Hectares	Global designation or priority lists (E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 200,)	Local Designation of Protected Area (E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)	IUCN Category for each Protected Area ³					
					I	II	III	IV	V	VI
PARÁ CLUSTER										
RESEX Arai- Peroba (F)	No	7,850	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 * Probio** Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Caeté-Taperaçu (Bragança)(F)	No	27,859	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Chocoaré-Mato Grosso (F)	No	2,797	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Gurupi-Piriá (F)	No	40,365	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Mãe Grande do Curuçá (F)	No	24,194	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Maracanã (F)	No	19,353	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX São João da Ponta (F)	No	3,210	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Soure (F)	No	13,660	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
RESEX Tracuateua (F)	No	18,992	Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
MARANHÃO CLUSTER										
APA Reentrancia Maranhense (S)	No	1,755,036	Ramsar site Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network Probio Extremely High Priority	State Environmental Protection Area					X	
RESEX de Cururupu (F)	No	185,047	Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve						X
MARANHÃO/CEARÁ/PIAUI CLUSTER										
APA Delta do Parnaíba (F)	No	188,356	Probio Extremely High Priority Global 200 Ecoregion 176	Federal Environmental Protection Area					X	

³ I. Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection, II; National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation; III. Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features; IV. Habitat/Species Management Area: managed mainly for conservation through management intervention; V. Protected Landscape/Seascape: managed mainly for landscape/seascape protection and recreation VI. Managed Resource Protected Area: managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems

Name of Protected Area And Administrative Level (Federal or State)	Is this a new protected area?	Area in Hectares	Global designation or priority lists (E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 200,)	Local Designation of Protected Area (E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)	IUCN Category for each Protected Area ³						
					I	II	III	IV	V	VI	
RESEX do Delta do Paranaíba (F)	No	26,771	Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine reserve							X
PARAÍBA CLUSTER											
APA Barra do Rio Mamanguape (F)	No	5,619	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Environmental Protection Area						X	
ARIE FOZ do Rio Mamanguape (F)	No	5,772	Probio Extremely High Priority	Area of ecological relevance and interest				X			
SÃO PAULO/PARANÁ CLUSTER											
EE de Juréia-Itatins (S) (SP)	No	79,820	Probio Extremely High Priority	Ecological Station				X			
APA Cananéia-Iguape e Peruíbe (F) (SP)	No	196,460	Probio Extremely High Priority	Federal Environmental Protection Area						X	
APAE de Guaraqueçaba (S) (PR)	No	191,596	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Environmental Protection Area						X	
APA de Guaraqueçaba (F) (PR)	No	242,068	Probio Extremely High Priority	Federal Environmental Protection Area						X	
EE de Guaraqueçaba (F) (PR)	No	4,831	Probio Extremely High Priority	Ecological Station				X			
PARNA do Superagüi (F) (PR)	No	33,988	Probio Extremely High Priority	National Park	X	X					
PARES da Ilha do Cardoso (S) (PR)	No	22,500	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Environmental Protection Area	X	X					
APAE de Guaratuba (S) (PR)	No	199,596	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Environmental Protection Area						X	
FLOES do Palmito (S) (PR)	No	530	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Forest							X
EE de Guaraguaçu (S) (PR)	No	1,150	Probio Extremely High Priority	Ecological Station				X			
PARES do Boguaçu (S) (PR)	No	6,052	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Park							X
Resex de Mandira – (F) SP	No	1,176	Probio Extremely High Priority	State Park							X
ARIE Ilha do Ameixal - (S) SP	No	400	Probio Extremely High Priority	Area of ecological relevance and interest				X			
APAE Ilha Comprida – (S) SP	No	19,375	Probio Extremely High Priority	Marine Reserve						X	

*WWF Global 200 Ecoregion 176 Orinoco Amazon Mangrove and Coastal Swamps

Probio – National Biodiversity programme that defined areas for biodiversity conservation priorities in the following ranking. Extremely high importance; very high; high and not enough information.

METT scores per Category per PA:

12 complete METTs are provided in the following pages, while the remaining 14 are available in a separate file

UCs by Cluster	Context	Planning	METT Category ⁴ Inputs	Processes	Outputs	Outcomes	• METT ⁵ Total
PARÁ CLUSTER							
RESEX Arai- Peroba (F)	67	60	27	53	0	56	49
RESEX Caeté-Taperaçu (Bragança)(F)	60	33	33	40	0	56	40
RESEX Chocoaré-Mato Grosso (F)	73	60	40	53	0	67	53
RESEX Gurupi-Piriá (F)	60	60	27	33	0	22	38
RESEX Mãe Grande do Curuçá (F)	47	47	33	43	0	67	42
RESEX Maracanã (F)	67	53	80	47	0	56	54
RESEX São João da Ponta (F)	67	53	27	30	0	44	39
RESEX Soure (F)	60	53	20	43	17	22	40
RESEX Tracuateua (F)	73	47	27	20	0	56	37
Average Sub-total Pará	64	52	35	40	2	49	44
MARANHÃO CLUSTER							
APA Reentrancia Maranhense (S)	40	33	40	20	0	56	31
RESEX de Cururupu (F)	60	47	33	17	0	56	34
Average Sub-total Maranhão	50	40	37	18	0	56	33
MARANHÃO/CEARÁ/PIAUI CLUSTER⁶							
APA Delta do Parnaíba (F)	47	47	53	23	0	33	36
RESEX do Delta do Paranaíba (F)	67	33	27	40	33	44	41
Average Sub-total Maranhão/Ceará/Piauí	57	40	40	32	17	39	38
PARAÍBA CLUSTER							

⁴ These categories are aggregates of the following METT questions: **Context:** 1) Legal status; 2) Protected area regulations; 3) Law enforcement; 6) Protected area boundary demarcation; 9) Resource inventory; **Planning:** 4) Protected area objectives; 5) Protected area design; 7) Management plan; 8) Regular work plan; 30) Monitoring and evaluation; **Inputs:** 10) Research; 12) Staff numbers; 14) Staff training; 15) Current budget; 16) Security of budget; **Processes:** 11) Resource management; 13) Personnel management; 17) Management of budget; 18) Equipment; 19) Maintenance of equipment; 20) Education and awareness programme; 21) State and commercial neighbours; 22) Indigenous people; 23) Local communities; 25) Commercial tourism; **Outputs:** 24) Visitor facilities; 26) Fees; and **Outcomes:** 27) Condition assessment; 28) Access assessment; 29) Economic benefit assessment

⁵ Shown as a % of the maximum possible score for each management effectiveness category (100% = 90 pts.), with corresponding ranges: Poor: < 25% (0 – 22.5 points); Fair: 25–50% (23 - 45 pts.); Good: 51–75% (46-67.5 pts.); Excellent: 76–100% (68-90 pts.).

⁶ In this cluster, the APA falls in all three states. The RESEX, which falls within the APA, falls only within the state of Maranhão.

APA Barra do Rio Mamanguape (F)	87	67	60	83	17	67	71
ARIE FOZ do Rio Mamanguape (F)	80	73	47	53	0	67	58
Average Sub-total Paraíba	83	70	53	68	8	67	64
SÃO PAULO/PARANÁ CLUSTER							
EE de Juréia-Itatins (S)	80	67	67	50	17	33	57
APA Cananéia-Iguape e Peruíbe (F)	60	40	47	70	33	22	52
Sub-total State of São Paulo	70	53	57	60	25	28	54
APAE de Guaraqueçaba (S)	60	33	13	10	0	33	24
APA de Guaraqueçaba (F)	53	40	47	27	33	44	39
EE de Guaraqueçaba (F)	40	33	27	13	0	33	24
PARNA do Superagüi (F)	67	47	67	43	0	56	50
PARES da Ilha do Cardoso (S)	93	93	60	67	67	78	76
APAE de Guaratuba (S)	73	47	47	30	0	67	44
FLOES do Palmito (S)	60	33	53	33	33	44	42
Estação Ecológica de Guaraguaçu (S)	67	53	53	30	0	44	43
PARES do Boguaçu (S)	40	20	13	7	0	22	17
Sub-total State of Paraná	61	44	42	29	15	47	40
Sub-total São Paulo/Paraná	63	46	45	35	17	43	43
Average per category by cluster	63	50	42	39	9	51	44

Individual METTS

APA Cananéia-CIP	11
APA de Guaraqueçaba	20
APAE de Guaraqueçaba.....	28
APAE de Guaratuba.....	36
ESEC Guaraquecaba.....	47
ESEC Juréia-Itatins.....	56
PARNA Superagui	64
PE do Boguaçu	73
PE Ilha do Cardoso	82
FE Palmito.....	91
ESEC Guaraguaçu.....	103
APA Da Barra Do Rio Mamanguape	114

Separate File:

APA Cananéia-CIP	11
APA de Guaraqueçaba	20
APAE de Guaraqueçaba	28
APAE de Guaratuba	36
ESEC Guaraquecaba	47
ESEC Juréia-Itatins	56
PARNA Superagui.....	64
PE do Boguaçu.....	73
PE Ilha do Cardoso	82
FE Palmito.....	91
ESEC Guaraguaçu	103
APA DA BARRA DO RIO MAMANGUAPE.....	114

APA Cananéia-CIP

Name of protected area	Cananéia Iguape Peruíbe EPA	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	South Coast of São Paulo State, Southeast region, equidistant from metropolitan regions of São Paulo and Curitiba. See attached regional map. Boundaries:	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed OCTOBER 23, 1984 and NOVEMBER 06, 1985.	Gazetted DECREE N° 90.347, OF OCTOBER 23, 1984, complemented by DECREE N° 91.892, OF NOVEMBER 06, 1985
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	A site is inserted in a region of the state of São Paulo with serious land issues. Private ownership. Private ownership admitted.	
Management Authority	IBAMA – Brazilian Environment and renewable natural resources Institute.	
Size of protected area (ha)	234.500 Ha	
Number of staff: 16	Permanent: 06	Temporary: 10
Budget	(2006) Approximately R\$ 40.000,00 Available by June/2006: R\$ 23.500,00	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Integrates Atlantic Forest Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO) World Heritage Site	
Reasons for designation	High value of environmental and cultural protection.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Participatory management of use of fishing resources of estuary-lagoon complex of Iguape-Cananéia-Ilha Comprida and adjacent coastal area. National Environment Fund (FNMA).	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	(see decree) Protect and preserve a) The ecosystems, from mangroves of coastal lines to countryside regions, in higher altitude areas; b) – species threatened of extinction; c) – nesting areas of sea and land birds; d) – archaeological sites; e) – remainders of Atlantic forest; f) – quality of water resources.	
Objective 2		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Lack of soil use regulation. Without defined demarcation, it is very difficult to enforce limits and conditions for state's licensing of potentially degrading and polluting activities.	
Threat 2	The deviation of the Ribeira de Iguape river's course, carried out in the 19th Century, with the construction of the "Valo Grande," has accumulated impacts that have contributed to changing the characteristics of the estuary environment of the north region of the estuary-lagoon complex of Cananéia Iguape Peruíbe.	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Monitoring both key anthropic activities and the quality of protection of natural resources and environmental services delivered by the area.	
Activity 2	Inspection of use of natural resources by more relevant economic activities of the region: fishing, agriculture, tourism.	

Date assessment carried out: June 2006 _____

Name/s of assessor: Eliel Pereira Sousa _____

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves DECREE 90.347, OF OCTOBER 23 1984, complemented by DECREE 91.892, OF NOVEMBER 06 1985	
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	Atlantic Forest Decree Establishment Decree	Both insufficient, PA management plan necessary.
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested? Human resources require training.	Restructure the team through engagement of new analysts; training of existing members.
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The focus on objectives was lost when the unit took on duties of the Regional office (Esreg) extinct in 2001.	To create Regional office for the region of Vale do Ribeira, so the PA team can focus on the PA management.
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different	Signal the boundary of the area in main land roads.

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	management zones and are these well maintained?	
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	The area ensures protection for the entire São Paulo region of the estuary-lagoon complex of Iguape-Paranaguá	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? There are several rural and caiçara communities in the area and many had no access to this information.	Contact between team and these communities and signaling in the communities.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The area has a great amount of secondary information and an established network of some 120 researchers of different areas of knowledge through the technical research board of the PA Consultative Council. PA environmental analyst trained by Direc.	Availability of resources to design the PA management plan.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	Other demands for the extinct Regional office's activities (Fauna, Authorization for Transportation of Forest Products (ATPF), Passeriformes, Licensing, inspection outside EPA) overburden the team.	Separate the area's targets and distribute Office demands among other PA in the region headquartered in Iguape (5 in total: Esec Tupiniquins, Aries da Ilha do ameixel and queimada Grande and Resex Mandira)
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The diversity of approaches in the different areas of knowledge has been maintained and is the strong point in decision-making.	Systematize the information produced.
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Although not directly related, the PA has held 2 research seminars and has formed the network of researchers of Vale do Ribeira and the network of researchers of the CIP EPA.	Greater time availability for dialogue with researchers.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	Inspections account for part of reduction of impacts on the area.	Monitoring of critical environments should be better structured.
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	Of the 06 permanent staff, only 02 higher-level analysts in activity.	Increase the staff number to service the main management areas.
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Lack of motivation and difficulty in communication and information flow hinders output.	Training of human resources and severe "motivation" measures.
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	Well-trained, high-level analysts.	Establishment of agreements with other institutions to supply skilled human resources.
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	Most of the budget available and used to cover demand of "extinct Regional office," compromising PA needs.	Direc management with Supes/SP to separate cost of PA and meet Regional office's demands with resources from DIFAP, DICO, etc.
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	External resources come basically from some projects coordinated with NGOs in the region.	The region has already received a large volume of resources and the main problems have not been solved. Now we have the problems, but the resources were used inefficiently.
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The problem lies in the amount of resources, which are used by the area but do not satisfy the demands of the area and rather those of the "extinct Regional office".	Training of employees in technical areas to work with administrative affairs.
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	Mainly vessels, adequate vehicles, and information technology equipment.	To improve both equipment and training on their correct use and conservation.
Is equipment adequately maintained?	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
<i>Process</i>	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Mainly in the area of geographic	Purchase of GPS and

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1	information and information technology.	software for use in geoprocessing; acquisition of vessels and adequate vehicles.
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	The PA's planned volunteers programme in execution includes local sustainability agents working with environmental information and coordination of actors involved in main PA conflicts.	Availability of specific resources to fund activities of volunteers.
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	The PA's consultative council is in its 39 th meeting, consolidating a participatory process that is already the main decision-making forum of the estuary-lagoon complex of this region. This is recognized region-wide, also by councils of other surrounding PAs.	Creating new thematic boards within the consultative council, such as on the use of soil and environmental education would foster the discussion and decision-making in yet unexplored areas of management, but this requires resources.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	They are the main partners in management and are organized in all municipalities included in the PA.	Strengthening information and cooperation networks among these actors would be a very important step.
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The council ensures the participation of all sectors.	Specific resources for mobilization of actors for renewal of council composition are extremely necessary.
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	There are actions planned for implementation of local sustainability agendas for some communities of Environmental Protection Area, but without specific resources for execution. There is a good information campaign on the sustainable use of fishing resources.	PA must be able to voice its opinion about unrecoverable subsidies given by the state to some NGOs to try to link actions in a more coordinated and integration context.
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> Do visitors damage the protected area?	Electric and hydraulic fittings and beds and bunds need remodeling.
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2	They have never been remodeled after construction.	
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> examples of contributions	To increase cooperation through work of thematic tourism board at PA Council.
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2	The region has a very small number of operators. The potential is very poorly explored.	
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	They are partly not collected because PA does not share gains, everything goes to central administration.	If PA gained with fees, it would be encouraged to collect it, because it requires work.
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcome</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	The PA has little possibility to change this reality. Strengthening the team and investing in equipments would be an expected decision.
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	Banana monoculture in the region is currently the main activity that impacts the integrity of forest areas. In the mangrove, the impact of <i>valo grande</i> and predatory fishing are also concerning.	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? The main economic activity when the area was created was predatory wood logging (mainly <i>Tabebuia cassinoides</i>), palm heart, and predatory fishing.	To increase fostering of sustainable activities such as agroecology, sustainable aquiculture, ecological tourism, and management of forest essences.
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	The creation of a unit management monitoring and assessment system is under discussion.	Training of councilors and team to establish a system.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE			23	

Name of Protected Area: APA Cananéia Iguape Peruíbe
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: Participative management of use of fishing resources of estuary lagoon complex of Iguape Cananéia and Ilha Comprida Funded by FNMA, this is currently the only project executed in partnership with other institutions. It aims at organizing fishing activities in the region by training actors and implementing demonstration units of aquaculture. It has already held a regional seminar and produced within the unit council the review and creation of some normative institutions in the fishing sector. A series of other projects in which the unit actively participated in the design are submitted to various financiers awaiting decisions.
SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 5 municipalities with an average 20,000 inhabitants each.
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Agriculture, mainly bananas and vegetables. Artisanal fishing. Services as the main source of income of urban residents. Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Region with lowest HDI of the state of São Paulo, third worst in assessments of middle-school indexes in the state of São Paulo; very low industrialization.
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Economic situation “pushes” army reserve to predatory use of natural resources, particularly fishing.
Main problems related to local productive chains High dependence on input and investments in infrastructure, mainly in rural areas. Lack of integration and planning of municipal public policies for productive areas, which burdens state with repair measures. Lack of cooperation and understanding among local producers and consumers hinders the formation of a local distribution system of products. Lack of experts to design business and marketing plans for main products, particularly in the sectors of tourism and extractive activities.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Investment in infrastructure and equipments in areas of agroecology, tourism, aquiculture. Economic players have not accumulated the capital necessary to development activities in these areas and the resources used by NGOs were used chiefly for training.
Agrarian and land tenure situation Complex agrarian situation which many times hinders the sustainable use of resources. Managers have no way of proving the land tenure to license their activities.
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation The state government held back the coastal demarcation. There is suspicion that the lobby for the construction of a port somewhere in the region was responsible for the halt. In addition, demarcation carried out has not considered physical features and possible risks – it was designed basically considering the boundaries already established by different norms of use, particularly those related to fishing activities.
Main active/potential actors for PA management State institutions and local productive sector associations, universities.
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) Very high level of organization and extremely active.
Other relevant information: The region is near the area of natural gas exploration in the Santos basin, but compensation resources have been directed to Esec Tupiniquins which socially has a very small scope. If the unit could use part of these resources, they could be invested in the development of crucial programmes to achieve quality in service delivery.

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor: Eliel Pereira Sousa

APA de Guaraqueçaba

Name of protected area	APA FEDERAL DE GUARAQUEÇABA	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	North coast of Paraná, Municipalities of Guaraqueçaba, Antonina, Paranaguá and Campina Grande do Sul Boundaries:	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted 31.01.1985
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Ownership: private	
Management Authority	IBAMA - Brazilian Environment and renewable natural resources Institute.	
Size of protected area (ha)	242.068 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent 4 employees (1 university level)	Temporary
Budget	R\$ 20000,00	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Category III IUCN, Biosphere Reserve	
Reasons for designation	Largest remaining continuous part of Atlantic Forest	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA		
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	To protect areas that represent the Atlantic Forest, the estuary complex, and archeological sites and caíças communities.	
Objective 2		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Inadequate extractive activities	
Threat 2	Predatory fishing and animal traffic	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Monitoring	
Activity 2	Inspection	

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name/s of assessor: Elisa Vieira

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves Decree: 90883 Date 31.01.85	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
<i>Context</i>				
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	There is non-regulated control	Design and formalization of Management Plan
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
<i>Context</i>				
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested? Enforcement of legislation is done as best possible, but is limited by structural issues and availability of human resources	Inter-institutional integration
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
<i>Context</i>				
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Have been strengthened with EPA Council	Maintain council's operations, expand scope of social participation, and spread information and decisions
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
<i>Planning</i>				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	Enhance actions in area less addressed and strengthen integration in region
Does the protected	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	Includes areas not integrated to processes of the region (part of the plateau)	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	Demarcation of area, spreading information on protection area
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2	There is significant knowledge – most of the population, but there is no demarcation	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is demarcation of the Environmental Protection Area of 1997, which was not regulated and is no longer applicable to the area's reality	Design of management plan
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	Annual work plan exists but is not regularly monitored	
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	Knowledge gaps. Need to systematize large existing database.	Systematize information and appraise knowledge gaps
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Lack of Management Plan makes it difficult to prioritize research. There is no mechanism to link survey to IBAMA in EPAs	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		Design of management plan
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	1 university-level expert, 3 administrative assistants	
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	There is no personnel management or institutional programme	
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	There is no regular training process.	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0	Budget is inadequate and often only available at mid-year	
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	The vessels (which are currently in disuse) are inadequate for location	
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	In view of administrative difficulties, there is inadequate control/maintenance of facilities and equipment	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	PA activities are developed by short-term and limited scope projects, enabled by outside funding	
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Cooperation has been enhanced within council	
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Incipient contribution through protection area council	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Same as above	
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors damage the protected area?</i>	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions</i>	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural</i>	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	values being affected	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	Private programmes for restoration of areas	
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	There is no access control and use is partially controlled by environmental inspection bodies.	
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? Improvement with Ecological Goods and Services Movement Tax (ICMS)	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Isolated, non-directed surveys	Management plan
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		23		

APAE de Guaraqueçaba

Name of protected area	State Environmental Protection Area of Guaraqueçaba	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	North Coast of Paraná – Brazil (entire municipality of Guaraqueçaba) Boundaries: (no information given)	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted Decree 1228 03/27/1992
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Private ownership	
Management Authority	IAP	
Size of protected area (ha)	191.595.50 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent: 01	Temporary: 05 - depending on demand
Budget	R\$ 0,00 + personnel costs	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Same as in Federal	
Reasons for designation	See objectives of creation	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA		
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Ensures protection (see decree)	
Objective 2		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Lack of priority in PA management	
Threat 2	Lack of public policies addressing issue	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Inspection, licensing	
Activity 2	Joint management	

Date assessment carried out: June 2006 _____

Name/s of assessor: Ozeas Goncalves _____

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1	Decree 1228 Date 03/27/1992	
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	There are legal mechanisms (Forest code, decree 750, dec. Atlantic Forest) Obs.: there is no intention of designing a management plan due to overlay with Federal EPA. Joint work with IBAMA is intended.	Promoting implementation of Agenda 21 by municipality and master plan.
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested? Although great efforts are made by institutions (Ibama, IAP, BPFlo), it is still insufficient for context of region.	Optimization of resources; change in procedures established; integration of agencies; coordination of work.
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Agency responsible is not effective area manager	Integration of IAP, Ibama, and BPFLo will help to meet area objectives
Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different	Integrated management

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	management zones and are these well maintained?	
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	State EPA overlays with federal PA, and complements it.	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	Promote awareness and demarcation of area jointly with federal EPA
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2	Existence of EPA is often not known by residents	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is no intention of designing isolated management plan	Propose joint design of management plan between IAP and Ibama
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	_____	_____
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	There are sporadic joint operations among agencies	Integrated work plan among institutions operating in region
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	Lack of control and systematization of research by management agency	Develop an integrated system of social-economic and environmental data
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Lack of identification and systematization of research	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	Lack of clear procedures; lack of norms	Participatory design of norms management plan
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	No perspective of hiring	_____
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Missing	
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	There are no staff to train.	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	General budget for all state PAs; insufficient even to increase staff.	Manage the budget.
Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	There are no facilities	
Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	There are no equipment	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	State and commercial neighbours!	
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors damage the protected area?</i>	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions</i>	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural</i>	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	values being affected	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE			23	

APAE de Guaratuba

Name of protected area	Environmental Protection Area of Guaratuba (EPA of Guaratuba).	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference):	Boundaries: the boundaries of the EPA of Guaratuba are the surrounding areas interfacing with the urban perimeter of Guaratuba and Matinhos; and with the rural areas of greater and smaller demographic density of the municipalities of Morretes and the Paranaguá, still in the coast of Paraná; Tijucas do Sul and São José dos Pinhais, the latter two are part of the Metropolitan Region of Curitiba.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed Created by State Decree 1.234, of March 27, 1992	Gazetted Management Plan, which has already been designed and is undergoing last adjustments to be approved yet this year.
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	According to Law 9.985 of July 18, 2000, Art. 15, section I, the EPA of Guaratuba is made up of public and private lands. The ownership of part of the public lands belongs to the State Government of Paraná – Environmental Institute of Paraná (IAP).	
Management Authority	Environmental Institute of Paraná (IAP)	
Size of protected area (ha)	199,569ha (One hundred and ninety nine thousand five hundred and sixty nine hectares)	
Number of staff	Permanent: 03 (IAP)	Temporary: 04 (Environmental Police Officers)
Budget		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Atlantic Forest Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO) through the Man and the Biosphere Programme – Decree 74.685 of 10/14/1974	
Reasons for designation	The Mata Atlântica (Atlantic Forest) Biosphere Reserve comprehends the Environmental Protection Area of Guaratuba and considers its protection important as an Atlantic Forest ecosystem.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	Paraná 12 meses: (Paraná 12 months) state government project for the agricultural sector, linked to SEAG, financed by the World Bank (BIRD) involving fishermen, rural producers, and those who live in the EPA of Guaratuba. Its overall objective is to relieve rural poverty through training of small-scale producers, supporting modernization aiming at environmental protection, improving housing and sanitation conditions, soil Conservation, promoting agroecology, and implementing Community Kitchens and the Farmer's Factory.	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Not given	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1996, the EPA of Guaratuba started receiving the public administration's attention through the Atlantic Forest Protection Programme (Pró-Atlântica) which is fruit of the financial cooperation signed between the German Federal Government through the Kreditanstalt Wiederaufbau Bank (KfW) and the State Government of Paraná, through its State Secretariat of Environment and Water Resources (SEMA). With the funds available from the partnership signed between the governments, several studies involving different themes were developed regarding the protected area, which led to the design of a Management Plan. • Baía Limpa: (Clean Bay) a project funded by the SEMA, and initially created for the economic and social development and environmental protection of the Guaratuba Bay, and over time extended its scope to include the estuary regions of the entire coast of Paraná. The project was in effect until February 2003, with the activities of cleaning bays, mangroves, which were done by fishermen who earned a monthly basic basket. In effect until 2002. • Projeto Plantando Palmito (Growing Palm Hearts Project) was in effect until 2002 with the objective of disseminating the production of palm heart according to the concept of Forest Plantations (Silviculture) among coastal communities that live off the extraction of native palm heart to allow palm heart harvesters (<i>palmiteiros</i>) to work legally. The funds came from the State Secretariat of Environment (SEMA). • Projeto Florestas Municipais (Municipal Forests Project) was developed within the scope of the State Secretariat of Environment and had the objective of forest restoration in the State of Paraná in its multiple aspects through three basic components: conservationist reforestation, productive 	

	<p>reforestation, and environmental education. This project was in effect until 2002.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programa ICMS Ecológico: (Ecological ICMS Program) one of the most important programs of the State of Paraná for municipalities with plots of land inside protection areas or in surrounding areas. The Program was implemented in 1991, through Complementary Law 59/91. The Law establishes the payment of an ecological ICMS (Goods and Services Movement Tax) (5% of the total ICMS) to municipalities that include protection areas or water springs for public supply in their territories. The municipalities that fill the legal specifications receive funds from the ICMS collected and to ensure the continuity of the benefit must guarantee the protection of those areas.
List the two primary protected area objectives	
Objective 1	To combine the rational use of environmental resources of the region and the orderly land occupation, to protect the water network, remnants of the Atlantic Forest and mangroves, archeological sites and biological diversity, as well as to discipline tourist use and ensure the quality of life of caíçaras communities and local population.
Objective 2	To protect sample of Remnants of the Atlantic Forest Biome, as specimens of the Mixed Ombrophilous Forest (Alluvial and Montane); of Dense Ombrophilous Forest (Alluvial, Lowlands, Sub-Montane, Montane, and High-Montane); Pioneer Formations (Vegetation with Fluvial Influence, Vegetation with Fluvial-Marine Influence and Vegetation with Marine Influence); Montane and High-montane Refuges.
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)	
Threat 1	Contamination of rivers and Guaratuba Bay waters caused by use of pesticides in banana monoculture in EPA region.
Threat 2	Contamination of soil, atmosphere, and waters through spilling of chemical products and/or fuels caused by accidents in Federal Highways BR 376 (Curitiba/PR-Joinville/SC) and 277 (Curitiba/PR-Paranaguá/PR) and leaks from the Petrobrás pipeline that connects the terminal in São Francisco do Sul Port to the Getúlio Vargas Refinery in Araucária.
List top two critical management activities	
Activity 1	Inspection inside PA and in buffer zone (EPA is very large)
Activity 2	Management of mineral exploration.

Date assessment carried out: July 2006

Name/s of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves Legalized by State Decree 1.234 of March 27, 1992.	Management Plan of EPA of Guaratuba is being concluded and approval is expected by the end of 2006.
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	The operational structure of mechanisms to control the EPA of Guaratuba includes daily support of environmental Police teams and IAP inspectors.	To structure the IAP's operational team and the Environmental Police Squad with equipment and personnel to improve management of inadequate activities.
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested? The AP's operational and inspection teams and Environmental Police Squad (BPAM) are technically trained to execute their duties.	For enforcement of legislation regarding PA protection, it is necessary to hire permanent personnel. There is insufficient number of staff available on the operational team to enforce the Law.
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The EPA of Guaratuba's objectives were agreed in the creation decree and management category.	The objectives that address the protection of forest environments and scientific research are satisfied but no productive activities are developed aiming at sustainability.
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	There are still areas of high biological and strategic value for protection around the EPA of Guaratuba. Annexing these
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	The design and accesses have helped to achieve the objectives	forest fragments will help to connect with other protected areas forming a broad ecological corridor.
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? Due to its size and relief, it is difficult to demarcate the limits of the EPA of Guaratuba. In the period when the field studies were carried out to design the Management Plan, several workshops were held with the local communities to address themes regarding the protected area.	To design communications programs with local communities and demarcate priority boundaries.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The Management Plan of the EPA of Guaratuba is still undergoing adjustments to be concluded and approved.	To implement the programs proposed in the Management Plan.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	No regular work plan exists.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or sign partnerships with other institutions to join efforts to achieve the goals defined in the Management Plan.
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The Management Plan has a series of information on the environmental dynamics of the EPA of Guaratuba, including biotic, abiotic and social-economic environments, which are necessary for decision-making.	The managing body of the EPA of Guaratuba must, through legal instruments, finance the execution of new scientific research projects with the objective of steering the work to themes of greater interest to the PA.
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	There are studies underway to subsidize information on the PN. Saint Hilarie/Langue, is inserted in the EPA of Guaratuba. In 2004, a study was concluded on the bacteriological and physical-chemical conditions of the waters of Guaratuba bay, carried out by the State Secretariat of Environment.	A survey must be conducted on new priority studies necessary for the effective management of the EPA of Guaratuba. These themes and/or areas of research must be suggested to financing and higher education institutions.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	These requirements are known and registered. The factor that hinders the execution of actions for effective management of the area in this aspect is the lack of a minimum permanent team of technical and operational experts.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or sign partnerships with other institutions to join efforts to execute the Management Plan of the EPA of Guaratuba.
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	There are only 3 staff, whose duties are directly connected to the management of the EPA of Guaratuba.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or sign partnerships with other institutions to join efforts to executive management in the protected area.
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	There are no problems with the management of personnel available. The requests for inspectors and other IAP operational agents and Environmental Police to support the inspection activities in the EPA of	
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3	Guaratuba are most times satisfied.	
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	The operational team has focused activities only on environmental inspection, regulation and monitoring of productive and exploration activities that occur in the area, failing to address other “pillars” of management, like environmental education, promotion and organization of eco-tourism, and scientific research.	Regularly attend training courses involving different areas of knowledge, like: management of PAs, socio-economy, environment dynamics, SIG, etc...
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	The budget is limited to the volume of activities that the EPA manager is capable of carrying out in the PA.	The IAP funding system is centered on two sources, which many times makes it difficult for the EPA manager of Guaratuba to make immediate decisions. It is suggested that the sums earmarked in the PA’s annual budget be totally or partially available to the head of the PA throughout the year.
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	There is a sufficient amount of financial resources to be invested in the EPA of Guaratuba to satisfy more than half the management area. The investment of these funds is limited to the volume of work that the team is able to carry out in the protected area.	The IAP funding system is centered on two sources, which many times makes it difficult for the EPA manager of Guaratuba to make immediate decisions. It is suggested that the sums earmarked in the PA’s annual budget be totally or partially available to the head of the PA throughout the year.
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The IAP funding system is centered on two sources, which many times makes it difficult for the EPA manager of Guaratuba to make immediate decisions.	It is suggested that the sums earmarked in the PA’s annual budget be totally or partially available to the head of the PA throughout the year.
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	The equipment available for the EPA	It is suggested that the

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1	is not sufficient to manage the area.	equipment acquired satisfy the area's management needs.
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	The delay in obtaining the necessary resources for MAINTENANCE of equipment has hindered the prompt management of the EPA of Guaratuba.	It is suggested that new methods to make these funds available be studied and implemented.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	There are no education and awareness programs.	To design a program and execute it according to the Management Plan.
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	There is regular contact with the owners of commercial establishments, rural producers, and ore explorers in the EPA and neighbouring area and has greatly improved after the Works executed in the design of the Management Plan.	To intensify the existing work and strengthen the group that forms the technical board and the managing council.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	There are no indigenous peoples inside the EPA of Guaratuba and neighbouring area.	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Contact with the community has greatly improved over the last two years but there is no information program on the EPA of Guaratuba	To intensify contact and exchange of information with the local community and implementation of
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2	directed to this group of people.	participatory programs.
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> Do visitors damage the protected area? There are no visitor facilities and services.	To design a program for public use, attractions for visitation and organize eco-tourism activities.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> examples of contributions At the moment there is no contact between managers and tourist agencies	To implement tourist programs proposed in the Management Plan through concessions for exploration.
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	No visitation fees are charged because there is no program for public use.	
If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected In the EPA of Guaratuba there are regular accusations and occurrences	To intensify inspection and enforcement of law on violators
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3	of various environmental damages, such as small deforestation, hunting, illegal palm heart harvesting, extraction of non-wood products and illegal extraction of minerals.	
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	In view of the management category, which allows private lands and residents inside the area, there is no control of accesses. Regarding the inspection of inappropriate use inside the EPA, IAP and BPAM teams have developed expressive work to curb environmental damage.	To intensify inspection and monitoring of access.
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? The State Government directs funds to Municipalities that have part of their lands inside the EPA of Guaratuba through the Ecological ICMS, defined by Complementary Law 59/91.	The law does not force the municipal government to invest the sums transferred in the environment. It is suggested that it become legally mandatory to invest part of these resources directly in the EPA of Guaratuba.
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Monitoring is directed to the use and occupation of land inside and around the EPA of Guaratuba, in view of the pressure caused by urban growth, by fishing, agricultural and cattle raising activities, and mining.	It is suggested that monitoring be carried out related to themes that involve fauna, flora, abiotic environments, socio-economic issues and the use of waters in areas that directly and indirectly affect the EPA of Guaratuba.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		40		

Name of Protected Area: Environmental Protection Area of Guaratuba (EPA de Guaratuba).
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: <p>Since 1996 the EPA of Guaratuba started receiving the public administration's attention through the Atlantic Forest Protection Program (Pró-Atlântica) which is fruit of international financial cooperation, signed between the German federal government through the Kreditanstalt Wiederaufbau Bank (KfW) and the State government of Paraná through its State Secretariat of Environment and Water Resources (SEMA). With the resources available from the partnership signed between these governments, various studies involving different themes were developed in the protected area, which resulted in the design of the Management Plan.</p> <p>The Projeto Plantando Palmito (Growing Palm Hearts Project) was in effect until 2002 and had the objective of disseminating the production of palm hearts according to the concept of Forest Plantations (Silviculture) among coastal communities that live off the extraction of native palm heart to allow palm heart harvesters (<i>palmiteiros</i>) to work legally. The funds came from the State Secretariat of Environment (SEMA).</p> <p>The Projeto Florestas Municipais (Municipal Forests Project) was developed within the scope of the State Secretariat of Environment and had the objective of forest restoration in the State of Paraná in its multiple aspects through three basic components: conservationist reforestation, productive reforestation, and environmental education. This project was in effect until 2002</p> <p>Paraná 12 meses: (Paraná 12 months) state government project for the agricultural sector, linked to SEAG, financed by the World Bank (BIRD) involving fishermen, rural producers, and those who live in the EPA of Guaratuba. Its overall objective is to relieve rural poverty through training of small-scale producers, supporting modernization aiming at environmental protection, improving housing and sanitation conditions, soil conservation, promoting agroecology, and implementing Community Kitchens and the Farmer's Factory.</p>
SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities living in PA: <p>The EPA of Guaratuba comprises the rural area of the municipality of Guaratuba and part of the rural area of the municipalities of São José dos Pinhais, Tijucas do Sul, Matinhos, Morretes, and Paranaguá.</p> <p>Communities: 21 mentioned in Management Plan.</p> <p>Families: no information was found.</p>
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities: <p>Craftsmanship; Illegal exploration and sale of non-wood forest products (moss, bromeliads, palm heart, and forest essences); Production and sale of cassava flour; Rice production; Banana production; Forest plantations (pines and eucalyptus); Palmaceae production; Cattle raising; Buffalo production; Fishing; Tourism; Services; Aquaculture and; Mining.</p>
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses: <p>Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats</p> <p>According to studies held in 2002, 85 families, involving 15 communities, live off the exploration and processing of non-wood products (guaricana, black vine, moss, and medicinal plants) inside the EPA.</p>
Main problems related to local productive chains <p>Difficulty of access and lack of opportunities, jobs, and social programs.</p>
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability: <p>Development of adequate plantation and management activities aiming at the sustainability of the Jucara Palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and other palmaceae species, production of scions of native species to restore degraded areas, honey production, promoting the implementation of agroforestry production systems and tourism in natural areas.</p>
Agrarian and land tenure situation: <p>The category of "EPA" management allows the presence of privately owned lands. Inside the PA in question, there are two other protected areas, the State Park of Boguacu, with little over 6,000ha and the Saint Hilaire/Lange National Park, with approximately 25,000ha, which have privately owned lands and need to be regulated, which will be carried out by the managing agencies, the IAP and IBAMA.</p>

<p>Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation:</p> <p>The Master Plan of the municipality of Guaratuba and other municipalities that form the EPA have considered the recommendations and uses defined in the Management Plan.</p>
<p>Main active/potential actors for PA management:</p> <p>The Managing Council and the group that forms the EPA Technical Board, governmental institutions like the City Halls of municipalities that comprise the EPA and its Trade and Industry Associations, Petrobrás, NGOs like the Wildlife and Environmental Education Research Society and the Vale da Ribeira/Guaraqueçaba Development Agency, higher education institutions like UFPR, PUC-PR, and FAFIPAR-PGUÁ, the Environmental Police Squad-BPAM, the National History Museum Capão da Imbuia of Curitiba, the VIVAT Forests Ecologic Systems, among others.</p>
<p>Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.):</p> <p>Z7 Fishermen colonies; Pro-Sustainable Agriculture Association of Guaratuba; Água-mar Guaratuba Association of Mariculture;</p>
<p>Other relevant information:</p> <p>The EPA of Guaratuba is formed by parts of the territories of Guaratuba, Matinhos, Morretes, São José dos Pinhais, Tijucas do Sul, and a small strip of Paranaguá, all bordering municipalities that present heterogeneous socio-economic characteristics. It is a set of areas that range from clearly urbanized - polarized by Curitiba (the case of São José dos Pinhais) - to Tijucas do Sul, where the rural population accounts for 85% of the total population; going through Guaratuba and Matinhos - municipalities that are close to the important port city of Paranaguá and connected to the condition of coastal cities - thus determining a population and economic dynamics that combines the multiplication of residents seeking work and income, with the attraction of a fluctuating population in summer seasons; and finally Morretes, a historical city also with strong tourist appeal. All this area is filled with recreation country houses, the mark of all municipalities that make up the EPA of Guaratuba. In some points that are critically pressured by urban expansion and intensive capitalization production, the EPA of Guaratuba is predominantly an immense and vibrant forest vegetation that is naturally protected by hills, countless water springs and basins that flow into the Guaratuba Bay, forming lakes and stimulating fluvial-marine environments of rare beauty. Inside the EPA, there is a small number of residents (demographic density of some 3.2 h/km²) but concentrated in some occupied areas. Ancestral signs and marks indicate that it has not always been that way, because the rich cultural heritage represented by over one hundred identified historical sites spreads throughout the entire territory. Geographically, this Protected Area Site is frankly associated to the Paraná Coast and Curitiba Metropolitan Region complex to accommodate influences from these regions, which are especially visible in changes to the profile of occupation. Thus, in view of the lack of options in the State's rural area and small cities, in addition to the saturation in the metropolitan region, it can be said that the region where the EPA of Guaratuba is located is part of a new frontier of occupation: more than for the relatively stabilized vegetative growth in a descending line, the dynamics of its population is strongly characterized by migratory flows.</p>

Date assessment carried out: July 2006
Name of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves

ESEC Guaraquecaba

Name of protected area	ECOLOGICAL STATION OF GUARAQUEÇABA		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	North Coast of Paraná, municipality of Guaraqueçaba Boundaries:		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted Dec. 87.222 of 05.31.82 (created) Dec. 93.053 of 07.31.86 (expanded)	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Ownership: no tenure rights regulation		
Management Authority	IBAMA		
Size of protected area (ha)	13643.5ha		
Number of staff	Permanent 0	Temporary 0	
Budget	R\$ 20000,00/year		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Category I of IUCN, Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage		
Reasons for designation	Protection of mangroves		
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA			
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA			
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA			
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	To protect ecosystems of mangroves and islands;		
Objective 2	To protect species threatened with extinction; maintain gene banks, and foster the development of scientific research.		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Extractive activities		
Threat 2	Pollution from port activities		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Lack of team		
Activity 2	Lack of research		

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name/s of assessor: Elisa Vieira

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves Dec. 87.222 of 05.31.82 (creation) Dec. 93.053 of 07.31.86 (expansion)	Demarcation of boundaries
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
<i>Context</i>				
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	Constant extractive activities	
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
<i>Context</i>				
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested? There is currently no staff	Staff building
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
<i>Context</i>				
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The attempt to implement these objectives is partially executed by neighbouring Pas	Staff building and design of management plan
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
<i>Planning</i>				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	Because these are mangrove areas	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? Most residents know of the PA's existence, but not of its exact location	Demarcation and signaling of boundaries
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0		Design of Management Plan
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	In view of the lack of staff, experts from other PAs try to cover demands	
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	Necessary strengthening of research	Survey of gaps and incentive for research
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Very limited research	Survey of gaps and incentive for research
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0		
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0		
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors damage the protected area?</i>	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions</i>	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural</i>	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	values being affected	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	Access control is quite difficult because these are mangroves and islands	
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	Possible issue for comment: how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? The neighbouring communities live mainly off picking crabs and oysters	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE			22	

Name of Protected Area: ECOLOGICAL STATION OF GUARAQUEÇABA
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area:
SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area None
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities The main sources of income of communities close to PA are activities related to fishing and picking crabs and oysters.
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses
Use of biodiversity by communities and other stakeholders – sustainable use and threats Illegal extraction of crabs and oysters from inside protection area.
Main problems related to local productive chains Existence of middlemen fish traders, which reduces the income of residents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability In surrounding communities, development of natural resources management.
Agrarian and land tenure situation Areas of private ownership, which are not regularized nor are in the process of.
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Councilor chair in EPA of Guaraqueçaba Council
Main active/potential stakeholders for PA management IBAMA, Communities of Ilha Rasa, Wildlife and Environmental Education Research Society (one of the owners has land area inside ESEC).
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) Associations of residents in neighbouring communities
Other relevant information

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor Ozeas Gonçalves

ESEC Juréia-Itatins

Name of protected area	Ecological Station of Juréia-Itatins	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	South coast and Vale do Ribeira (São Paulo)	
	Boundaries: Peruíbe, Iguape. Itariri and Miracatu	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted State Law 5,649/87
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Ownership (private/public) Approximately 10% State ownership / 60% in process of expropriation / 30% undefined	
Management Authority		
Size of protected area (ha)	79.820 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent: 43 people	Temporary
Budget	R\$ 150.000,00/year expenditures - R\$ 350.000,00/ year/ personnel.	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Ecological Station / World Heritage Site	
Reasons for designation		
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	World Bank (1992-1995)	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	PPMA – Programa de Preservação da Mata Atlântica (Atlantic Forest Protection Program) (2003 – 2006)	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA		
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protection	
Objective 2	Research	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Lack of land use regularization / Real estate speculation	
Threat 2	Extraction of natural resources	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Inspection	
Activity 2	Administration	

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name/s of assessor: Eng. Ftal Joaquim do Marco Neto

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2	Ecological station State Law 5649/87	
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	It is necessary to define land use network.	
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2	There are deficiencies in staff to satisfy all existing demands.	
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Environmental Zoning (1990)	
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	Some areas have features and use that are incompatible with other PA categories and reassessment of category of some areas could enable adequate and participatory management.	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? There is partial demarcation (only by sea and some rivers – 30%)	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	Currently being executed.	
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	No	
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	Lack of technical human resources.	
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The amount of existing information is relevant and enables guidelines for	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1	management.	
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Large amount of research.	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0		
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0		
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0		
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1	Stable over the last 3 years. Insufficient for needs in previous years (10)	
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
<i>Process</i>				
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors damage the protected area?</i>	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions</i>	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		23		

PARNA Superagui

Name of protected area	SUPERAGÜI NATIONAL PARK	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	North coast of Paraná state, municipality of Guaraqueçaba Boundaries:	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted Dec. 97668 (creation) Lei 9513/97 (expansion)
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Ownership: land tenure situation not regularized, with presence of squatters and glebes without infrastructure. Island areas – owned by the Federal Government.	
Management Authority	IBAMA	
Size of protected area (ha)	33.998 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent 2 higher ed. level staff 1 field assistant	Temporary 2 secondary ed. level staff offered by the Municipal City Hall
Budget	R\$ 30000,00/year	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	National Park – IUCN Category II, Cultural Heritage, Biosphere Reserve	
Reasons for designation	Protect the Atlantic Forest and associated ecosystems	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Community based tourism (WWF, FNMA, SPVS); Protection of the red-tailed amazon (FNMA, SPVS), Protection of the black-faced lion tamarin (IPE), Diagnosis of fishing (IPE, FNMA); PNMA – Infrastructure; PROBIO/MMA	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA		
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protect remnants of Atlantic Forest and associated ecosystems.	
Objective 2	Develop research, environmental education, and recreation.	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Expansion of communities inside PA and in adjacent areas	
Threat 2	Illegal extraction of forest products	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Control and Monitoring	
Activity 2		

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name/s of assessor: Selma Ribeira

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0		
Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves	
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2	Dec. 97668 of 20.04.89 (creation) Lei 9513 de 20.11.97 (expansion)	
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0		
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1	There are communities inside the National Park	Term of commitment with native communities
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1	The staff have the technical capacity to enforce the legislation but there are no administrative mechanisms to execute this objective satisfactorily.	Give the necessary support to the unit in administrative matters so that the staff can focus on technical issues.
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		
Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1	The objectives of creation are too general	Design of Management Plan
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	More discussion on this aspect due to its complexity
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	The Park's expansion placed a well-consolidated traditional community inside the area. This area could have been left outside because it is located in the extreme north and would not interfere in the habitat of the black-faced lion tamarin, which was the reason for the expansion.	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? There are landmarks in place but demarcation is done by trails and signaling.	Periodical maintenance of trails and signaling
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The Terms of Reference have already been approved by DIREC which is currently studying the origin of the resources to be used.	
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan?	No regular work plan exists	0	There are internal planning activities and Annual Budget Plans, but this does not necessarily mean that there will be resources to carry out the activities planned, thus interfering in the achievement of goals.	Work plan compatible with Management Plan, obtaining resources from other sources.
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	There is much information on the area, but it is not organized. There are knowledge gaps, which however do not hinder the decision-making and planning of actions.	Directed by Management Plan
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
<i>Context</i>				
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Some of the research developed is directed to satisfying the current needs of the area.	Directed by Management Plan
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		Urgently design Management Plan
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<i>Process</i>				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0		Obtain more human resources for the area.
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	It is not possible to conduct management with the small staff.	
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	Small, but well trained, staff.	
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0	As mentioned above, there are budget cuts and administrative problems.	
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	There are resources for basic operations in PA, but not for other initiatives and innovations.	
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The small volume of resources received faces problems in execution in view of bureaucratic processes.	Staff with administrative functions only.
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Process	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? Process	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		Staff with administrative functions only.
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? Process	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		Staff with administrative functions only.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? Process	There is no education and awareness programme	0	There are projects of other institutions in the area and irregular activities developed by PARNA.	Design of a specific programme for the area.
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? Process	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Contact greatly fostered by process of formation and structuring of PA council.	Maintenance of process.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? Process	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Contact greatly fostered by process of formation and structuring of PA council.	Maintenance of process.
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment.</i> Do visitors damage the protected area? Not inside unit but in directly adjacent area.	Design of Management Plan
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment.</i> examples of contributions Irregular contacts	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	There is no official visiting because there is no Management Plan.	Design and implementation of MP.
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	values being affected	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3	Localized impacts	
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	Control of real estate speculation with the demolition of eight houses; work with the Attorney General's Office and Funai to restore the area previously occupied by indigenous peoples.	
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	Irregular inspection, difficulty enhanced by geographical configuration (islands).	Improve inspection
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? The transformation in the area is visible.	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	It is necessary to systematize data and update the strategy, making it more regular.	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		42		

Name of Protected Area: SUPERAGÜI NATIONAL PARK
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: Development of sustainable bases for management of fishing resources in region of Superagüi National Park (Guaraqueçaba, Paraná, Brasil) – IPE, FNMA Community based Ecotourism – SPVS, WWF Protection of the red-tailed amazon (<i>Amazona brasiliensis</i>) – SPVS, FNMA Escola das Águas (School of Waters) Project – State Secretariat of Education Survey of potentials of Pinheiros bay for ocean farming: subsidies to implementation of aquiculture parks in north coast of Paraná state – LACTEC, SEAP Environmental Education for protection of red-tailed amazon in Superagüi National Park, Guaraqueçaba, Paraná – Ecological Research Institute, Loro Park Foundation.
SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area Inside Park: approximately 100 families in 5 communities and in some isolated points In adjacent areas: approximately 300 families in 8 communities.
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities The main source of income of communities of the PARNA do Superagüi region is fishing activities. About 15% of the population has other activities scattered around in professions like: oyster and crab picking, construction, carpentry, homemakers, and activities connected to tourism. It can be noted that over the last 10 years, initiatives of services linked to tourism have been growing significantly in the area. Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. According to surveys taken, some 66% of the population receives up to R\$200,00 per month, whereas spending on food for the population with this income accounts for around 65% and in many cases the total income is spent on food. About one fourth of the houses in the region has no bathroom and over one third does not use septic tanks. In terms of adult education, in villages like Barbados and Saco do Morro, 50% of the population has never gone to school. In Canudal and Guapicum, however, all the residents interviewed went to school. In larger villages (Barra do Superagüi and vila das Peças), the illiteracy rate is low (about 5%) and many residents have concluded above the 8th grade (about 3% and 15% respectively).
Use of biodiversity by communities and other stakeholders – sustainable use and threats Several communities use mainly palm heart (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and crab as a complementary source of food and income.
Main problems related to local productive chains The main problems related to local productive chains are connected to logistical difficulties in selling fishing products and the consequent existence of intermediaries. In the case of tourism, the difficulty of access somehow also hinders the activity. In addition the lack of treatment of residues in local communities promotes environmental impacts in these points.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability One of the major vocations of the region is ecotourism.
Agrarian and land tenure situation The PARNA do Superagüi is formed by four main islands and one continental area. However, the Superagüi island is undergoing a process of historical recovery because there is still no consensus on whether the location is a natural or artificial island. Thus, the islands of Peças, Pinheiro and Pinheirinho are already a property of the federal government, despite the existence of land squatters in different points. Regarding the island of Superagüi, there is still no decision on its nature. There are various processes in course to regularize the agrarian land tenure situation of older properties in the continental part.
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation The activities of PARNA do Superagüi are directly linked to the APA de Guaraqueçaba, which carries out various activities of territorial demarcation in the region. In addition, it is part of different governance bodies, such as the Coast Tourism Council, the Regional Rural Development, Aquaculture, and Fishing Council, among others.
Main active/potential stakeholders for PA management IBAMA, Environmental Institute of Paraná, Regional Management of Federal Heritage, Forest Police Squad, City Hall of Guaraqueçaba, local communities, Wildlife and Environmental Education Research Society, Ecological Research Institute, Tourism Operators, Fishing Associations, PROVOPAR, etc.
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) Some of the communities are organized in associations of residents. There are also organizations structured by other criteria, such as: Association of women of Vila das Peças, Fishing Association, Handicraft Association, in which some of these are formally established and others are not. The settlement of fishermen is considered non-representative by local residents.
Other relevant information

PE do Bogaçu

Name of protected area	Bogaçu State Park (PE do Bogaçu)	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference):	Boundaries: the boundaries of PE do Bogaçu form the surrounding area with the urban perimeter of Guaratuba to the east-northeast; in the south with the municipality of Garuva/SC; to the west it has boundaries with the rural lands of the APA of Guaratuba and to the north with the Guaratuba Bay.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed Created by State Decree 4.056 of February 26 1998 and altered by Law 13.979 of December 26 2002	Gazetted There are no activities being executed inside the PE do Bogaçu aiming at the implementation of management actions.
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Through State Decree 4.056 of February 26 1998. The ownership of part of the public areas belongs to the State Government of Paraná – Environmental Institute of Paraná (IAP). Inside the area there are privately owned lands that must be expropriated.	
Management Authority	Environmental Institute of Paraná (IAP)	
Size of protected area (ha)	6.052 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent	Temporary: 04 (Environmental Police Officers)
Budget		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Atlantic Forest Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO) through the Man and the Biosphere Programme – Decree 74.685 of 10/14/1974	
Reasons for designation	The Atlantic Forest Biosphere Reserve comprehends the State Park of Bogaçu and considers its protection important as an Atlantic Forest ecosystem.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	Not given	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Not given	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baía Limpa: (Clean Bay) a project funded by the SEMA, and initially created for the economic and social development and environmental protection of the Guaratuba Bay, and over time extended its scope to include the estuary regions of the entire coast of Paraná. The project was in effect until February 2003, with the activities of cleaning bays, mangroves, which were done by fishermen who earned a monthly basic basket. In effect until 2002. • Programa ICMS Ecológico: (Ecological ICMS Program) one of the most important programs of the State of Paraná for municipalities with plots of land inside protection areas or in surrounding areas. The Program was implemented in 1991, through Complementary Law 59/91. The Law establishes the payment of an ecological ICMS (Goods and Services Movement Tax) (5% of the total ICMS) to municipalities that include protection areas or water springs for public supply in their territories. The municipalities that fill the legal specifications receive funds from the ICMS collected and to ensure the continuity of the benefit must guarantee the protection of those areas. 	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	To protect the biological, archeological, and cultural heritage it contains; to promote activities aiming at public visitation and scientific visitation.	
Objective 2	To protect samples of Remnants of the Atlantic Forest Biome, such as specimens of the Dense Ombrophilous Forest (Lowlands and Sub-Montane); Pioneer Formations (Vegetation with Fluvial Influence, Vegetation with Fluvial-Marine Influence and Vegetation with Marine Influence).	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Operation of a sanitary landfill close to the PA, exploration of mineral resources, and the irregular occupation of the margins of one of its tributaries, the Bogaçu-Mirim River.	
Threat 2	Wild animal hunting, illegal harvesting of Juçara palm heart, and uncontrolled exploitation of fishing resources.	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Inspection inside PA and in buffer zone. (Lack of personnel and operational structure)	
Activity 2	Management of mineral exploration.	

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name/s of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves Legalized through State Decree 4.056, of February 26 1998 and amended by State Law 13.979 of December 26 2002.	Begin the process of land regularization.
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
<i>Context</i>				
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	As an operational structure for control mechanisms, PE do Boguaçu regularly receives support of the Environmental Police Offer teams and IAP inspectors.	Structure the IAP's operational team and the Environmental Police Squad with equipment and personnel to improve management of inadequate activities.
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
<i>Context</i>				
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	The operational teams and IAP inspectors and of the Environmental Police Squad (BPAM) are technically trained to carry out their duties.	To enforce the legislation referring to the AP protection, it is necessary to hire permanent personnel. The number of people on the operational team available to enforce the law is insufficient.
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
<i>Context</i>				
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	The objectives of PE do Boguaçu were agreed through the decree that created it and its management category.	The existence of the PA has currently been carrying out the role of "holding back" the process of urban expansion and organizing the land in adjacent areas. The activities referring to other management "pillars" are not being implemented, such as: public use, research, environmental monitoring, etc.
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
<i>Planning</i>				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	The PA design is relatively divided, which suffers the influence of the	Around the PE do Boguaçu there are still areas of high

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	border effect.	biological and strategic area for protection. Annexing these forest fragments will enable the connection with other protected areas forming an extensive ecological corridor.
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	The boundaries of PE do Boguaçu are unknown.	Begin the process of boundary demarcation and inform the local community.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	There is no Management Plan.	Enable means to design the Management Plan.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	There is no regular work plan.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or enter into partnerships with other institutions with the purpose of joining efforts to carry out the PA's management activities.
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The existing information on habitats is insufficient for decision making.	The managing body of PE do Boguaçu must use legal

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		instruments to finance the execution of new projects on scientific research with the objective of focusing efforts on themes of higher priority and interest to the PA.
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	There is currently no research project under development in the PA.	A survey must be conducted on priority studies necessary for the effective management of PE do Bogaçu. These themes and/or areas should be suggested by financing and higher education institutions.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	These requirements are recognized. The factor that prevents executing actions for the effective management of the area in this aspect is the lack of a permanent team of technical and operational personnel.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or enter into partnerships with other institutions with the purpose of joining efforts to carry out the PA's management activities.
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	There are no permanent employees to carry out activities regarding to management of the area.	The State Government must enable hiring personnel and/or enter into partnerships with other institutions with the purpose of joining efforts to carry out the PA's management activities.
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	There are no permanent personnel.	Hiring a manager and operational team to execute management actions in the area.
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	There is no permanent operational team.	
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0	There are no personnel to manage the unit's budget.	
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	There are sufficient financial resources to be invested in PE do Boguaçu to satisfy more than half of the management of the area. The investment of these resources depends on having personnel to manage these resources.	
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The system to obtain resources from the IAP is centralized in two sources, which in many occasions prevents the PE do Boguaçu's management body from making immediate decisions.	It is suggested that sums earmarked in the PE do Boguaçu's current budget be entirely or partially available to the head of the PA throughout the year.
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	The PA has no equipment.	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	There is no equipment.	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	There are no Environmental awareness and education programs	Design and carry out these programs.
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	There is no manager (individual person).	Hiring a manager and operational team to execute the area's management actions.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	There are no indigenous peoples inside and around PE do Boguaçu.	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	There is no management of PA.	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	There are no visitor facilities and services.	Design a public use program, attractions for visitors, and organize existing eco-tourism activities.
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	There is currently no commercial tourism.	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	No visitation fees are charged because there is currently no public use program.	
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	Due to the lack of management, the area is being severely degraded.	Hiring a management and establishing land regularization of the protected area. In addition to
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		intensifying the inspection and enforcement of the law against violators.
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	There is no access control.	Demarcate the area and intensify inspection and monitoring of accesses.
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	The State Government directs financial resources to the Municipality of Guaratuba through the Ecological ICMS established by Complementary Law 59/91.	This law does not force the municipal government to invest the resources transferred in the environment. It is suggested that through legal instruments part of these resources be mandatorily invested directly in the PE do Boguaçu.
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	There is no monitoring and evaluation of PA management.	Enable operational personnel to execute activities regarding monitoring related to themes that involve fauna, flora, abiotic and social-economic means, and the use of bodies of water that directly and indirectly affect the PE do Boguaçu.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE			15	

Name of Protected Area: Boguaçu State Park (PE do Boguaçu).
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: Baía Limpa: (Clean Bay) a project funded by the SEMA, and initially created for the economic and social development and environmental protection of the Guaratuba Bay, and over time extended its scope to include the estuary regions of the entire coast of Paraná. The project was in effect until February 2003, with the activities of cleaning bays, mangroves, which were done by fishermen who earned a monthly basic basket. In effect until 2002
SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities living in PA: There are no data regarding the number of families and communities.
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities: Craftsmanship; Illegal exploration and sale of non-wood forest products (moss, bromeliads, palm heart, and forest essences); Forest plantations (pines and eucalyptus); Palmacea production; Cattle raising; Fishing; Tourism; Aquaculture and; Mining.
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses: Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Part of the community that lives inside the PE do Boguaçu lives off the exploration and processing of non-wood products (guaricana, black vine, moss, and medicinal plants).
Main problems related to local productive chains Difficulty of access and lack of opportunities, jobs, and social programs.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability: Development of adequate plantation and management activities aiming at the sustainability of the Jucara Palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and other palmacea species, production of scions of native species to restore degraded areas, honey production, promoting the implementation of agroforestry production systems and tourism in natural areas.
Agrarian and land tenure situation: Inside the PE do Boguaçu there are significant numbers of privately-owned properties that must be expropriated.
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation: The Master Plan of the municipality of Guaratuba has considered the existence of PE do Boguaçu important for nature protection.
Main active/potential actors for PA management: The Managing Council and the group that forms the EPA Technical Board, governmental institutions like the City Halls of municipalities that comprise the EPA and its Trade and Industry Associations, Petrobrás, NGOs like the Wildlife and Environmental Education Research Society and the Vale da Ribeira/Guaraqueçaba Development Agency, higher education institutions like UFPR, PUC-PR, and FAFIPAR-PGUÁ, the Environmental Police Squad-BPAM, the National History Museum Capão da Imbuia of Curitiba, the VIVAT Forests Ecological Systems, among others.
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.): Z7 Fishermen colonies; Pro-Sustainable Agriculture Association of Guaratuba; Água-mar Guaratuba Ocean Farming Association.
Other relevant information: The PE do Boguaçu, inserted in the Municipality of Guaratuba, in its northeast/east portion is pressured by urban expansion. It is covered by immense and vibrant vegetation protected by extremely fragile environments, like mangroves, swamps, and the Lowland Dense Ombrophilous Forest, in addition to several water springs and basins, which outflow to the Guaratuba Bay. It includes an environment rich in biodiversity and of significant scenic beauty. And also presents a rich cultural heritage represented by the different archaeological sites that spread all throughout the area.

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves

PE Ilha do Cardoso

Name of protected area	Ilha do Cardoso State Park	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Brasil, south coast of São Paulo state, region of estuary lagoon complex of Cananéia Iguape and Ilha Comprida. Boundaries: boundary between São Paulo state e Paraná state	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Gazetted by Dec. 40.319, of July 3, 1962
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Ownership (private/public) Public	
Management Authority	State Secretariat of Environment Instituto Florestal (Forest Research Institute)	
Size of protected area (ha)	15.100 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent 33	Temporary 6
Budget	R\$ 500.000,00 /year approximately (+ personnel costs)	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	World Heritage Core Area of Biosphere Reserve	
Reasons for designation	Great biodiversity in good state of conservation	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	PPMA (Projeto de Preservação da Mata Atlântica) (Atlantic Forest Protection Project), na agreement between the state government and Germany's KFW Bank. Focuses on protection and inspection activities.	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Protection (see decree)	
Objective 2	Environmental Education	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Palm heart cutting – important source of food for fauna	
Threat 2	Hunting – decrease of fauna	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Irregular human occupation – Summer houses	
Activity 2	Organizing public visitation	

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name/s of assessor: Marcos Buhner Campolim

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	Decree 40.319 Date July 3, 1962	
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
<i>Context</i>				
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	There is an official Management Plan	Updating stage
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
<i>Context</i>				
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	Management is carried out, but there are deficiencies mainly regarding staff and park rangers.	Hiring staff
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
<i>Context</i>				
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Management Plan in effect	Updating Management Plan
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
<i>Planning</i>				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	The Park is an entire island	Implement new PAs in neighbouring areas.

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area? It is an island	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	Management Plan approved and implemented	Updating Management Plan
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	Management Plan designed to involve participation of local stakeholders Management Plan under review	
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan?	No regular work plan exists	0	Matrix of activities of Management Plan under execution	
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	Some 70 research projects underway. Very good basis and information on flora.	
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
<i>Context</i>				
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	Some 70 research projects underway.	Implementation of Research Council for Park.
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	Deficiency of staff. Delay in solving legal issues.	
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<i>Process</i>				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	Deficiency of staff	Requests for new hiring or partnerships.
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
<i>Inputs</i>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Deficiency in training and salary incentives	
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	Deficiency in training	
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0	Acceptable	
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	Depends on higher levels and state budget	
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	Need for training	
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	Deficiency in training and specialized personnel	
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Deficiency in training and specialized personnel	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	Programs underway which need to be improved, mainly with budget funds.	
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	There is limited contact with neighbours. Activities are concentrated around municipality schools.	
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Traditional caiçaras peoples actively participate in management of PEIC. Indigenous peoples participate partially in their area.	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Representatives actively participate through the PEIC Consultative Council	
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	Positive	
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	Some programmes are being implemented. Lack of more staff and partnerships.	
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	Sufficient infrastructure, but needs reforms and adaptations.	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	Few companies want to establish partnerships	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
management? <i>Process</i>	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Fees are charged with return to PA central administration and stakeholders involved (bankers, environmental monitors, local residents)	Needs regulations
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	There are difficulties in inspection and specific technical activities in view of shortage of staff.	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	It is an island that can be accessed from any point.	
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	Ecological tourism grows each year	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Deficiency in technical team	
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE			23	

FE Palmito

Name of protected area	<i>Floresta Estadual do Palmito</i> (FEP) [Palmito State Forest]	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Boundaries: the Almeidas River comprises the boundary to the east and northeast, the Coreias River to the west, and Highway PR 407 to the south.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed Established by Decree Num. 4.493 of June 17, 1998.	Gazetted Established by Decree Num. 4.493 of June 17, 1998.
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	By means of Decree Num. 4.493 the area is publicly owned by the Paraná State Government – Paraná Environmental Institute (IAP).	
Management Authority	Paraná Environmental Institute (IAP)	
Size of protected area (ha)	530 ha (five hundred and thirty hectares)	
Number of staff	Permanent:01	Temporary:00
Budget		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Atlantic Rainforest Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO) through the Humans and Biosphere Program – Decree Num. 74.685 of 10/14/1974	
Reasons for designation	The Atlantic Rainforest Biosphere Reserve encompasses the UC, which is considered important for preservation as an Atlantic Rainforest Ecosystem.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Plantando Palmito” Project [Planting Palmito], which ended in 2002, aimed to disseminate planting of Juçara Palm by adopting a Silviculture approach (planting in the forest) among coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on extracting native palm hearts, thus enabling the palm heart collectors [“<i>palmiteiros</i>”] to carry out this activity legally. The funds stemmed from the State Environment Secretariat (SEMA). The goal of the Florestas Municipais Project [Municipal Forests], which was designed by the State Environment Secretariat, was to recover forests in their various facets within the state of Paraná through three basic components: conservationist reforestation, productive reforestation, and environmental education. This project was concluded in 2002. 	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Not available	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ever since 1999, the research project known as “Solo Bioma” has received government funding by means of a partnership between German research institutes and the Soils Laboratory at UFPR - Brazil, through the two countries’ respective Ministries of Education, focusing on nutrient cycling and assessment of soil diversity and function under human influence. In 2001, the FEP received funding from the Atlantic Rainforest Protection Program [<i>Pró-Atlantica</i>] through an international financial cooperation agreement established between the German government, through the KfW, and the Paraná State Government, through its State Environment Secretariat, which produced a paper entitled Sustainable Tourism in Conservation Units [<i>Turismo Sustentável em Unidades de Conservação</i>] that focused solely on the FEP. ICMS Ecológico Program [Value-added Ecological Tax]: one of the most important programs in the state of Paraná involving municipalities that have land within conservation units or their surrounding areas. The Program was implemented as of 1991 through Supplementary Law [<i>Lei Complementar</i>] 59/91. This Law provides for payment of an ecological value-added tax (5% of total ICMS) to the municipalities that harbor conservation units or public water supplies. The municipalities included in this law receive funds from the ICMS collected and need to ensure the preservation and conservation of these areas in order to continue receiving these funds. 	

List the two primary protected area objectives	
Objective 1	Promote actions aimed at ensuring the conservation of a small portion of the Atlantic Rainforest Biome by introducing silvicultural production of the Juçara Palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and Peach Palm (<i>Bactris gasipaes</i>), so as to reduce illegal and predatory exploitation of native hearts of palm in the region, thus ensuring the local sustainability of this species while also enabling scientific research.
Objective 2	Preserve a sample of the Atlantic Rainforest Biome and ecosystems contained in Lowland Ombrophile Forests, including: Marine-influenced Pioneer Formations, Fluvio-marine-influenced Pioneer Formations and Fluvial-influenced Pioneer Formations.
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)	
Threat 1	Urban expansion of the Municipality of Paranaguá, which causes the destruction of still conserved areas in the FEP surrounding areas (the FEP currently plays a key role as a barrier to urban expansion, and is thus considered utterly important for the integrity of the environment and protection of the Guaraguaçu Ecological Station).
Threat 2	Pollution caused by urban effluents dumped into the Itiberê River, which joins the Correias River, which in its turn is in direct contact with the FEP's environments and fauna.
List top two critical management activities	
Activity 1	Enforcement within the UC and its buffer zone.
Activity 2	Monitoring land use and occupation in the surrounding areas.

Date assessment carried out: May 2006 _____

Name/s of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<p><i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves</p> <p>Was gazetted through State Decree Num. 4.493 of June 17, 1998.</p>	<p>Studies are underway to annex surrounding areas (devolved lands) in order to significantly increase the protected area.</p>
Does the protected area have legal status?	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
<i>Context</i>				
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	<p>The operating structure for enforcement is based on Environmental Police and IAP officers.</p>	<p>Draft a schedule for implementing enforcement activities and provide staff to carry out this schedule. The main constraint is little available staff to carry out these activities within the UC.</p>
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled?	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
<i>Context</i>				
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<p><i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?</p> <p>The operational and enforcement teams at the IAP and Environmental Police Battalion (BPAM) are technically capable of fulfilling their duties.</p>	<p>In order to comply with legislation pertaining to the Conservation Unit, full-time staff needs to be hired. Minimum staff is not available to enforce the law.</p>
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough?	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
<i>Context</i>				
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	<p>The FEP's objectives were agreed on through the decree that created it and according to its management category.</p>	<p>The parts of its objectives that address the conservation of forest environments and scientific research are being met but no productive activities aimed at local sustainability are being carried out.</p>
Have objectives been agreed?	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
<i>Planning</i>				
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<p><i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different</p>	<p>It is necessary to annex to the FEP devolved lands in the</p>

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	management zones and are these well maintained?	surrounding areas and other private lands that have a significant conservation value.
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	The FEP's design is elongated and narrow and the border effect renders its forest environments very vulnerable, thus causing serious damage to its biodiversity.	
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	Activities aimed at periodic maintenance of boundaries, such as cutting the undergrowth.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2	All of the FEP boundaries are known and demarcated. It shares boundaries with devolved lands and other private lands defined by "picadões" (deforested area 03m in width that sets the boundary of the land belonging to the UC). Other boundaries are defined by the Correias and Almeidas Rivers.	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The FEP does not have a Management Plan.	Provide the means and resources for drafting the Management Plan.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1		
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan?	No regular work plan exists	0	There is a work plan based on which the Head of the FEP has targeted his activities.	The State Government must provide for hiring of personnel and/or establish partnerships with other institutions to join
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Planning/Outputs	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		efforts in achieving planned targets.
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	There is a significant volume of information on the vegetation but little work has been done on the animal species.	The institution that manages the FEP should adopt legal instruments to fund the implementation of scientific research projects with a focus on subjects that are considered top priorities for the FEP and relevant for management and decision making.
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
Context				
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	There are two research projects underway in this UC: "Solo Bioma" [Soil Biome], and; "Avifauna da FEP" [FEP Birdlife].	A needs assessment of new studies aimed at the effective management of the FEP should be carried out. Research fields and/or subjects should be suggested to funding agencies and higher learning institutions.
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
Inputs				
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	These requirements are known and recorded. The key constraint to implementing activities aimed at effectively managing the FEP is the lack of a full-time operational and technical staff.	The State Government must provide for hiring of such staff and/or establish partnerships with other institutions to join efforts in implementing the management plan.
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
Process				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	A single employee has provided operational support to ongoing research activities, performed minor maintenance on fences and boundaries, and supported monitoring/enforcement activities in the surrounding areas along with IAP	The State Government must provide for hiring of such staff and/or establish partnerships with other institutions to join efforts in implementing the FEP's management plan.
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3	staff and environmental police	
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Only one employee works directly on managing the FEP. Requests for operational personnel and officers from IAP and the environmental police to provide support for enforcement activities in the FEP are usually met.	
Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
<i>Process</i>				
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0	The only employee is duly trained to carry out management activities in the FEP.	Periodically attend training courses in several fields of knowledge, such as: socioeconomics, environment dynamics, GIS, etc...
Is there enough training for staff?	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
<i>Inputs/Process</i>				
15. Current budget	There is no budget for the protected area	0	The budget is restricted to the activities that the single employee can carry out in the FEP.	The IAP's fundraising system relies mainly on two sources, which on several occasions has hindered the FEP manager's immediate decision-making capacity. We suggest that the funds from the FEP's yearly budget be made available to the head of the UC throughout the year.
Is the current budget sufficient?	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	Financial resources to be invested in the FEP are sufficient to manage over half of the area. The implementation of these funds is limited by the amount of work that the single employee can carry out in the protected area.	The IAP's fundraising system relies mainly on two sources, which on several occasions has hindered the FEP manager's immediate decision-making capacity. We suggest that the funds from the FEP's yearly budget be made fully or partially available to the head of the UC throughout the year.
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	<i>Inputs</i>	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The IAP's fundraising system relies mainly on two sources, which on	We suggest that the funds from the FEP's yearly budget

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1	several occasions has hindered the FEP manager's immediate decision-making capacity.	be made fully or partially available to the head of the UC throughout the year.
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	The existing equipment only partially meets the needs of implementing management in the FEP.	We suggest purchasing equipment that minimally meets the needs of research projects and environmental monitoring.
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Delays in obtaining necessary funding for maintenance has slowed down FEP management activities.	We suggest implementing new methods for disbursing funds.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	The visitors are mostly students from the municipal public schools who take hikes on visitation trails. These activities happen only when scheduled ahead of time.	Establish partnerships with organized groups (NGOs and university student) to plan activities related to environmental education programs.
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Contact with the local population, which is quite limited, occurs during visits to the FEP surrounding areas.	Increase the exchange of information with the surrounding population so that it becomes a routine.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Process</i>	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	There are no indigenous people within the FEP or its surrounding area.	
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Contact with the local community is quite limited since there is no program for disseminating information about the FEP to this group.	Increase contacts and the exchange of information with the local community and implement participatory programs.
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> Do visitors damage the protected area? The FEP's facilities are appropriate for visitors and have enough space for various activities. These facilities include interpretive trails, a visitor's center, restrooms, and a place for setting up a snack bar.	Outfit the visitor's center with furniture and communication systems such as posters and other visual aids; extend and improve visitation trails.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> examples of contributions	Once facilities have been improved, promote tourism activities in natural areas within the FEP.
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2	There is currently no contact between the managers and tourism operators.	
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Visitation fees are not charged.	There are no plans to charge visitation fees.
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	Step up monitoring and law enforcement aimed at perpetrators of these acts.
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2	Throughout the last three years, there were several occurrences of illegal extraction of native palm hearts and clear evidence of hunting of wild animals within the FEP.	
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	The number of actions that contribute directly to protecting the FEP is low.	Increase monitoring and enforcement at access routes.
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development	This law does not oblige the municipal government to

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1	impact on the protected area?	invest transferred funds on the environment. We suggest using legal instruments to make it mandatory to earmark part of these funds to the FEP.
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2	The State Government disburses funds to the Municipality in which the FEP lies through an Ecological Value Added Tax ("ICMS Ecológico"), as defined by Supplementary Law (<i>Lei Complementar</i>) Num. 59/91. In the last 7 years over R\$ 250,000 were transferred.	
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Monitoring is focusing on land use and occupation in the FEP's surrounding areas due to the pressures stemming from urban growth.	We suggest monitoring issues related to fauna, flora, abiotic media, socioeconomics and the use of bodies of waters and areas that directly or indirectly affect the environmental quality of the FEP.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		38		

Name of Conservation Unit: <i>Floresta Estadual do Palmito (FEP)</i> [Palmito State Forest].
Brief details of projects funded in the Conservation Unit: <p>Ever since 1999, the research project known as “Solo Bioma” has received government funding by means of a partnership between German research institutes and the Soils Laboratory at UFPR - Brazil, through the two countries’ respective Ministries of Education, focusing on nutrient cycling and assessment of soil diversity and functions under human influence.</p> <p>In 2001, the FEP received funding from the Atlantic Rainforest Protection Program [<i>Programa de Proteção a Floresta Atlântica</i>] through an international financial cooperation agreement established between the German government, through the KfW, and the Paraná State Government, through its State Environment Secretariat, which produced a paper entitled Sustainable Tourism in Conservation Units [<i>Turismo Sustentável em Unidades de Conservação</i>] that focused solely on the FEP.</p>
SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities that live in the UC: 01 (only one person lives within the FEP)
Main economic activities in the UC – source of community income: There are no communities within the FEP.
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and Fragilities:
Use of biodiversity by the communities and other stakeholders – sustainable use and threats People from the surrounding communities have entered the FEP to extract (steal) palm hearts (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and hunt wild animals.
Main problems surrounding local chains of production Lack of opportunities, jobs and social programs.
Economic alternatives for promoting sustainability: Carry out planting and other appropriate management activities aimed at promoting the sustainability of the Juçara Palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) by planting seedlings of native species to restore degraded areas, meliponiculture, and foster tourism in natural areas.
Land tenure situation: The land is owned, as per the original land title of the FEP’s area, by a mixed capital company called <i>Ambiental Paraná Florestas S/A</i> . The IAP is negotiating an exchange of this UC’s area with other areas used for pine tree plantations. These negotiations should be implemented by the end of 2011.
Relationship between management of the UC and territorial zoning: We have noticed that in the near future the FEP will undergo pressures stemming from urban expansion in the municipality of Paranaguá. Management of the FEP has focused efforts on ensuring the conservation of the region’s environments and the Paranaguá Master Plan is currently in design stage.
Main stakeholders that play a role in managing the UC or have a potential to do so: Potential stakeholders: government institutions such as the municipal governments of Paranaguá (which has one employee available) and Pontal do Paraná as well as Commercial and Industrial Associations, Paranaguá Port, Petrobrás, NGOs and the Society for Wildlife Research and Environmental Education [<i>Sociedade de Pesquisa em Vida Selvagem e EA</i>], higher education institutions such as UFPR, PUC and FAFIPAR, and the Environmental Police Battalion, the <i>Museu de H.N. Capão da Imbuia de Curitiba</i> , amongst others.
Extent of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.):

Other relevant information:

This area has a history of intense exploitation, especially of the Juçara Palm, of logging for small-scale construction and as a fuel source, and of places that used to be occupied by residents and subsistence yam, cassava, and pineapple farming. Additionally, the Dense Lowland Ombrophile Forests are well conserved in several environments and the natural forest is undergoing different stages of natural regeneration. Some of the plant species with a significant size are *Maçaranduba* (*Manilkara subsericea*), *Guanandi* (*Callophyllum brasiliense*), *Figueiras* (*Ficus* spp) and Juçara Palm (*Euterpe edulis*), besides several species of orchids and bromeliads. Among the representative species of fauna found in this environment are the Crab-eating Fox (*Cerdocyon thous*), the Lesser Anteater (*Tamandua tetradactyla*), and the Oncilla (*Leopardus tigrinus*). Within the UC one may also find Pioneer Formation Areas with a Marine Influence (called *restinga* [or coastal plain shrubland]) with sandy soils (Spodosol) and little available water comprised of small and medium-sized plants, especially *Caúna* (*Ilex theezans*), *Cupiúva* (*Tapirira guianensis*), *Jacarandá-lombriga* (*Andira anthelminthica*) and *Canela-lageana* (*Ocotea pulchella*), as well as Pioneer Formation Areas with a Fluvio-marine Influence, characterized by mangroves and its plant species, such as: *Mangue branco* (*Laguncularia racemosa*), *Mangue vermelho* (*Rhizophora mangle*) and *Siriúva* (*Avicennia schaueriana*), in addition to the estuarine complex comprised of the Almeidas and Correias Rivers, which sets two of the protected area boundaries, and the local fauna that live in this environment. With regard to birdlife in the area, as described in the monitoring and scientific research underway since 2001, 255 different bird species were catalogued, the most abundant of which were the Grey-hooded Flycatcher (*Mionectes rufiventris*), the Blue Manakin (*Chiroxiphia caudata*) and the White-bearded Manakin (*Manacus manacus*). Other species of high ecological importance were found, such as: the Temminck's Seedeater (*Sporophila falcirostris*), the Buffy-fronted Seedeater (*Sporophila frontalis*), the Red-tailed Parrot (*Amazona brasiliensis*), the Purple-winged Ground Dove (*Claravis godefrida*), and the White-necked Hawk (*Leucopternis lecernulatus*).

Date of signature: May 2006

Name of Manager: Ozeas Gonçalves

ESEC Guaraguaçu

Name of protected area	Estação Ecológica de Guaraguaçu [Ecological Station] (EEG)	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Boundaries: to the northwest, shares border with area belonging to <i>Empresa Ambiental Paraná Florestas S/A</i> and to the southwest, with subdivided settlements close to highway PR 407 to the southwest. Its boundaries are also defined by the Guaraguaçu and Pequeno Rivers.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed Established by Decree Num. 1.230 of March 27, 1992.	Gazetted Decree Num. 1.230 of March 27, 1992
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Publicly owned – Paraná State Government – Paraná Environmental Institute (IAP).	
Management Authority	Paraná Environmental Institute (IAP).	
Size of protected area (ha)	1,150 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent: 01	Temporary
Budget	R\$: 60,000.00 (given estimated yearly minimum)	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Atlantic Rainforest Biosphere Reserve (UNESCO) through the Humans and Biosphere Program – Decree Num. 74.685 of 10/14/1974	
Reasons for designation	The Atlantic Rainforest Biosphere Reserve encompasses the UC, which is considered important for preservation as an Atlantic Rainforest Ecosystem.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	Not available	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Not available	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Starting in 1996 the EEG received government support through the Program for the Protection of the Atlantic Rainforest (<i>Pró-Atlântica</i>), which stemmed from an international financial cooperation agreement signed between the German government, through the Kreditanstalt Wiederaufbau Bank (KfW) and the Paraná State Government, through its State Secretariat for the Environment and Water Resources (SEMA). Several scientific research projects were funded through a partnership between these two governments. By means of a Rapid Ecological Appraisal and a Management Plan, surveys in the following areas were conducted: Characterization of the Vegetation, Birdlife, Mammals, Amphibians and Reptiles, Fishes, Geology, Geomorphology and Soils, and Socio-economic aspects, as well as demarcation of the area belonging to EEG, by building markers and wire fences along boundaries and by drafting a Management Plan. Also provided technical and operational staff to support all activities during the project term, in addition to purchasing materials and equipment. This partnership is scheduled to last until 12/2006.	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Preserve the biological, archeological, and cultural heritage it contains and promote scientific research activities.	
Objective 2	Preserve a sample of the Atlantic Rainforest Biome and ecosystems contained in Lowland Ombrophile Forests, including: Marine-influenced Pioneer Formations, Fluvio-marine-influenced Pioneer Formations and Fluvial-influenced Pioneer Formations.	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Hunting, illegal extraction of palm hearts, and collection of fisheries resources (crabs and oysters). These threats directly affect the habitat and food chain of the UC's biota.	
Threat 2	Occurrence of environmental hazards in Paranaguá Bay, due to the port facilities and ships that spend time moored there, which may lead to chemical spills, thus threatening Guaraguaçu River, which is directly linked to the bay. The EEG is located only 5Km from the mouth of the Guaraguaçu River.	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Enforcement within the UC and its buffer zone.	
Activity 2	Monitoring land use and occupation in surrounding area.	

Date of assessment: June 2006

Name of assessor: Ozeas Gonçalves _____

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status	The protected area is not gazetted	0		
Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1	<i>Note:</i> see fourth option for private reserves State Decree Num. 1230 Date: 27 March, 1992.	Studies are being conducted to annex surrounding areas (devolved lands) to expand the protected area significantly.
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0		
Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1	The operational structure of the enforcement mechanism relies on the environmental police and IAP officers.	Draft a schedule for implementing enforcement activities and provide staff to carry out this schedule. The main constraint is the lack of available staff to carry out these activities within the UC.
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> What happens if people are arrested?	
Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1	The operational and enforcement teams at the IAP and Environmental Police Battalion (BPAM) are technically capable of fulfilling their duties.	In order to comply with legislation pertaining to the Conservation Unit, full-time staff needs to be hired. Minimum staff is not available to enforce the law.
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0		
Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1	The Management Plan is the tool used for the proper management of the UC and lays the groundwork for compliance with the legislation pertaining to the objectives of this management category.	Throughout the last five years, more than 10 scientific research projects have been implemented within the UC, in keeping with one of its objectives.
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?	The Paraná State Government, through the IAP, is conducting assessments of neighboring areas in order to
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2	The EEG's design is fragmented and undergoes a substantial border effect, which has a direct and indirect influence on the dynamics of forest environments and fauna habitats and behavior. Since most of the boundaries are defined by the Guaraguaçu and Pequeno Rivers, they provide access for monitoring and management per se, but also for invaders to carry out improper activities.	extend the EEG's protected area. In addition to the current area of 1,150ha, throughout the next five years approximately 2,350ha of forest in advanced stages of recovery shall be added, which will mean a total of 3,500ha. This extension will join the EEG with another sustainable use UC (Palmito State Forest), which has approximately 530ha of protected area, thus comprising a micro ecological corridor with a significant role in conserving Paraná coastal plains environments.
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?	Carrying out periodic border maintenance activities, such as fixing fences and removing fallen trees.
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2	All of the EEG boundaries are known and demarcated. At the tips of the boundaries fixed markers were built out of concrete, the rivers are well known boundaries around the UC and wire fences were built on areas that share borders with private or devolved lands.	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The Management Plan has existed since 2003, but it was only homologated by the government in June of this year.	Ever since 2003 the EEG management guidelines are based on information in the Management Plan – 2003 version. The key constraint for implementing this plan is the lack of minimum staff numbers to carry out such activities and meet previously established targets.
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	IAP technical staff in charge of technical/operational as well as political/institutional issues took part in all stages of planning on management and administration of this protected area.	
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	The activities outlined in the work plan are not monitored because there is no available staff to do so.	The State Government must provide for hiring of staff and/or establish partnerships with other institutions to join efforts towards meeting planned targets.
Is there an annual work plan?	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		
<i>Planning/Outputs</i>				
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0	The information laid out in the Management Plan is needed for decision making. The research underway is being conducted by students who depend on this information to receive their university degrees.	The agency that manages the EEG should fund the implementation of scientific research projects with a focus on subjects that are considered top priorities for the EEG and relevant for management and decision making.
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
<i>Context</i>				
10. Research	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	2 scientific research projects are underway in the EEG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Biology and basis for managing the African Catfish, <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> (Burchell, 1822): a species 	A needs assessment of new studies should be carried out for the effective management of the EEG. Fields and/or subjects should be suggested to funding agencies and
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3	introduced in the Guaraguaçu River Paranaguá – PR”) – 02 doctoral theses, and; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“Ictiofauna in polyhaline, mesohaline, oligohaline, and limnatic zones of the Guaraguaçu River, Paranaguá – PR” – 01 dissertação de mestrado e 01 TCC. 	higher learning institutions.
11. Resource management	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	These requirements are known and recorded. The constraint to implementation of activities aimed at effectively managing the EEG is the lack of a full-time operational and technical staff.	The State Government must provide for hiring of such staff and/or establish partnerships with other institutions to join efforts in implementing the management plan.
Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)?	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
<i>Process</i>				
12. Staff numbers	There are no staff	0	A single employee has provided operational support to ongoing research activities, performed minor maintenance on fences and boundaries, and supported monitoring/enforcement activities in the surrounding areas along with IAP staff and environmental police, while also contributing significantly to activities related to drafting the Management Plan.	
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	<i>Inputs</i>	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	Only one employee works directly on managing the EEG. Requests for operational personnel and officers from IAP and environmental police to provide support for enforcement activities in the EEG are usually met.	
Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	<i>Process</i>	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0	The only employee is duly trained to carry out management activities in the EEG.	Periodically attend training courses in several fields of knowledge, such as: socioeconomics, environment dynamics, GIS, etc...
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0	The budget is restricted to the activities that the single employee can carry out in the EEG.	The IAP's fundraising system relies mainly on two sources, which on several occasions has hindered the EEG manager's immediate decision-making capacity. We suggest that the funds from the EEG's yearly budget be made available to the head of the UC throughout the year.
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0	Drafting the Management Plan and building facilities in the EEG were made possible due to external funds stemming from a technical cooperation agreement between the State Government and the KFW.	Establish new partnerships and draft other specific projects in order to raise funds for improving the quality of management of the protected area.
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0	The IAP's fundraising system relies mainly on two sources, which on several occasions has hindered the EEG manager's immediate decision-making capacity.	We suggest that the funds from the EEG's yearly budget be made fully or partially available to the head of the UC throughout the year.
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	The existing equipment only partially meets the needs of implementing	We suggest purchasing equipment that minimally

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1	management in the EEG.	meets the needs of research projects and environmental monitoring.
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0	Delays in obtaining necessary funding for maintenance has slowed down EEG management activities.	We suggest implementing new methods for disbursing funds.
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	Not available	
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Contact with the local population, which is quite limited, occurs during visits to the EEG surrounding areas.	Increase the exchange of information with the surrounding population so that it becomes a routine.
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	The little contact between indigenous people and the head of the EEG has hampered the exchange of information.	Increase the exchange of information with the indigenous people living in the surrounding areas.
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Contact with the local community is quite limited since there is no program for disseminating information about the EEG to this group.	Increase contacts and the exchange of information with the local community and implement participatory programs.
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment.</i> Do visitors damage the protected area? The EEG does not have facilities for public use.	Up until now visitation has been carried out in the Palmito State Forest UC, which has facilities for public use, similar environments, and lies only 5Km from the EEG.
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	<i>Possible issue for comment.</i> examples of contributions Not applicable to the EE management category, as per SNUC.	
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0	Visitation can happen in the EEG for educational/scientific purposes and no fees are charged.	Draft a Public Use Program as mentioned in the Management Plan.
If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Outputs</i>	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected Throughout the last three years, there were several occurrences of illegal extraction of native palm hearts and clear evidence of hunting of wild animals within the EEG.	Step up monitoring and law enforcement aimed at perpetrators of these acts.
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1		
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0	The number of actions that contribute directly to protecting the EEG is low.	Increase monitoring and enforcement of access routes.
Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> how does national or regional development impact on the protected area? The State Government disburses funds to the Municipality in which the EEG lies through an Ecological Value Added Tax ("ICMS Ecológico"), as defined by Supplementary Law (<i>Lei Complementar</i>) Num. 59/91. In the last 10 years over R\$ 900,000 were transferred.	This law does not oblige the municipal government to invest transferred funds on the environment. We suggest using legal instruments to make it mandatory to earmark part of these funds to the EEG.
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0	Monitoring is focusing on land use and occupation, on the <i>Juçara</i> palm,	We suggest monitoring issues related to fauna, flora,

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Planning/Process</i>	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1	<i>Euterpe edulis</i> , on wastewater thrown into the Peri River (effluents from a landfill close to the EEG), and on the physical/chemical water conditions in the Paranaguá Bay.	abiotic media, socioeconomics and the use of bodies of waters and areas that affect the EEG directly or indirectly.
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		41		

Name of the Conservation Unit: <i>Estação Ecológica de Guaraguaçu</i> (EEG).
Brief details of projects funded in the Conservation Unit: Starting in 1996, the EEG received government support through the Program for the Protection of the Atlantic Rainforest (<i>Pró-Atlântica</i>), which stemmed from an international financial cooperation agreement signed between the German government, through the Kreditanstalt Wiederaufbau Bank (KfW) and the Paraná State Government, through its State Secretariat for the Environment and Water Resources (SEMA). Several scientific research projects were funded through the partnership between these two governments. By means of a Rapid Ecological Appraisal and a Management Plan, surveys in the following areas were conducted: Characterization of the Vegetation, Birds, Mammals, Amphibians and Reptiles, Fishes, Geology, Geomorphology and Soils, Socio-economic aspects and demarcation of area belonging to EEG, by building markers and barbed wire fences along boundaries and by drafting a Management Plan. Also provided technical and operational staff to support all activities during the project term, in addition to purchasing materials and equipment. This partnership is scheduled to last until 12/2006.
SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Number of families and communities that live in the UC: 00 (nobody lives in the EEG)
Main economic activities in the UC – source of community income: There are no communities within the EEG.
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and Fragilities:
Use of biodiversity by the communities and other stakeholders – sustainable use and threats People from the surrounding communities have entered the EEG to extract (steal) hearts of palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>) and to hunt wild animals.
Main problems surrounding local chains of production Lack of opportunities, jobs and social programs.
Economic alternatives for promoting sustainability:
Status of land and ownership: 95% of the EEG's area is regulated, demarcated and belongs to the managing institution, the Paraná Environmental Institute, and the remaining 5% is comprised of land belonging to another mixed-capital institution, of which the state government owns 99% of the shares and the private sector owns the remaining 1%.
Relationship between management of the UC and territorial zoning: In the near future, the EEG will undergo pressures due to urban expansion from the municipality of Paranaguá. Management of the EEG has focused efforts on ensuring the conservation of environments in the region where the UC is located, since the Master Plan for Paranaguá is currently being drafted and should be concluded in the next three years.
Main stakeholders that play a role in managing the UC or have a potential to do so: Potential stakeholders: government institutions such as the municipal governments of Paranaguá (which has one employee available) and Pontal do Paraná as well as Commercial and Industrial Associations, Paranaguá Port, Petrobrás, NGOs and the Society for Wildlife Research and Environmental Education [<i>Sociedade de Pesquisa em Vida Selvagem e EA</i>], higher education institutions such as UFPR, PUC and FAFIPAR, and the Environmental Police Battalion, the <i>Museu de H.N. Capão da Imbuia de Curitiba</i> , amongst others.
Extent of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.):
Other relevant information: The <i>Estação Ecológica do Guaraguaçu</i> has samples of flora that is characteristic of coastal regions such as, for instance: <i>Restinga</i> [sandy coastal plain], Mangroves, and <i>Marismas</i> [salt marshes], as well as some of the last remaining areas of Dense Ombrophile Forests in well preserved Lowland formations. The presence of threatened plant species, such as, <i>Juçara</i> palm (<i>Euterpe edulis</i>), <i>Caxeta</i> (<i>Tabebuia cassinoides</i>), bromeliads and orchids, among others, which used to be abundant but are currently facing low natural stocks due to intense exploitation, are a few examples of the area's natural heritage. Among the threatened fauna are species such as the Yellow-legged Tinamou (<i>Crypturellus noctivagus</i>), the Broad-snouted Caiman (<i>Caiman latirostris</i>), the Cougar (<i>Puma concolor</i>), the Ocelot (<i>Felis pardalis</i>), the Long-tailed Otter (<i>Lontra longicaudis</i>), the Marsh Antwren (<i>Stymphalornis acutirostris</i>) and the Red-tailed Parrot (<i>Amazona brasiliensis</i>). These last two species are endemic to a quite restricted geographical area, which reinforces the importance of this conservation unit to their survival.

Date of signature: June 2006

Name of Manager: Ozeas Gonçalves

APA DA BARRA DO RIO MAMANGUAPE

Name of protected area	APA DA BARRA DO RIO MAMANGUAPE	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	<p>Boundaries: The <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i> is located in the meso-region of Zona da Mata, on the north coast of the Brazilian State of Paraíba, between the geographic coordinates of 06° 43' 02" and 06°51' 54" S and 35° 07' 46" and 34° 54' 04"W, roughly 70 km from the state capital, João Pessoa. It encompasses the estuaries of the Mamanguape, Miriri and Estivas Rivers, parts of the municipalities of Rio Tinto to the west, Marcação and Baía da Traição to the north, Lucena to the south, and, to the east, its border is the Atlantic Ocean. The APA is home to fishing and farming communities and indigenous villages.</p> <p>The main road to the APA is federal highway BR-101, which goes to Rio Tinto (where the APA begins) through Mamanguape municipality on a paved local road that joins the two municipalities. A dirt road straight off BR-101 (km 40) known as <i>Estrada do Peixe-Boi</i> goes to Campina Beach and Barra de Mamanguape, which are the most well known spots in this Unit, especially because of the Manatee Project Base run by CMA-IBAMA. This road can also be accessed through Lucena, either through Lerolândia or through the town of Rio Tinto, on a dirt road leading to Campina Beach.</p> <p>The Mamanguape River estuary's area of influence stretches from east to west and is approximately 24 km long and 2,5 km wide at its widest point, which is close to its mouth, and includes the municipalities of Rio Tinto, Marcação and Mamanguape. The estuary of the Estivas River covers the municipalities of Marcação and Baía da Traição, whereas the Miriri River estuary, the smallest of the three, covers a small stretch of the boundary between Rio Tinto and Lucena.</p>	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Established by: Presidential Decree 924 on 09/10/93
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Privately owned, including prawn farmers, sugar cane and ethanol plants, and large landowners. Additionally, 18 communities exist within the APA or in its immediate surrounding areas, including: 1 that owns its land, 6 that belong to the Indigenous Reserve and the rest are squats established decades ago.	
Management Authority		
Size of protected area (ha)	14,640 HA	
Number of staff	Full time : 05	Temporary
Budget	Roughly R\$ 36.000,00/YEAR	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	The APA was recommended as a priority area for biodiversity studies and conservation actions in Latin America (Biodiversity Support Program, 1995; Dinerstein et al., 1995).	
Reasons for designation	Besides an extensive stretch of exuberant mangroves, the APA houses remnants of Atlantic Rainforest and Restinga Forest [sandy coastal plain vegetation]. Other ecosystems present in this Unit include estuaries, lagoons and lakes, dunes, beaches, and reef formations. Several of these ecosystems are considered threatened globally, which led to the recommendation mentioned above.	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA		
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	<p>*Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment of the <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i> [Projeto Avaliação Ambiental e Sócio Econômica da <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i>], Paraíba, <u>Partner Institutions: Embrapa Meio Ambiente, IBAMA/PB, CNPq.</u></p> <p>This project, which will end next July, aims to promote environmental management of rural activities by implementing the APOIA-NovoRural System as a tool for enabling the adaptation of management strategies and the adoption of conservationist technologies. This goal must be understood by all stakeholders, from prawn farmers to sugar and ethanol plants, thus encompassing the full range of production activities that prevail in the <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i>. Moreover, given prospects for extending rural tourism and ecotourism activities in the area, such activities should be included in the assessment. Since the <i>Centro Nacional de Mamíferos Aquáticos (Projeto Peixe-Boi)</i>/IBAMA promotes a tourist</p>	

	<p>visitation program involving traditional fishermen, this activity is appropriate for assessing environmental impacts of rural/ecological tourism as an input for drafting recommendations and guidelines. The main goal of this research project is to provide environmental management tools for rural activities in the APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape/PB, thus contributing towards drafting and implementing the Management Plan through the Paraíba State IBAMA. This initiative entails assessing social, economic, and ecological profiles of the 42 municipalities that comprise the Mamanguape and Miriri River Basins, which feed the APA study area, as part of a regional assessment. A Certificate of Guaranteed Sustainability shall be suggested by IBAMA in order to add value to the products. These environmental management initiatives, eco-certification and designation of sustainable origin of products are valuable tools for organizing forms of production that focus on the special traits of local environments and communities, thus fostering more ethics and solidarity in relationships between producers and consumers. These initiatives will foster social relations that enable the inclusion of producers committed to sustainable development, which is the main management goal of Environmental Protection Areas such as Barra do Rio Mamanguape.</p> <p>*Environmental Education through Art – (NEA) Drafting and implementing the project jointly with traditional communities, the ONG MAR aims to teach Environmental Education through art and culture, so as to recover and enhance already existing culture and perpetuate traditional knowledge.</p>
List the two primary protected area objectives	
Objective 1	Conservation and preservation of the manatee habitat and species (<i>Trichechus manatus</i>)
Objective 2	Conserve important ecosystems, such as mangroves and Atlantic Rainforest
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)	
Threat 1	Prawn Farming: The construction of nurseries for farming sea prawns, which has been done in recent years without conducting Environmental Impact Assessments - EIA-RIMA(s) and without complying with the Decree that created this Unit (which still lacks a Management Plan), has led to the deforestation of several areas close to the banks of the Mamanguape River.
Threat 2	Sugar Cane: The estuary, which makes up the largest portion of the <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i> , is comprised of approximately 6,000 ha of quite well-preserved mangroves along its banks and stands as the largest stretch of mangroves in the state of Paraíba. The mangroves are one of the most well-preserved in the state, however, they are already undergoing some interference due mainly to the expansion of sugar cane plantations. In 1994, evidence of contamination from substances used in sugar cane monocultures was found in one of the estuary's tributaries. The fishermen whose livelihoods depend on this estuary have stated that fishing production has been declining due to the effect of pesticides used in cultivating sugar cane along the banks of this river. The islands and crowns are also undergoing transformations due to silting of the riverbed, which is increasingly apparent.
List top two critical management activities	
Activity 1	Prawn farming.
Activity 2	Land use and occupation, real estate speculation.

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name/s of assessor: Carla Marcon

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	Decree Num. 924 Date 09/10/1993	
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	3		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0	The UC Management Plan is in the design stage, the Steering Council has been set up and several measures have been taken with IBAMA and MPF [Federal Public Prosecutor's Office] to organize and monitor activities and use of the APA.	Publish and implement Management Plan. Conduct Federal Environmental Audit of UC and draft MPF recommendations.
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	2		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	The capacity exists, however understaffing is a serious constraint.	
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	2		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	3		
4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	Precisely. The Unit has a Strategic Planning drafted simultaneously with the Management Plan.	
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	3		
5. Protected area design	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	The Unit overlaps with indigenous areas, which raises issues about	

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1	which well-defined public policies do not exist, and political measures have not been in keeping with provisions laid out in federal laws pertaining to UCs.	
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	3		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	Boundary markers used for the physical demarcation of the APA have already been built.	Install markers jointly with INCRA, in accordance with the map's Legal Description
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	2		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		
7. Management plan Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	There is no management plan for the protected area	0	The Management Plan is currently being drafted	
	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems	2		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
Additional points <i>Planning</i>	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	+1	A participatory management initiative is underway in the UC in order to draft the Management Plan	
	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	+1		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
8. Regular work plan Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	No regular work plan exists	0	The APA has a Strategic Plan that steers all of its activities	
	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but many activities are not completed	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
9. Resource inventory Do you have enough information to manage the area? <i>Context</i>	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		
	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	2		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	2		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0	Exactly	
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being addressed	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being partially addressed	2		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0	Exactly	
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	2		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	The APA has only one Environmental Analyst [AA]. The others are involved	Negotiate the hiring of an additional environmental

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1	with routine administrative problems.	analyst. um analista ambiental
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	2		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	2		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no budget for the protected area	0		
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	2		
	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget Is the budget secure? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	2		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget Is the budget managed to meet critical management	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
needs? <i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0	Only the administrative headquarters and Visitor's Center (*) need to be refurbished.	
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	2		
	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> maintenance of equipment and facilities	1		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0	But staff is not available to render it operational.	
	There is a limited and <i>ad hoc</i> education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	2		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0	Yes, they hold a seat on the UC Council.	
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	2		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
22. Indigenous people Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Both the traditional and indigenous communities hold a seat on the APA Council	
	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0	Very much so, both in issues pertaining specifically to the community and in general issues.	
	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in the resulting decisions	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1	Total transparency	
	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1	The UC is available to take all possible measures to involve the community.	
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	The APA has a Visitor's Center building with a capacity for 400 people, however it needs to be adapted.	
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area	0	We are making efforts to establish closer ties with partners. The Paraíba State Secretariat of Tourism has a seat on the UC Council and a joint management proposal for Ecotourism in the APA	
	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	1		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected area values	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
management? <i>Process</i>	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve conflicts	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	3		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0	The Unit was undergoing a significant loss of values in general, although the activities implemented managed to thwart this process, putting it back on the path laid out in the objectives for which it was created	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	2		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	+1	Program for recovering the Riparian Forest by making changes in fines	
28. Access assessment Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	2		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	Work aimed at conservation and preservation added value to local farming activities while also attracting more tourists seeking out natural beauties	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	2		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
<i>Outcomes</i>	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	2		
<i>Planning/Process</i>	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		68		

Name of Protected Area: APA DA BARRA DO Rio Mamanguape
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION Included in the digital publication: Evaluation of Environmental Impacts for Managing the APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape [Impactos Ambientais para Gestão da APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape]
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area The boundaries of the APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape's area encompass almost the entire municipality of Rio Tinto, part of Marcação, where the indigenous villages mentioned in this study are located, and a small portion of Baía da Traição municipality to the North and Lucena to the south. The rural population in this area is spread out in small villages and townships. Intense changes in land use and tenure stemmed from the expansion of sugar cane plantations in the region, which was spurred by the Federal Government's Proálcool Program, according to the final report of the environmental and socioeconomic assessment of the Rio Mamanguape estuarine region conducted by IBAMA in 1991. Many homesteads disappeared as they gave way to sugar cane plantations (Rodovalho, 2003). The main communities shown in Figure 5, according to the study aimed at demarcating the APA, are comprised of 16 communities located in rural areas and 5 in municipal urban areas. The number of people living in the 21 communities in 2004 was 16,381, according to data provided by local health workers. Moreover, the region's migratory process has remained stable and the form of social organization adopted by communities in rural areas - or which carry out rural activities - are associations, cooperatives, or fishing communities [<i>colônias</i>]. Close to 4,500 families, with an average of 3.8 people per household, live in brick or mud and wattle houses, and most have electricity. Television, radio, and telephone are the most widely used means of communication in these homes and postal services are available in few communities. Means of transportation are precarious in the APA region. Buses are the most commonly used vehicles, although some locations do not have access to buses and thus lack any means of public transportation. The roads are in poor conditions and lack adequate maintenance, which makes it difficult for residents to circulate between communities and go to the nearest urban centers on which they depend to receive health and education services, as well as other needs. Trash is collected only in some of the urban centers and oftentimes burned or disposed of in open air dumps. Trash collection is not provided to rural communities. The water supply comes from the public system or from artesian wells. The most widely employed method of domestic water treatment is chlorination, followed by filtering and boiling. Most of the households have septic tanks, although open-air sewage disposal also occurs, both in rural and urban areas. All of the rural communities have schools, most of which are primary municipal schools providing kindergarden to fourth grade, which enables teaching literacy to most of the school aged population. Those who wish to continue their studies can take school buses to urban centers, although many students face transportation difficulties because of the long distance between the communities and the urban centers and due to the poor road conditions, which oftentimes cause serious delays in leaving from and returning to the communities. All of the communities in the study area have a low quality of living. According to a report drafted by the Rio Tinto Health Secretariat, the population's health risks are due to the lack of basic sanitation, to the mud and wattle houses, to rearing of domestic animals in the households, to the reuse of pesticide containers, to pollution from sugar cane plantation fires, and to bathing in the rivers, one of the main forms of leisure besides beaches, sports, and bars that open at night. Among the 23 indigenous villages in the Potiguara reserve, only six are located within the Barra do Rio Mamanguape APA, one (Akajutibiró - 246 indigenous people) of the 12 in Baía da Traição; another (Jaraguá - 904 indigenous people) of the two in Rio Tinto; and four (Brejinho - 287, Caieira - 365, Camurupim - 823 and Tramataia - 1009 indigenous people) of the nine in Marcação, which means a total of over 3.6 thousand indigenous people living within the APA in 2004, or 22% of the population residing in the main communities included in this study. The villages have several socio-economic characteristics and dynamics that are similar to those of traditional rural communities in the APA; the biggest difference is the federal legislation that pertains to them. For the purposes of the study on "Environmental management of rural activities in the Barra do Rio Mamanguape APA" [<i>Gestão ambiental das atividades rurais na APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i>] (see the chapter "Sustainable Development Programs for the Barra do Rio Mamanguape APA in the State of Paraíba") 18 communities were chosen among the 21 considered for the study area. In the municipalities of Baía da Traição and Marcação, the indigenous villages (five in all) were the selected communities. In Rio Tinto, Jaraguá village and 12 other communities were chosen, as mentioned above. Below we present the results of the field work carried out with the leaders of the 16 rural communities considered for this study, as well as two others that belong to the Rio Tinto urban area (Praia de Campina and Vila Veloso), which carry out rural activities that are representative of the APA and possess livelihood characteristics typical of the region's rural areas.
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses.
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats

Main problems related to local productive chains
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability
Agrarian and land tenure situation
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation
Main active/potential actors for PA management
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.)
<p>Other relevant information:</p> <p>(*) The <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i> currently has an administrative headquarters, a Visitor's Center, and one housing facility and storage room located in the urban center of Rio Tinto municipality on a 1.300 m² plot that was purchased recently. This facility has 4 computers, 1 laptop, 1 data show projector, dvd, 29" TV, 3 digital cameras; GPS, as well as appliances and furniture. The UC already has internet access and 2 telephone lines, in addition to a traveling exhibition. The buildings still need to be refurbished so that they may be used as originally intended but we are already operational.</p> <p>In addition to these buildings, the APA has 2 plots in its rural area: on the first, which has 900m², we are planning to build housing facilities for interns and technical staff, and the second has approximately 400m² and housing facilities with 3 dormitories that need to be adapted, as set out in the project sent to FNMA, and a teaching laboratory for conducting research on native species. The APA purchased for this lab a microscope, an underwater digital camera, a conventional scale and a precision scale.</p>

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: **Carla Marcon_**

