

## ANNEX 11 – Individual METTS 13-26

ARIE de Manguezais da Foz do Rio Mamanguape.....	125
APA Delta of Parnaíba .....	134
APAE Reentrância Maranhense .....	143
Araí-Peroba RESEX.....	153
Caeté-Taperaçú RESEX .....	163
Chocoaré-Mato Grosso RESEX .....	172
Cururupu RESEX .....	180
Delta of Parnaíba RESEX .....	189
Gurupi-Piriá RESEX.....	198
Mãe Grande RESEX .....	207
Maracanã RESEX .....	216
São João da Ponta RESEX .....	225
Soure RESEX .....	234
Tracuateua RESEX.....	243

ARIE de Manguezais da Foz do Rio Mamanguape

Name of protected area	<i>Área de Relevante Interesse Ecológico de Manguezais da Foz do Rio Mamanguape</i> [Mangroves in the Mamanguape River Mouth Area of Relevant Ecological Interest]	
Location of protected area (A Figure of the ARIE is available at CSR/IBAMA – Maps for All Project)	Boundaries: the <i>ARIE de Manguezais da Foz do Rio Mamanguape</i> is located in the meso-region of Zona da Mata, on the northern coast of the Brazilian state of Paraíba, roughly 70km from the state capital, João Pessoa, in the municipality of Rio Tinto. It covers an area of 5,721.07 ha of mangroves, as well as reefs, sandbanks and islands, within the mouth of the Mamanguape River. 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. 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.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed	Established by Presidential Decree num. 91.890 of 11/05/85
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	Owned by the Federal Government	
Management Authority	IBAMA	
Size of protected area (ha)	5,721.07 HA	
Number of staff	Full time: 01	Temporary
Budget	R\$ 0	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)		
Reasons for designation		
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	Conservation and preservation of the mangrove ecosystem	
Objective 2		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	<b>Prawn farming:</b> 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	<b>Sugar Cane:</b> 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	Deforestation	

Name/s of assessor: Carla Marcon

Date of assessment: **May 2006**

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. 91.890 Date 11/05/85	
	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	Exactly. 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		
	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		
	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		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 APA to draft the ARIE's 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, including the ARIE	
	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		

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		
	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  Are the staff managed well enough?	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0	0 No staff is allocated to the ARIE, the head of the <i>APA da Barra do Rio Mamanguape</i> is in charge of the UC and the staff takes care of its area.	1 Negotiate the hiring of an additional environmental analyst.
	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		
	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		
	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	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		

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 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		
	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		
	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	Very much so, both in issues pertaining specifically to the community and in general issues.	
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	Total transparency	
<i>Outputs</i>	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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
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	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	
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		
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	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	
Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives?	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		
	<i>Outcomes</i>	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact		
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	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
Are the available management mechanisms working to control access or use?	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		
	<i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives		
29. Economic benefit assessment	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	
Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities?	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		
	<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)		
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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
<i>Planning/Process</i>	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		56		

APA Delta of Parnaíba

Name of protected area	APA Delta of Parnaíba	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Piauí, Ceará and Maranhão - coast	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed: 08/28/96	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)		
Management Authority	IBAMA	
Size of protected area (ha)	313.800 HA	
Number of staff	Permanent: 3 Environmental Analysts	Temporary
Budget		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)		
Reasons for designation		
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	Design Management Plan for PA	
Objective 2	Install Consultative Council	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Predatory fishing	
Threat 2	Shrimp farming	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Lack of physical and functional infrastructure	
Activity 2	Lack of financial resources	

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name/s of assessor: Marcio Barragana** \_\_\_\_\_

\* 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		Consultative Council; management plan
	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		
	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		Expand and train staff and consultative council
	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		Design PA 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		Conduct studies for adjustments and expansion of PA
	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		
	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		Inform consultative council; conduct campaigns and finalize PA
	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 to be prioritized
	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	Lack of annual financial 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		

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		Conduct studies and contact research institutions
	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	Lack of resources from Toba to Oraci	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		Attempt to relocate staff from other areas; outsource
	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 is small but with good technical level	Recycle 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		Attempt to approve resources from other sources, through projects and agreements
	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		Increase inflow of foreign funds
	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		Ensure resources for equipment and facilities
	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		Develop and implement projects of Environmental Ed. in APA
	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	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		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	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		Install 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		
	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		
	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		Install consultative council; regulate activity; management plan
	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	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
help protected area management?  <i>Outputs</i>	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		
	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	The PA is an APA	
	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		
	There is some <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
<i>Planning/Process</i>	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		<b>33</b>		

APAE Reentrância Maranhense (Maranhão Recess)

Name of protected area	APAE Reentrância Maranhense (Maranhão Recess)	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)		
Management Authority	SEMA	
Size of protected area (ha)	2.680.193,2 ha	
Number of staff	Permanent	
Budget	R\$ 96.000,00	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	RANSAR ranch	
Reasons for designation	Relevance of ecosystems	
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	Unknown	
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA	Unknown	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Control and inspection activities	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Discipline soil use and occupation	
Objective 2	No compromising of biocenoses of marine and fluvial-marine ecosystems	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Predatory fishing – carried out by vessels in and outside of state	
Threat 2	Use of mangrove wood for coal and other uses	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Inspection of fishing boats from other states	
Activity 2	Coal activities	

**Date assessment carried out: June 2006** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name/s of assessor: Inácio Amorim Ribeiro**

\* 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	Carried out according to legislation	Management plan consultative council
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		

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		
	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		
	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		
	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		
	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		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		



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 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	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		

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  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		
	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 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?	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		

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		
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	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		
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	
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	
<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		
	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
TOTAL SCORE			29	

Name of Protected Area: APAE of Reentrâncias Maranhense (Maranhão Recess)
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: There is a monitoring Project for migratory birds which is carried out by the federal university of Maranhão.
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area Not yet identified
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Artisanal fishing Subsistence agriculture Ecotourism  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. The municipalities inserted in the APA in government social programs The HDI is low Pressure on natural resources
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Communities live off the use of natural resources available, which jeopardizes the sustainability
Main problems related to local productive chains Lack of associativeness Exploration through dispatching system, resulting in high dependence of intermediaries Low appreciation of production
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Encourage creation of associations Sustainable use of natural resources Implementation of environmental awareness programs, particularly regarding the use of available resources
Agrarian and land tenure situation There are large rural areas, public lands, lands occupied by traditional peoples, federal government lands
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation They interface because in 2004 the state established the zoning of the coast to identify potential areas for agriculture, shrimp farming, and fishing
Main active/potential actors for PA management Universities Port Authority Municipalities Attorney General's Office
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) Most often the level is fishing colonies
Other relevant information: Areas of major strategic relevance, because this is the entrance door in Brazil for migratory birds. Better structuring is necessary

Date assessment carried out:

Name of assessor: **Inácio Amorim Ribeiro**

## Araí-Peroba RESEX

Name of protected area	Araí-Peroba RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use		
Reasons for designation			
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	PNRA/INCRA		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Disorganized occupation of PA environments		
Threat 2	Predatory fishing		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Share responsibilities		
Activity 2	Control of water mirror and area adjacent to PA		

**Date assessment carried out: June 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Mônica Pinheiro IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA**

\* 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		Management plan and demarcation of protected area
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		



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		
	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	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	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
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 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	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	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		
	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		
	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		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is equipment 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		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		

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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
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		
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		
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		
	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		
	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		
	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		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>49</b>	

Name of Protected Area: Araí-Peroba RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 900 families 9 communities
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc) Naval carpentry. Confection of fishing gear
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents conflict due to disorganized occupation of surrounding communities
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council in the process of creation
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 7 community associations 1 fishermen colony

Other relevant information:

The area has the following management instruments implemented:

- 1 – Community base association
- 2 – Registration bank
- 3 – Utilization plan

And the following in the process of creation:

- 1 – Deliberative council

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor: Mônica Pinheiro - Head of Arai-Peroba RESEX –  
Contact – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

## Caeté-Taperaçú RESEX

Name of protected area	Caeté-Taperaçú RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use		
Reasons for designation			
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	PNRA/INCRA		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Occupation of mangrove areas around PA		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Inspection of PA environment		
Activity 2	Share responsibilities		

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Waldemar Londres Vergara Filho  
IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA**

\* 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		Management plan, physical demarcation and signaling with plates
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		

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		
	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	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	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
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 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	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	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		
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		

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		
	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		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	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		
<i>Process</i>	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	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		
<i>Process</i>	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	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	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		
<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		
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions?	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		
<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		

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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
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		
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		
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		
	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		
	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		
	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		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>38</b>	

Name of Protected Area: Caeté-Taperaçu RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation Project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 39 riparian and insular communities 6,000 families (approximately)
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming Capture of sururu and mussels (small scale) Capture of oysters and shells (small scale)
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license - SEAP – etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc) Naval carpentry. Confection of fishing gear
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial stage of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents “great conflict” due to disorganized occupation of urban nucleus of municipality (which does not present a Master Plan) causing strong anthropic pressures around this PA.
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council created awaiting Ordinance to be implemented (with 23 institutions)
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 30 associations 1 fisherman colony
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan And in the process of creation: 1 – Deliberative council

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: Waldemar Vergara Londres Filho - Chefe da RESEX Caeté-Taperaçu  
Contato – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)



**Chocoaré-Mato Grosso RESEX**

Name of protected area	Chocoaré-Mato Grosso RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use		
Reasons for designation			
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	SDS/CEX/MMA/PNRA/INCRA		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Disorganized occupation of communities		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Management of social actors		
Activity 2	Inspect water mirror of PA		

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Emerson Austim Napomuceno - IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA**

\* 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		Create deliberative council, design Management Plan, and perform demarcation of area
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		

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		
	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	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	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
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 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	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	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		
	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		
	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		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is equipment 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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		
	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		50		



## Cururupu RESEX

Name of protected area	Cururupu RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)	Boundaries: Cururupu and Serrano municipalities of Maranhão		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed March 2003	Established 06.02.2004	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	UNIA lands "pretence" owners		
Management Authority	CNPT/IBAMA-Maranhão		
Size of protected area (ha)	107.000 ha (mangrove)		
Number of staff	Permanent: 1	Temporary: 2	
Budget			
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Resex		
Reasons for designation	Traditional populations and natural resources		
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	Sustainable use of natural resources		
Objective 2	Protection of mangroves (enq 1º ecosystems)		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Increase of tourism		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Overfishing in all regions of the State		
Activity 2	Non-demarcated boundaries		

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Kátia Barros (CNPT/IBAMA-MA)**

\* 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	Created through decree 06/02/2004	
	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	We are in the stage of discussion and design of utilization plan A	
	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	Staff is trained but resources are insufficient for requirements	
	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	In design of use and management plan, it was taken into account	
	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	Design enables forming a corridor with other 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	Contact with navy on this regard	
	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	Under design	
	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	Lack of resources and structure	
	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	Great amount of research, little systematized	
	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		
	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 is no specific staff for PA	
	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		
	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		
	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		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		

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 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	AVV Program (Adults/Children)	
	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	There are no indigenous populations in the 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		

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	Considering that management is beginning	
	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		
	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 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 are no 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		

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		
	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		
	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			32	



Name of Protected Area: Cururupu RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: There are no major projects There were: Ambientla management projects in Cururupu islands Design of biological and social-economic report of Resex Leadership training Financing: IUNC-NC Project Protecting Habitats of Migratory Birds 1st stage accomplished – with financing survey : TNC - Brasil
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 3,000 families 15 communities/islands
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Fishing (fish, shrimp) Crab picking (smaller scale)  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. There are no begginers of vegetables and fruit production, etc. 14 out of 15 communities have energy generated by diesel oil, have no treated water, and 30% have no license documents
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Predatory fishing and overfishing - carried out mainly by other actors Mangrove used with responsibility and in sustainable manner by residents Large owners turning their eyes to region
Main problems related to local productive chains Region is rich which has led to overfishing Primary form of marketing centered on intermediary
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Adding value to fishing products Solidarity in marketing (eliminating intermediary) with structure
Agrarian and land tenure situation Federal union owns most of the lands but there are pretense owners of 4 islands
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Still underdevelopment
Main active/potential actors for PA management CNPT/IBAMA-MA Association of Reserve (residents) City Hall Agenda 21 Trade Union of Fishers and Rural Workers Attorney general
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) Fishermen trade union – Organized Association of Residents that includes the 15 communities Group by communities
Other relevant information: Deliberative council in stage of formalization Management Plan under design Search for partnerships to structure Association and DC

Date assessment carried out: May 2006  
Name of assessor: Kátia Barros (CNPT/IBAMA-MA\_

### Delta of Parnaíba RESEX

Name of protected area	Delta of Parnaíba RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed 1998	Established: 2000	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)	27.000 ha		
Number of staff	01		
Budget			
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)			
Reasons for designation			
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	Ensure self-sustainable exploration and protection of natural resources		
Objective 2	By extraction population of area		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Erosion and landfill of rivers		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Lack of financial resources		
Activity 2	Lack of staff		

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Deolino Moura 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		
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		
	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?	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		
<i>Context</i>	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
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		
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		
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>				
13. Personnel management	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
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>				

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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		
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		

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 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		
23. Local communities  Do local communities resident or near the protected area have	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	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		
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		
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		
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		
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		



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	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		
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		
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		
<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		
	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				

Name of Protected Area: Delta of Parnaíba Marine Resex
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area:
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area ± 500 Residents ±2000 users
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities Fishing – Crab picking and fishing, subsistence agriculture
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 Presence of Intermediaries
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Oyster production Ecotourism Honey production
Agrarian and land tenure situation Not solved yet. There are some squatters in area
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation
Main active/potential actors for PA management Residents Users NGOs, municipal, state, and federal partners
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) There is a minimum level of organization but it is necessary to strengthen these associations for co-management with PAs
Other relevant information:

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: Deolindo Moura Neto

## Gurupi-Piriá RESEX

Name of protected area	Gurupi-Piriá RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use		
Reasons for designation			
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	SDS/CEX		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Use of poison in rivers		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Inspection of water mirror		
Activity 2	Management of actors involved		

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name/s of assessor: Waldemar Londres Vergara Filho - IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA

\* 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		To create deliberative council and management plan
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		

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		
	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	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	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
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 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	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	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		
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		

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		
	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		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
<i>Process</i>	There is adequate equipment and facilities	3		
19. Maintenance of equipment	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
Is equipment adequately maintained?	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		
<i>Process</i>				
20. Education and awareness programme	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
Is there a planned education programme?	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		
<i>Process</i>	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	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
Is there co-operation with adjacent land users?	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		
<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		
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions?	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		
<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		



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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
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		
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		
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		
	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		
	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		
	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			36	

Name of Protected Area: Gurupi-Piriá RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: –SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House –PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 44 communities 6000 fishermen
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming Capture of sururu and mussels (small scale) Capture of oysters and shells (small scale)
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license - etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc) Naval carpentry. Confection of fishing gear
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents conflicts due to disorganized occupation of urban nucleus of municipality, causing strong anthropic pressures around this PA.
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council in initial stage of creation
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 1 fishermen colony 24 community associations
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor: Waldemar Vergara Londres Filho - Head of Gurui-Piriá RESEX  
Contact CNTP – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

## Mãe Grande RESEX

Name of protected area	Mãe Grande RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use		
Reasons for designation			
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	FNMA/SDS/CEX/INCRA		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Disorganized occupation of urban nucleus		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Inspection of water mirror		
Activity 2	Management of social actors		

**Date assessment carried out: June 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Flávio Cerezo - IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA**

\* 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		Management plan, physical demarcation and signalling/plates
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		

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		
	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	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0		
Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?  <i>Inputs</i>	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	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
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 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	There are no staff	0		
Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?  <i>Inputs</i>	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		
	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		
	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		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is equipment 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		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		

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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
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		
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		
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		
	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		
	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		
	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			42	

Name of Protected Area: Mãe Grande-Curuçá Marine RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation Project - IBAMA Participatory Management Project – FNMA Uça-Crab Project – CEPNOR/IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 3,000 families (approximately) 52 communities (riparian and insular)
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming Capture of sururu and mussels (small scale) Capture of oysters and shells (small scale)  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license - etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats –Food – sustainable use –Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats –Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use –Income generation – sustainable use –Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc) Naval carpentry. Confection of fishing gear
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents “great conflict” due to disorganized occupation of urban nucleus of municipality (which does not present a Master Plan) causing strong anthropic pressures around this PA.
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council created, with 27 institutions)
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 14 community associations implemented (various fishing segments) 1 fishermen colony
Other relevant information: – –The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan 4 – Deliberative council

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor: Flávio Lúcio Cerezo - Head of Curuçá RESEX  
Contato – CNTP – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

## Maracanã RESEX

Name of protected area	Maracanã RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		Temporary: yes	
Budget	(+ personnel costs)		
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)			
Reasons for designation			
Brief details of World Bank funded project or projects in PA	ARPA		
Brief details of WWF funded project or projects in PA			
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	SDS/CEX/PNRA/INCRA		
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Real estate speculation		
Threat 2	Predatory fishing		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Use of fishing resources		
Activity 2	Basic sanitation		

**Date assessment carried out:** May 2006 \_\_\_\_\_

**Name/s of assessor:** Emerson Austim Nepommenco - IBAMA/CNTP/Belém-PA

\* 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		Creation of deliberative council and management plan
	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		
	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		
	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 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 Does the protected area need enlarging,	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0		
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
corridors etc to meet its objectives?  <i>Planning</i>	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 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		
	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		
	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  Do you have enough information to	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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		
	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? <i>Process</i>	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		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		



Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is there enough training for staff? <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  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		
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	There is no education and awareness programme	0		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	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		
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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
	Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	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 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 being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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 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			54	

Name of Protected Area: Maracanã RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation Project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 15 communities 5.000 fishermen
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license - etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc)
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents many conflicts of interest between PA and adjacent areas
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council created and in implementation stage
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 1 fishermen colony 25 community associations 1 crab pickers association
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: Emerson Astin Nepopoceno - Head of Maracanã RESEX  
Contato – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

### São João da Ponta RESEX

Name of protected area	São João da Ponta RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		2 temporary	
Budget	R\$	(+ personnel costs)	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)			
Reasons for designation			
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	SDS/CEX	PNRA/INCRA	
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Lack of demarcation		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Urban nucleus		
Activity 2	Share responsibility with other actors		

**Date assessment carried out: June 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Flávio Cerezo - IBAMA/CNTP/Belém-PA**

\* 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		Management plan; demarcation of unit
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		
	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?	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 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		
	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? <i>Process</i>	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		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is there enough training for staff?  <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  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		
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	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
maintained? <i>Process</i>	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		
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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
24. Visitor facilities Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough? <i>Outputs</i>	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		
	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 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 being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
	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	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
use? <i>Outcomes</i>	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		
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		
<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		
	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			37	

Name of Protected Area: São João da Ponta RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation Project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 13 communities 600 families
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming  Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license – etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc)
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents conflict due to disorganized occupation with communities in adjacent area
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council created and in implementation stage
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 7 community associations 1 fishing association 1 fishermen colony
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan

Date assessment carried out: June 2006

Name of assessor: Flávio Lúcio Cerezo - Head of São João da Ponta RESEX  
Contato – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

**Soure RESEX**

Name of protected area	Soure RESEX		
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)			
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree	
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)			
Management Authority			
Size of protected area (ha)			
Number of staff		1 temporary	
Budget	R\$	(+ personnel costs)	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)			
Reasons for designation			
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	SDS/CEX	PNRA/INCRA	
List the two primary protected area objectives			
Objective 1	Environmental protection		
Objective 2	Social inclusion		
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)			
Threat 1	Predatory fishing		
Threat 2	Pressures in adjacent area		
List top two critical management activities			
Activity 1	Management plan		
Activity 2	Physical demarcation and plates		

**Date assessment carried out: May 2006**

**Name/s of assessor: Marcos Antônio Solimões**

**IBAMA/CNPT/Esritório de Soure**

\* 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		Management plan and demarcation of area
	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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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 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		
	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		
	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		
	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		
	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? <i>Process</i>	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		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is there enough training for staff?  <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	<b>0</b>		
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	<b>0</b>		
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	<b>2</b>		
	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There is little or no equipment and facilities	<b>0</b>		
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	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	<b>0</b>		
Is equipment adequately maintained?  <i>Process</i>	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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		
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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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  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 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 being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
	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	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
use? <i>Outcomes</i>	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		
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		
<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		
	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			37	

Name of Protected Area: Soure RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – ZERO HUNGER PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 13 communities 400 families – approximately 1,300 persons registered
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc)
Agrarian and land tenure situation In stage of sending “GRPU” for effective request of right of use and of Marine Lands of area Final design of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Still presents conflict due to land issue in region of conflict of interests between PA and adjacent areas
Main active/potential actors for PA management There is a deliberative council with 19 institutions including most of the community base, local governmental institutions (municipal, state, and federal) and non-governmental Created, implemented and in stage of consolidation (in 2nd mandate)
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 15 associations created and implemented with community committees 1 fishermen colony
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan 4 – Deliberative Council

Date assessment carried out: May 2006

Name of assessor: Marcos Antônio Solimões - Head of Soure RESEX  
Contato – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)

## Tracuateua RESEX

Name of protected area	Tracuateua RESEX	
Location of protected area (country and if possible map reference)		
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)		By decree
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)		
Management Authority		
Size of protected area (ha)		
Number of staff	1 permanent	
Budget	R\$	(+ personnel costs)
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	Sustainable use	
Reasons for designation		
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	IBAMA	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Environmental protection	
Objective 2	Social inclusion	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	Predatory fishing	
Threat 2	Mangrove cutting	
List top two critical management activities		
Activity 1	Inspection of water mirror	
Activity 2	Integrated management	

**Date assessment carried out:** July 2006

**Name/s of assessor:** Maria Liberalina Fontes - IBAMA/CNPT/Belém-PA

\* 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		Implement management
	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		Lack of fixed demarcation and management plan
	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		Lack of staff for implementation
	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		Lack of financial resources
	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		
	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		
	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 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		Lack of financial resources
	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		
	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		
	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		
	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?  <i>Process</i>	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		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
Is there enough training for staff?  <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	<b>0</b>		
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	<b>0</b>		
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	<b>0</b>		
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	<b>0</b>		
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	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	<b>0</b>		
Is equipment adequately maintained?  <i>Process</i>	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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		
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	There are no visitor facilities and services	0		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
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 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 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 being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	0		
	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	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		

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next Steps
use? <i>Outcomes</i>	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		
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		
<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		
	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			35	

Name of Protected Area: Tracuateua RESEX
Brief detail of projects funded in Protected Area: SDS/CEX/MMA Project – RESEX Fisherman House PNRA/INCRA Project Implementation project - IBAMA
<b>SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION</b>
Number of families and communities living in Protected Area 36 communities 1,500 families
Main economic activities in PA – source of income of communities crab picking, fishing and shrimp farming
Social vulnerability (food security, social benefits) and weaknesses. Low value added to products Low level of social organization Deficient registration of professionals (fishing license etc)
Use of biodiversity by communities and other actors – sustainable use and threats Food – sustainable use Ornaments and handicrafts – sustainable use and threats Construction of fishing tools – sustainable use Income generation – sustainable use Medication and charms – sustainable use Still “sustainable use” because they are used in small scale. Problems: reptiles, mammals, and birds
Main problems related to local productive chains Low level of value added product regarding dependence of methods of capture, protection and marketing. Subject to external market agents.
Economic alternatives to promote sustainability Growing stingless bees Handicraft Community based-ecotourism Mariculture (oysters and mussels) Live pharmacy Products and sub-products derived from fish (fish skin, smoked, stuffed etc) Carpentry. Confection of fishing gear
Agrarian and land tenure situation Initial phase of demarcation map
Relationship between PA management and territory demarcation Presents conflict due to disorganized occupation of surrounding communities
Main active/potential actors for PA management Deliberative council created and in the implementation stage
Level of social organization – communities (cooperatives, associations, fishing communities, etc.) 1 fishermen colony 15 community associations
Other relevant information: The area has the following management instruments implemented: 1 – Community base association 2 – Registration bank 3 – Utilization plan

Date assessment carried out: July 2006  
Name of assessor: Maria Liberalina Fontes - Head of Tracuateua RESEX  
Contato – CNPT – Belém - (91) 3224-5899 (258)