Annexes to Governance of Protected Areas—From understanding to action

Citation: Borrini-Feyerabend, G., N. Dudley, T. Jaeger, B. Lassen, N. Pathak Broome, A. Phillips and T. Sandwith (2013). Annexes to Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN; available on line at www.iucn.org/pa_governance

Annex 1. DOs and DON'Ts in recognising and supporting ICCAs

(adapted From Borrini-Feyerabend et al., Bio-cultural Diversity Conserved by Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities: Examples & Analysis, IUCN/CEESP and CENESTA, Tehran, 2010; reprinted 2012)

DOs	DON'Ts
Support the concerned communities to **document their ICCAs and make them known and appreciated,** if this is requested and/or agreed upon by them	Do not research or disseminate ICCA information without the **Free, Prior and Informed consent** of the relevant communities, as defined by them
Assist communities governing and managing ICCAs to gain **recognition of** their **land, water, and bio-cultural resource rights** (property, custodianship, use), including by supporting their claims to such rights through maps, demarcation, historical records, etc.	**Do not impose** top-down **governance regimes** upon ICCAs, including co-management/shared governance regimes; **do not acquiesce** when rights have been taken by force or ignored
Recognise the **local institutions governing the ICCAs**, while supporting them to **self-evaluate and strengthen** the **quality** of their **governance** (indicated by, for example, gender and class equity, transparency, accountability and effectiveness)	**Do not undermine or displace** functioning ICCA governance institutions **or impose** new **institutions** upon endogenous bodies and rules
Strengthen national laws and policies that **recognise indigenous peoples** and **local communities** as **legal actors** possessing **common rights**	**Do not neglect communities in State legal systems** (e.g., by recognising as legal subjects only State bodies, individuals, and corporate actors)
Demonstrate that ICCAs are **living links between biological and cultural diversity**, highlighting history, ancestral territories and cultural identity, as well as their continuing evolution and adaptation	**Do not** overtly or implicitly **promote** cultural uniformity, narrow-mindedness, intolerance, ethnic disrespect, or any type of **discrimination and prejudice**
Provide **support and backing to communities enforcing ICCA regulations**, in particular to apprehend violators and have them judged and sanctioned in **fair** and **consistent** ways	**Do not leave communities alone** to carry the **burden of surveillance** and **repressing violations**, in particular when the ICCA is striving to implement and enforce state rules
Provide means for joint, constructive **evaluation** of ICCAs by concerned communities, civil society, and government administrations, **focusing on outputs and impacts** for conservation, livelihoods, governance, and cultural and spiritual values	**Do not evaluate ICCAs** in isolation from their concerned communities **or** solely or mostly **in terms of compliance with external expectations** (e.g., types of committees, rules, and plans)
Provide **assistance in technical aspects of management**, if required and sought by the community, through respectful, cross-cultural dialogue between different knowledge systems, including mutual validation where necessary	**Do not impose management objectives**, legal categories, or **technical expertise** that undermine ICCAs' local meaning and value; do not assume that local and indigenous knowledge can only be validated by "scientific" knowledge, and not vice versa.
Help **prevent and mitigate threats** to ICCAs from outside and within the community, **including by seeking special status** for them (e.g., as off-limits to destructive activities, as "ecologically important", or as part of the national protected area system)	**Do not impose protected area status** or any other special status on an ICCA without the free, prior and informed consent of the relevant indigenous peoples or local communities as decided and controlled by them
Support local **sustainable livelihoods activities**, both those linked and not linked to the ICCAs, ensuring that distribution of benefits is equitable and that any integration with the market	**Do not** formally recognise ICCAs in ways that **diminish local livelihoods** or **support development that undermines ICCAs** (e.g., inappropriate tourism and other initiatives that see nature and culture as

economy is culturally appropriate and desired by the community	commodities)
Provide or strengthen socio-cultural, political, and economic incentives for conserving ICCAs, while seeking to maintain their **independence** and **autonomy**	Do not displace or undermine existing motivations for supporting ICCAs or make ICCAs entirely or primarily **dependent** on **outside economic incentives**
Provide special **support to young people** contributing to ICCAs and facilitate locally relevant, **culturally-sensitive health and education services** that incorporate local languages and knowledge	Do not support health and education services that are culturally insensitive, irresponsive to local contexts and livelihoods, and/or **disruptive of local identities**
Respect and strengthen **local and indigenous knowledge**; protect it against piracy and misuse; facilitate its evolution in complementary partnership with other forms of knowledge; and aim, in particular to fill gaps and to ensure that local communities are not marginalised	**Do not impose** external or "scientific" **ways of understanding and solving problems**; do not undermine customary approaches and values that provide effective contributions to the ICCA
Support **networking among ICCAs** for mutually beneficial learning and empowerment	Do not flood attention on individual ICCAs and do not overwhelm them with excessive expectations and demands
Support **respectful alliances** among indigenous peoples, local communities, human right advocates, and development and conservation practitioners	Do not pit local, **culture-based rights** and values **against human rights**, human development, or conservation aspirations with general appeal
Promote values of **community integrity** and **solidarity** and **environmental awareness and care**	Do not acquiesce to private interests over the interests of the community, nor to the imposition of decisions by force
Support conflict management and **peace and reconciliation** efforts that respect local communities and their ties to nature	Do not exacerbate **conflicts** or put communities in the frontline of conflicts

Annex 2. A group exercise to examine and discuss governance quality for protected areas

The advice that follows is not intended to be prescriptive. Different groups may approach a review of governance quality in different ways. But on the basis of the authors' experience, we recommend a fairly structured approach and offer this exercise as one way to do it.

The participants in the workshop of Phase 3 should be separated into small groups of 5-7 persons. All the groups should then be invited to carry out the exercise in parallel.

The exercise involves considering the sets of questions below and agreeing upon answers that represent – as far as possible – a consensus among the participants in the group. If the group agrees that a specific topic or issue requires some action, it should identify this.

At the end, all groups report in plenary and agree on a synthesis of their recommendations.

The exercise

Each group should begin by identifying one or two *rapporteurs* and one rotating chairperson, who will remain in charge only for the time it takes to discuss a single governance principle.

The chairperson should read each question about the principle (see below), linking it to the case of the protected areas system or individual site, as appropriate. She/he should then ask the group to clarify the question, if necessary, and to answer it in a collective way. The collective answer does not need to be such that everyone in the group agrees absolutely with it, but everyone in the group should be able to "live with the answer", and no one should be left feeling so upset that they wish to oppose the whole group. Importantly, problems and issues "**flagged for action**" should be accompanied by concrete suggestions and recommendations. Should consensus prove impossible, two or more answers could be recorded by the *rapporteurs*.

Before leaving the discussion of each principle, the group should consider expanding the questions, or developing further questions, that specifically fit the context. Whenever the group agrees that the issue is so important that something needs to be done about it, it should note an **action flag** and suggest some proposed actions.

The chairperson should remain as neutral as possible throughout, helping the group to communicate respectfully and effectively and to reach an agreement on answers and action flags. After each principle has been discussed, she/he should pass on the role to another member of the group, chosen by all. When all the principles have been discussed, the chairpersons and *rapporteurs* should together re-edit the recorded answers and action flags and compile a concise group report, including specific recommendations, for agreement by the group as a whole.

The questions

The following tables include sets of questions relating to each principle of good governance, and should be answered with reference either to a system of protected areas or to an individual protected area. The questions are meant to assist a group of concerned actors to investigate what criteria were followed in establishing the protected area (or system) and in its management. The questions are not exhaustive and only introduce some of the many issues and phenomena that can be investigated for each principle noted below. In particular, the group should be aware of country-specific values and situations and adjust its analysis to them. If the answer to a question is a clear "yes" or "no", some comments or advice are offered to the participants. *For many questions*, however, *the answer will not be a clear "yes" or "no", but "yes, but…" or "no, however…". In such cases, the user will need to combine the advice*.

Legitimacy and Voice

Question	If your answer is "yes"	If your answer is "no"
Is *knowledge about the protected area or protected area system* (e.g., its existence, location of individual elements, values, purpose, governance settings, problems, benefits) available, known and well diffused in society?	This is good, and hopefully the richness of social communication and debate is brought to bear on actual governance processes and decisions.	This is worrisome. Not knowing about protected areas is equivalent to not valuing and possibly resenting them.
Have a variety of protected area rightsholders and stakeholders— including the underprivileged and those directly depending on natural resources for their livelihoods and cultural and spiritual needs— been engaged in *planning and guiding the establishment and running* of the protected area or protected area system? If yes, through which specific mechanisms? And, do the rightsholders and stakeholders believe they have gained an effective voice?	This is good, and you can draw from such experiences and their participants to set up the multi-sectoral committee to guide the PoWPA, as recommended by the CBD. You may also re-engage in a broad stakeholder analysis to review if participating actors are indeed representative of all concerned groups in society (e.g., are women well represented? the youth? ethnic minorities? the poorest social classes? migrants?).	If no protected area-related participatory dialogue has yet happened, you may begin with a broad stakeholder analysis, from which you will identify key actors to engage. Remember rightsholders and stakeholders may need assistance and capacity building to participate effectively in guiding the governance and management of protected areas.

Are there mechanisms in place to ensure that the *representation of various rightsholders and stakeholders* in governing bodies (e.g., bodies dedicated to decision-making, advice, implementation of decisions) are chosen through legitimate processes? What are those processes?	Please consider that "voting" is not the only (and at times not the most legitimate or effective) means of choosing a representative. Every society has its ways, which should be respected and changed from within, if necessary.	You may wish to promote processes of self-organisation by rightsholders and stakeholders. This can be done (some NGOs are specialised on this type of work), but it does take dedicated effort and time.
If necessary, are there mechanisms to provide tangible and non-tangible *support for the participation* in the protected area governing bodies of all key rightsholders and stakeholders— in particular local communities and indigenous peoples?	Examine the nature of the mechanisms and whether they address the full range of actors in need and actually ensure fair and equitable access to the process.	Lack of specific mechanisms should be addressed, as it can make a mockery of participatory governance processes by effectively excluding some rightsholders or stakeholders altogether.
Is the protected area system *broadly accepted in society*, e.g., is it easier to encounter clubs of "friends of nature" than groups of organised citizens who are actively opposed to one or more protected areas?	Are the supporters of protected areas engaged in governance processes, at least as advisors?	The detractors of protected areas should be met and listened to, and they should be invited to formulate constructive proposals to address their needs in ways that are compatible with the protected area system or site.
If the country has an *action plan for implementing PoWPA*, is a diversity of actors involved, or expected to be involved, in implementing and monitoring the plan?	This is good, and such actors should also be involved in this governance assessment and evaluation.	This is wasteful, as important capacities and resources may be overlooked.

If meetings are called to discuss, plan or review a particular protected area or protected area system, are these run in a way that ensures all stakeholder groups feel *empowered to express and defend their views*?	The stakeholder groups should identify what specific conditions helped them, which may be replicated at individual protected area level.	The stakeholder groups could identify what specific conditions impeded their effective participation, and these barriers to engagement should be resolved.
Is there any effort at achieving *subsidiarity* for the protected area s or protected area system? For individual protected areas, subsidiarity would imply engaging, strengthening and assigning preferential protected area-related authority, responsibility and resources to capable local actors. For the protected area system, subsidiarity would imply engaging, strengthening and assigning as much authority, responsibility and resources as possible to capable individual protected areas rather than retaining these at central/ system level.	This is good, and likely to enhance effectiveness and efficiency; and better still if an adequate support system is also in place, in particular for matters of surveillance and prevention/repression of infractions.	The blockages should be identified, investigated and addressed. More broadly, as decentralisation and subsidiarity are bound to encounter opposition by vested interests, a broad analysis of their pros and cons could be undertaken and publicised.
Are *customary laws and institutions*— including the conservation-relevant institutions of indigenous peoples and traditional communities— recognised and respected in the country?	This is good, and dialogue between customary leaders and government institutions should be promoted in a spirit of respect and collaboration.	Dialogue between customary leaders and representatives of government institutions should begin as soon as possible.
Do indigenous peoples and local communities possess	This is a very positive entry point to recognise ICCAs	This may be the major stumbling block toward the

collective rights to the lands and water under their customary governance?	formally in the country.	effective and equitable governance of the protected area system and individual protected areas. Dialogue and progressive legislation can solve the impasse.

Are there any other questions that, in your view, should be posed to clarify whether the principle of "legitimacy and voice" has been followed in the case of your system of protected areas or individual protected area? If so, please pose and answer those questions as well.

Please also record carefully any "action flag" that you may have noted, and the agreed recommendations that the group developed about it.

Direction

Question	If your answer is "yes"	If your answer is "no"
Is there an overall strategic *vision* (broad, long term perspective) for the protected area or protected area system? Is it grounded in an appreciation of the *ecological, historical, social and cultural specifics* that characterise the country, EEZ or specific region? Is it spelled out in terms of clear and feasible objectives?	This is excellent. For a protected area system, it would be useful to develop a map and succinct summary of that vision, showing where individual protected areas are located and the strengths, weaknesses and other characteristics of the system as a whole (e.g., connectivity options).	You may wish to develop a "talking map" of the protected area system or site (e.g., a map surrounded by boxes related to, and illustrating, specific features) and promote dialogues on strengths, weaknesses and needed action. From those, an overall vision can be developed and documented.
Are protected areas **integrated into main national strategies and plans** (e.g., development, health, agriculture, disaster mitigation, responses to climate change)? Does the governmental institution in charge of PAs liaise and ensure *coherence and compatibility* with other relevant sectors (e.g., tourism, forestry, agriculture) and institutions at various levels?	It would be interesting to take the good work to the next level and examine the efficacy of inter-ministerial cooperation and the lessons thereby learned.	You may wish to promote a dialogue between the related national and/or sub-national ministries, agencies, rightsholders and stakeholders, so that points of conflicts and potential synergies are identified, discussed, understood and acted upon.
For the protected area system, is there *coherence in policy intent and direction* between levels of protected area governance? For an individual protected area, is there trust and	This is an essential element for both the governance and management of a well-functioning system	The lack of coherence should be reviewed and addressed, as it may be the cause of poor system effectiveness and more.

coherence among the actors and institutions involved in governance?		
Are there opportunities, formal or otherwise, for staff, owners and custodians of different protected areas to meet, *exchange experiences* and plan together how a protected area system, or individual protected area, should function?	Ideally such opportunities should be *regular*, including through electronic means (mailing lists, web pages, Skype calls, etc.)	Some opportunities could be promoted, at the minimum through electronic means. If there are some frequent, practical obstacles to such exchanges of experiences, some innovative ways to meet them should be explored.

Are there any other questions that, in your view, should be posed to clarify whether the principle of "direction" has been followed in the case of this system of protected areas or individual protected area? If so, please pose and answer those questions as well.

Please also record carefully any "action flag" that you may have noted, and the agreed recommendations that the group developed about it.

Performance

Question	If your answer is "yes"	If your answer is "no"
Is the protected area or protected area system *achieving its stated objectives*?	Excellent.	Consider whether certain objectives could be more easily achieved if the governance system were to be renewed and strengthened.
Is the governance of the system *responsive*, i.e., does it manage to take into account the needs of all its rightsholders and stakeholders, including the unprivileged ones (e.g., for the prevention of human-wildlife conflicts, livelihood needs, maintenance of cultural identities and practices)?	Excellent (make sure that this is confirmed by all relevant rightsholders and stakeholders).	Consider whether the unsatisfied rightsholders and stakeholders could be more or better engaged if the governance system were to be renewed and strengthened
Do people who govern and manage the protected area or protected area system have the *necessary capacities*, including the capacity to relate to others, and elicit their interest and support for protected areas? And, are there sufficient opportunities for capacity building for people who feel that need?	Excellent.	Strive to provide capacity building opportunities. Consider also whether capacities could be better supported if the governance system were to be renewed and strengthened.
Are there *sufficient resources* (financial, human, information, technologies) allocated or generated for protected areas in the country?	Excellent.	Strive to have more resources allocated, including resources from a variety of rightsholders and stakeholders. Consider whether more and/or more appropriate resources could

		be dedicated if the governance system would be renewed and strengthened.
Is the protected area or protected area system pursuing its stated objectives in an *efficient* manner, is it making a *wise allocation and use of its available resources*?	Excellent.	Promote a resource allocation analysis. And consider whether resources could be better allocated and used if the governance system would be renewed and strengthened.
Is the protected area or protected area system run in a *financially responsible* manner, which ensures *financial sustainability*?	The relevant mechanisms and results should be broadly shared within the system and among individual protected areas.	Promote a sustainability analysis. And consider whether financial sustainability could improve if the governance system would be renewed and strengthened.
Is there a management *monitoring system in place* for the protected area or protected area system? Are rightsholders and stakeholders involved? Is there assessment of performance on a regular basis?	Excellent.	A monitoring system could be set up as part of the governance assessment and evaluation under way, including indicators and methods to assess governance type and quality.
Are there processes by which *threats, opportunities and associated risks* to the protected area or protected area system are anticipated and managed?	Excellent.	This could be started as part of the wider governance assessment and evaluation.
Is the protected area or protected area system geared to ensure "*institutional learning*" (e.g., via opportunities for debate, openness to critical analyses, mutual respect, collegiality,	This is excellent. Institutional learning processes are crucial for the resilience and sustainability of the protected area or protected area system.	Promote institutional learning by a variety of assessment and evaluation exercises. Consider whether institutional learning could improve if the governance system would be renewed

systematic recording of decisions and assessment of performance, outputs and impact, feedback and adaptation)? Is new learning *incorporated into decision-making and implementation in a timely way*?		and strengthened.

Are there any other questions that, in your view, should be posed to clarify whether the principle of "performance" has been followed in the case of this system of protected areas or individual protected area? If so, please pose and answer those questions as well.

Please also record carefully any "action flag" that you may have noted, and the agreed recommendations that the group developed about it.

Accountability

Question	If your answer is "yes"	If your answer is "no"
Do decision makers about the protected areas system have *clear responsibilities*? Do they report about those to the public at large? Is there a regular and transparent system to assess whether and how responsibilities have been met? Are there feed-back mechanisms about the *ecological and social impacts* related to the protected area or protected area system decisions?	Excellent.	The ecological and social impact of protected areas should be analysed and openly discussed, and accountability mechanisms developed for the protected area or protected area system. For instance, reports and assessments can be posted on relevant web sites, where it could also be possible to upload comments and information.
Are the *integrity and commitment of all rightsholders and stakeholders* assessed, e.g., through mechanisms to ascertain whether the representatives with a governance role share information fairly and convey views effectively with their constituencies?	Excellent.	It is desirable to promote processes of stakeholder self-organisation. This can be done (some NGOs are specialised in this type of work), but it does take dedicated efforts and time.
In case of actors failing to perform with integrity and effectiveness, is there a *complaint and redress mechanism*, accessible to all, including indigenous peoples and local communities?	It is important that the existing mechanism is known to all potentially concerned actors.	If a complaint and redress mechanism does not exist, it should be developed. At the minimum, an ombudsperson could be identified who could receive complaints in a confidential way.
Are there *mechanisms to enforce protected area rules and to sanction violations*? Are those available to all protected areas in the	Excellent.	Exchanges among protected areas should be promoted so that examples of rules, sanctions, implementation

system? Are those applied in ways that are transparent and fair? Are there mechanisms to hear complaints and appeals about violations?		mechanisms and mechanisms to hear complaints and appeals are shared, discussed and learned from.
Is there a system of collecting and analysing data related to the *violations of protected area rules*, including through comparative analysis among different protected areas in the system?	Excellent. The results of comparative analyses should be incorporated in management practice.	A simple mechanism should be put in place for data collection and analysis regarding the violation of protected area rules
Does legislation ensure the *freedom and right to information* regarding the country's protected area system? Is information that is relevant to protected areas made accessible to all concerned in a timely way? Is there full disclosure of: the decisions taken; the reasons and processes by which they were taken; the methods of handling conflicts and objections; financial transactions; and all protected area system plans, budgets, reviews and other relevant documents? Can all these documents be consulted by the public?	Excellent. Consider more information avenues than the obvious and always useful dedicated web site. Make sure that the web site includes a comment/blog facility where opinions and advice can be recorded.	Engage in a communications campaign on the protected area system or site, and include in this a dedicated web-site. At each protected area level, it should be clear to all rightsholders and stakeholders when and where information is disseminated and discussed through the web site and other avenues.
Are there any other questions that, in your view, should be posed to clarify whether the principle of "accountability" has been followed in the case of this system of protected areas or individual protected area? If so, please pose and answer those questions as well. Please also record carefully any "action flag" that you may have noted, and the agreed recommendations that the group developed about it.		

Fairness and Rights

Question	If your answer is "yes"	If your answer is "no"
Is the protected area system based upon a specific *legal framework (rule of law)*? Is this framework fairly and impartially enforced?	Excellent.	Consider a process to develop and/or improve the implementation and enforcement mechanisms of such a legal framework, as much as possible drawing upon both local customary practice and international technical guidance.
Are *human rights and cultural practices* respected by the protected area system or site (e.g., no forced displacements of indigenous peoples)? Are there specific avenues for reporting related problems? Are there policies for the *compensation/ redress* of rights eventually violated?	Excellent. It should be verified that complaints about human rights violations related to protected areas can be effectively reported and redressed.	Mechanisms to identify, report and redress human rights violations should be planned and deployed.
Does the protected area, or protected area system, respect the *livelihoods and legal/ customary rights* to land and resources of local communities and indigenous peoples?	This is a fundamental indicator of equity in conservation.	Spare no effort to renew and strengthen the governance of the protected area system so that conservation can be effectively reconciled with local livelihoods and the respect of rights, and in particular the legal/ customary rights of vulnerable communities and indigenous peoples.
Are there mechanisms in place to assess and *fairly distribute the costs and benefits* of the country's protected areas? Are	Excellent. It would be good to disseminate information on such mechanisms and the lessons learned in their	These mechanisms will operate best where the governance arrangements for the protected area system and individual

there compensation and redress policies and mechanisms in case of loss of access to natural resources and displacement due to the establishment of protected areas? Are there measures in place to promote the positive impacts from protected areas and to prevent their negative impacts, especially on vulnerable people?	application.	protected areas are genuinely participatory, transparent and fair.
Are there transparent and culturally appropriate ways of resolving protected area-related *conflicts*? Are *justice and legal assistance* available to rightsholders and stakeholders in case of conflict?	The mechanisms in place should be highly valued.	The best way to put such arrangements in place would be through a wise merging of customary institutions and the modern rule of law.
Are there any other questions that, in your view, should be posed to clarify whether the principle of "fairness and rights" has been followed in the case of this system of protected areas or individual protected area? If so, please pose and answer those questions as well. Please also record carefully any "action flag" that you may have noted, and the agreed recommendations that the group developed about it.		

Annex 3. Suggested indicators for monitoring governance quality (adherence to the IUCN good governance principles listed in Table 8 of the Governance Guidelines)

(adapted from Abrams, P., G. Borrini-Feyerabend, J. Gardner and P. Heylings,
Evaluating Governance — A Handbook to Accompany a Participatory Process for a Protected Area,
Report for Parks Canada and CEESP/CMWG/ TILCEPA, 2003)

This Annex should be read in conjunction with Table 8 of the Governance Guidelines (page 59 of Guidelines no. 20). It offers a basket of options from which to draw in developing indicators that are appropriate to the particular situation. Please note these key points:

- Some indicators grouped under a heading are similar to others under a different heading. This is deliberate; they are included to show a full range of choices, but they can often be combined.

- Many options are listed, but *a few well-chosen indicators followed carefully over time* will provide a much more meaningful sense of governance quality than a large number of indicators, which may end up being poorly monitored.

- Overall, we recommend being very selective in the choice of indicators, and taking care to choose only those *indicators that are relevant to the context* and are *likely to remain monitored through time*.

- We also recommend being creative, taking inspiration from the examples provided here to elaborate *indicators that are* s*pecifically telling for your own protected area or system*, and *possibly unique to it*.

Interpreting the indicators

The indicators listed in this Annex are both quantitative and qualitative. They all, however, need to be applied with relevant definitions and easily understood scales. For instance, if an indicator seeks to establish the "extent of public appreciation for the protected area" the scale might relate to the proportion of respondents able to describe more than three benefits they receive from it. One could then note "good appreciation" for three or more benefits mentioned, "medium appreciation" for only one or two, and "poor appreciation" if no benefit at all can be described. Similarly, but adding a level of complexity, the extent of "participation in decision-making" could be measured by combining two scales: one for frequency (e.g., from "never attend decision-making meetings" to "present in all relevant meetings") and another for effectiveness (e.g., from "inconsequential" to "often determining the outcome of meetings"). In measuring the number of conflicts that have arisen, it would be important to clarify what counts as a conflict. And so on. The relevant *definition, scale and measuring method should be explicit, unambiguous and stored together with the data*.

Definitions and scope

The terms **governing institution** and/or **governing bodies** are used to indicate the organisations (e.g., boards of directors, scientific council, managing agency, steering committee) that develop and agree upon the key decisions affecting a protected area, and ensure that they are enforced. In this sense, governing bodies can be policy making, decision making, consultative, and executive organisations. The terms **rightsholders and stakeholders** are defined in the main body of the Governance Guidelines and would normally comprise all interested members of the public. We usually refer questions to **protected area**s. As appropriate, however, you may wish to extend your consideration also to territories and areas conserved in a voluntary or ancillary way.

Indicators related to the principle of Legitimacy and Voice

Social acceptance and appreciation
- extent of public acceptance and appreciation of protected areas and their governance institutions;
- number and proportion of rightsholders and stakeholders who consider that the protected areas effectively conserve the bio-cultural heritage of their region/country; support livelihoods; and respect individual and collective rights;
- number and proportion of rightsholders and stakeholders who approve the election/ selection processes and composition of the protected areas' governing bodies.

Information for rightsholders and stakeholders
- public attendance at meetings of protected areas' governing bodies is allowed and encouraged;
- existence and variety of means of communication (e.g., websites, forums, offices open to the public, social communications events) for informing the public and receiving feedback on the policies and operations of the protected areas and their governing bodies;
- existence and frequency of reports on protected areas that reach, and can be exploited by, the concerned rightsholders and stakeholders;
- amount and variety of information on the performance of the protected area accessible to all rightsholders and stakeholders;
- level of awareness and knowledge of protected areas by rightsholders and stakeholders;
- number and range of rightsholders and stakeholders who take advantage of opportunities to engage in consultation and decision-making regarding protected areas;
- level of satisfaction of rightsholders and stakeholders with the amount and quality of information provided on the performance of protected areas.

Representation of rightsholders and stakeholders

- existence of organised groups capable of representing rightsholders' and stakeholders' interests in protected areas;

- number of such organised groups that are represented in the protected areas' governing bodies;

- extent of rightsholders and stakeholders' satisfaction with the ability of their representatives to express their concerns accurately and to negotiate constructively and effectively on their behalf;

- number and severity of conflicts between rightsholders and stakeholders and the members of the governing bodies supposed to represent them;

- number and severity of challenges made to the legitimacy of a member, or of a member's representative, in the protected areas' governance bodies;

- number of claims from un-represented rightsholders and stakeholders to be members of the relevant governance bodies, and proportion of those considered to have received satisfactory answers.

Voice of rightsholders and stakeholders

- extent of support to participatory processes in consultation and decision making regarding protected areas, for instance through

  - time devoted to participatory planning, assessment and evaluation,

  - financial and material resources invested in such processes,

  - staff time dedicated to positive relationships with rightsholders and stakeholders,

  - training initiatives open to non-staff;

- existence and use of mechanism(s) for gathering protected area information and feedback directly from the rightsholders and stakeholders and, in particular, from grassroots and vulnerable groups;

- extent of participation of rightsholders and stakeholders in the generation, analysis and reporting of technical information and plans regarding protected areas;

- appreciation of local knowledge and skills by the protected area governing bodies;

- agendas of the meetings of protected area governing bodies developed collaboratively with a variety of rightsholders and stakeholders (e.g., proportion of meetings for which the agenda was collaboratively developed);

- level of rightsholders and stakeholders' satisfaction about the content of the agendas for the protected area governing bodies (i.e., extent to which they consider that their interests are being covered);

- existence and use of mechanism(s) that promote fairness in the functioning of the protected area governing bodies (e.g., a rotating chair);

- existence and use of mechanisms to handle sensitive issues and conflicts regarding the protected area (e.g., presence of mediators or of an ombudsperson who has the trust and acceptance of local interests);

- origin of technical proposals discussed at the meetings of the protected area governing bodies (proportion of technical proposals originating from the rightsholders and stakeholders themselves);

- proportion of the meetings of the protected area governing bodies that are held in locations that favour local constituencies (e.g., in remote, rural environments that concern the protected area issues under discussion versus meetings at Park Headquarters or in towns and cities);

- number of proposals initiated by rightsholders and stakeholders that managed to affect national policies or were transformed into legally-binding regulations for national or local application;

- number and range of rightsholders and stakeholders that were effectively involved in designing protected areas' governing bodies and their mandates;

- extent of protected area operations in which local rightsholders and stakeholders play an active and meaningful role (e.g., as advisors, evaluators, decision makers, staff);

- existence and types of collaboration forged by governing bodies with rightsholders and stakeholders (e.g., joint training on governance skills);

- level of rightsholders and stakeholders' satisfaction with their ability to have a say in policy-making and decision-making regarding protected areas.

Active engagement
- level of attendance at meetings of the members of the protected area governing bodies (e.g., average attendance at regular meetings over a given number of months or years);

- level of public attendance at consultative and decision-making meetings called by the protected areas governing bodies;

- existence and use of mechanism(s) developed and run by rightsholders and stakeholders to promote their internal communication, consultation and organisation relating to protected area issues that need to be negotiated, decisions that have just been taken, etc.;

- number of internal meetings initiated by the rightsholders and stakeholders in preparation for events where protected are decisions are to be discussed, negotiated and agreed upon;

- amount and type of rightsholders and stakeholders' resources committed to participating in and maintaining the governing bodies' collaborative processes (e.g., if they need to travel to a meeting, are the rightsholders/ stakeholders' representative supported even in a partial way by their own constituencies?);

- instances of constructive proposals developed and submitted to the governing bodies by the rightsholders and stakeholders themselves;

- trend in rightsholders/ stakeholders' capacity to influence decision-making about the protected areas (e.g., trends in numbers and proportion of policies and decisions the rightsholders/ stakeholders have effectively influenced);

- existence of effective examples of various types of governance for both protected areas and voluntary and ancillary conservation (including shared governance, private governance and governance by indigenous peoples and local communities).

Diversity, gender-equity, age-equity and non-discrimination
- presence of clauses and measures in protected area legislation and rules that specifically refer to diversity, gender-equity, age-equity and non-discrimination;

- existence and use of (updated) rightsholders/ stakeholders' analysis and gender and age analyses with regard to protected areas;

- number and proportion of agenda items in meetings of the protected area governing bodies that are drawn in collaboration with organisations representing indigenous peoples, women, youth and vulnerable groups;

- instances of proposals presented by (or for) indigenous peoples, women, youth and vulnerable groups that directly address their concerns;

- instances of indigenous peoples, women, youth and vulnerable groups receiving support (financial resources, training, material, technical assistance) to improve their participation in policy and decision-making forums;

- evidence of affirmative action taken to empower vulnerable groups of rightsholders in protected areas (e.g., special decision-making or advisory roles, compensation arrangements, dedicated incentives);

- proportion of protected area governing bodies' members and protected area staff positions held by indigenous peoples, women, youth and vulnerable groups;

- degree to which indigenous peoples, women, youth and vulnerable groups believe that protected area initiatives are non-discriminatory and respond, at least in part, to their own concerns.

Support to rightsholders and stakeholders' organisational capacity
- numbers of local organisations receiving organisational support (e.g., training, funding for travel) to participate in protected area governance and management operations;

- extent of support from governing bodies to rightsholders and stakeholders' organisations in the form of

    - training on protected area governance and management issues,

    - technical assistance (e.g., seconded or dedicated staff),

    - material resources,

    - financial resources;

- existence and frequency of internal meetings of rightsholders and stakeholders in preparation for negotiations over key protected area decisions;

- degree of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with the support received to organise themselves and take part in dialogue and the shaping of decisions relevant for protected areas.

Consensus orientation
- existence of protected area goals and objectives broadly agreed by all rightsholders and stakeholders;

- number and type of protected area governing bodies that have a policy and/or legal requirement to promote dialogue and use consensus processes for decision-making;

- existence and use of clear and fair procedures to guide the governing bodies in consensus processes for decision-making (who is to participate; with what status [e.g., participant, observer, facilitator]; with what responsibilities; when and where meetings are to be held;

how issues are to be discussed; how options are to be developed; how decisions are to be submitted for approval, modified, agreed upon; etc.);

- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' knowledge of consensus processes in decision-making for protected areas;
- existence and use of appropriate support for informed and effective consensus processes (e.g., relevant documents distributed in advance; maps; financial resources for travel; training opportunities; timely technical inputs; skilled facilitators);
- degree to which information provided at meetings is perceived by rightsholders and stakeholders as being balanced and impartial;
- proportion of key protected area decisions agreed upon by consensus versus the ones agreed by vote;
- effective use of (transparent) incentives to reach consensus on protected area decisions;
- degree of participant satisfaction with the consensus decision-making processes for protected areas.

Mutual respect
- existence of legal frameworks establishing clear roles, rights and responsibilities of different actors in decision-making processes regarding protected areas;
- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with the way in which protected area governing bodies relate to them (e.g., perception that they are treated with positive attitudes, consideration and respect);
- presence of effective facilitation when decisions are negotiated among rightsholders and stakeholders with different cultures, capacities and socio-political status;
- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with power sharing in protected area governing bodies (e.g., perception that they can effectively influence decisions that are relevant for themselves and for the protected areas).

Respect of agreed rules
- proportion of governing bodies' agreements (e.g., policy decisions, rule making) honoured and implemented by protected area managers, rightsholders and stakeholders;
- proportion of governing bodies' agreements rejected and/or non-implemented by protected area managers, rightsholders and stakeholders (including after an initial approval by their representative in the governing bodies);
- degree to which agreements are *perceived* by protected area managers, rightsholders and stakeholders as being generally honoured or generally rejected/ non-implemented;
- extent of rightsholders' and stakeholders' resources committed to supporting and implementing governing bodies' decisions and rules;
- number of protected area governing bodies' meetings or activities boycotted or disrupted by complaints regarding the legitimacy of the governing processes and interventions;
- number of land, water and natural resource use conflicts resolved using the governing bodies' own conflict resolution mechanisms;
- degree to which rightsholders and stakeholders perceive that the decision-making by the protected area governing bodies is unduly influenced by external forces (e.g., by

politicians, the private sector, donors, international lobbying, confrontation strategies by the loudest stakeholders);

- trends in number of confrontational strategies (e.g., strikes, demonstrations, civil disobedience) employed by rightsholders and stakeholders to advance their interests vis-à-vis the protected area;

- total number and proportion of protected area decisions affected by rightsholders and stakeholders through ;

- proportion of rightsholders and stakeholders who believe they can better influence the protected area governing bodies through their own engagement and collaboration as opposed to confrontation;

- proportion of rightsholders and stakeholders who honour commitments because they participated in shaping them and not only because of fear of repression and sanctions;

- proportion of rightsholders and stakeholders satisfied with the governing bodies' ability to honour commitments.

Subsidiarity
- existence of nested governance institutions for the national protected area system, sub-national levels and individual protected areas, which allow for (different) decisions to be taken at different levels;

- the degree to which protected area system shows a tendency to decentralise, delegate or devolve decisions as capacities increase at the lower levels;

- the number and proportion of key protected area decisions that are taken at the lowest level deemed compatible with required capacities;

- the degree to which local rightsholders and stakeholders consider that they are able influence the protected area decisions though the governance institutions that are closest to them.

Indicators related to the principle of Direction

Vision
- existence of a strategic vision (broad, long-term perspective) for the protected areas, coherently translated into clear conservation objectives;

- use of the vision statement as part of the operations of the governing bodies;

- concrete support publicly harnessed by the protected area for the attainment of its vision;

- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' knowledge and approval of the vision statement for the protected areas of concern to them;

- existence of a shared perspective about what constitutes "appropriate, effective and equitable governance" for the protected area among the governing bodies and the key rightsholders and stakeholders.

Values

- existence of, and respect for, a number of agreed values reflected in the strategic visions for protected areas, their governance institutions and conservation in general;
- level of understanding and satisfaction of the agreed values among the members of the governing bodies, and among rightsholders and stakeholders in general.

Appreciation of complexities

- evidence that the strategic vision and conservation objectives agreed for the protected areas are based on an appreciation of the ecological, historical, social and cultural complexities relevant to each context;
- evidence of flexibility and fine-tuning of the rules and regulations applicable to different contexts.

Coherence between practice and values

- number of complaints to governing bodies or ombudspersons because the protected area governing bodies have not respected the guiding values that appear in their charter, and/or in the relevant national policies and constitution;
- degree of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with the consistency between the stated protected area values and practice.

Compatibility and coordination

- level of coherence and compatibility between the protected area stated obligations and practice; the policies, plans and obligations of other levels and sectors in the landscape/ seascape; and national and international obligations in general (including CBD PoWPA);
- degree of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with such coherence and compatibility;
- number of complaints to governing bodies or ombudspersons pointing to a discrepancy between the way the protected area is governed and managed and local, national and international policies and obligations (including CBD's PoWPA).
- existence of institutional analyses that reviewed the compatibility between the way in which protected areas are governed and managed and local, national and international policies and obligations;
- frequency of governing bodies' decisions supported, overruled or contradicted by other bodies at lower or higher level or by those with overlapping jurisdictions;
- existence of joint initiatives between the protected areas and other entities and actors at local, national and international levels (e.g., cross-border initiatives, projects with private businesses and community organisations, and inter-sectoral dialogue with forestry, mining, health, employment, tourism, fisheries agencies);
- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with the protected area governing bodies' ability to coordinate with other relevant actors.

Policy Direction

- existence of policy statements and decisions directly addressing the key issues of concern for the protected areas and, in particular, for contentious issues (e.g., conservation priorities; relationship with commercial interests and extractive industries);
- consistency between such policy statements and decisions and actual budgetary allocations and management practice;
- degree of satisfaction of rightsholders and stakeholders with the clarity and consistency of policies and decisions about the protected areas.

Adaptive management

- extent of attention and resources provided by governing bodies to research, inventories, planning, outreach, enforcement, monitoring, evaluation and problem-solving activities;
- existence of management activities that respond to, and aim to satisfy, both conservation and sustainable livelihoods objectives, and possibly objectives related to other social values and goals;
- evidence of timely and effective decision making by the protected area governing bodies in response to new information (e.g., rightsholders' and stakeholders' consultations, alarming new data, new environmental hazards, socio-economic problems);
- existence and implementation of a risk management strategy (or at least some analysis, discussion and adoption of measures) to prevent and/or respond to threats to the protected areas.

Champions and innovations

- evidence that "champions" and new ideas and initiatives are emerging and/or are being fostered, nurtured and valued as part of protected areas' governance and management processes;
- existence of specific initiatives and mechanisms (e.g., studies and research results that lead to new management decisions, social communication events, inclusion of new rightsholders in the governing bodies) that demonstrate the active (and not only reactive) role of the protected area governance institutions with respect to social, economic and ecological challenges.

Indicators related to the principle of Performance

Management effectiveness

- degree of implementation of planned activities, including for:
    - governing practice and institutions (e.g., for rightsholders' and stakeholders' participation in decision making, integration of traditional ecological knowledge);
    - building capacities;
    - improving infrastructure;
    - generating revenues and resources;
    - developing partnerships (e.g. with resource user communities, private businesses, local authorities);

- fostering social communication at various levels (e.g. promoting dialogue before developing new regulations);

- enforcing agreed rules while promoting adaptive management and governance;

- carrying out specific activities as detailed in the management plan;

- managing conflicts, as necessary;

- degree to which the management objectives for the protected areas are being met;
- degree to which the stated vision of the protected areas is being achieved.

A learning culture for policy and practice
- existence of mechanisms that promote change in protected area policy on the basis of lessons learned from experience, and evidence of their effective use;
- existence and use of rules for the management practice of protected areas' governing institutions that promote learning from experience;
- existence of programmes to promote collaborative learning and cross-fertilisation in governing and managing protected areas, e.g., regional information sharing, national and international peer exchanges, linkages with institutions with similar challenges in other sectors;
- number and nature of learning tools being used, e.g., exchange visits, staff refresher courses, national conferences;
- number and nature of learning partnerships created or adhered to by the protected areas.

Effective advocacy and outreach
- evidence of interaction between the protected area governing institutions and outside allies, such as supporters within higher governing bodies who can assist in meeting the protected areas' objectives;
- proportion of success of lobbying efforts by the protected areas governing bodies (e.g., decisions favourably influenced);
- evidence of positive change in protected area appreciation as a direct result of social communication and outreach activities.

Responsiveness
- number of governance changes made by the governing bodies in response to inquiries and reasonable demands expressed by rightsholders and stakeholders (e.g., improved consultation in policy and decision-making processes);
- number of management changes made by the governing bodies in response to inquiries and reasonable demands expressed by rightsholders and stakeholders (e.g., regarding rules of access to resources, harvesting quotas, employment opportunities)
- evidence of unresolved complaints and public criticism of governing bodies for not providing timely and effective response to inquiries and reasonable demands expressed by rightsholders and stakeholders;

- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with the protected area governing bodies' capacity to respond in a timely way and effectively to inquiries and reasonable demands.

Effective use of institutional and technical capacity

- evidence of carrying out strategic planning process for the protected areas, and using their results;
- evidence that an up-to-date and effective management plan is in place for the protected area and is available and being used;
- existence of appropriate protected area infrastructures and resources;
- level of satisfaction of protected area staff (including decision-makers and managers) with
    - their own ability to perform their roles and meet their responsibilities,
    - the quantity and quality of contributions they receive from other staff,
    - the capacity building support they receive,
    - the procedures by which their performance is evaluated ;
- existence and use of performance promotion mechanisms (e.g., social and financial rewards);
- existence and use of conflict resolution mechanisms;
- evidence of the governing bodies' ability to attribute roles and responsibilities wisely, promote effective performance, handle sensitive issues and manage conflicts.

Efficiency and financial sustainability

- proportion of annual budget allocated to fixed costs (e.g., salaries, rents) versus variable costs (e.g., supplies and equipment, travel expenses, revenue generating initiatives);
- proportion of annual budget allocated to operating costs (e.g., salaries, rents supplies and equipment, travel expenses, revenue generating initiatives) versus capital costs (e.g., buildings, infrastructure);
- proportion of annual revenue earned directly by the protected area (e.g., from fees and licenses, local services, exclusive grants, in-kind contributions);
- existence and use of self-financing mechanisms to cover *in toto* or in part the costs of i) information, consultation and decision-making processes; ii) management processes, including maintenance operations; iii) monitoring, evaluation and reporting; iv) other needed activities;
- trends in time needed by the protected area governing bodies to reach agreement on controversial decisions;
- effective use of incentives and disincentives to promote the enforcement of decisions and rules;
- trends in infractions of protected area rules and regulations;
- proportion of budgetary expenditures dedicated to enforcement costs;
- cost comparisons for similar activities as carried out by other protected areas;

- expert certification of the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of protected area spent resources.

Social sustainability and resilience
- number of years the protected areas have existed and their governing bodies have been functioning;
- existence of a governing institution with legal mandate and/or solid social support (legitimacy) for each protected area in the system;
- trend in legislation or policy that act to strengthen (or weaken) the protected areas (possibly as a response to rightsholders' and stakeholders' advocacy initiatives);
- number and type of threats and attacks that the protected areas have been able to endure and survive (e.g., political sabotage, perverse incentives, reductions in financial support, natural disasters);
- instances of rightsholders and stakeholders taking direct responsibility for significant initiatives (e.g., organising meetings of the governing bodies; restoring sites; investing resources in surveillance operations);
- level of dependence of protected areas upon outside interventions (e.g., funding to carry out management operations, technical support to execute planned activities);
- existence and implementation of a risk management strategy (or at least some analysis, discussion and adoption of measures) to prevent and/or respond to threats to the protected areas;
- instances of remarkable capacity and flexibility demonstrated by the protected areas' governing bodies (e.g., in rapidly experimenting with, and adopting novel solutions to problems);
- level of shared awareness of sensitive issues and quality of communication among protected areas staff, rightsholders and stakeholders.

Indicators related to the principle of Accountability

Integrity and commitment
- members of the protected area governing bodies and staff carry out their duties with probity, impartiality and good will;
- rightsholders and stakeholders respond to requests for help and/or carry out unpaid services and/or go beyond the call of duty in support of protected areas;
- rightsholders and stakeholders spontaneously organise initiatives, provide information and ideas and offer material and financial resources in support of protected areas.

Transparency and access to information
- existence and use of laws and regulations guaranteeing public access to information about the functioning and results of the protected areas and their governing bodies;

- existence and use of mechanism(s) to ensure that all members in the governing bodies receive information on time (e.g., technical reports, information about forthcoming issues to be discussed and decided upon);

- level of rightsholders' and stakeholders' satisfaction with information on protected areas (this includes its timeliness, relevance, comprehensiveness, accuracy, reliability and ease of understanding and use);

- existence and frequency of complaints about poor access to information and lack of transparency in decision making regarding protected areas;

- use of technical information by rightsholders, stakeholders and members of the protected area governing bodies in their proposals and arguments;

- open discussion of protected area-related issues within civil society and/or the media;

- level of public awareness about what is at stake in decision-making about protected areas; which processes and institutions can exert influence; who is responsible for what; and how people can be made accountable.

Clarity and appropriateness of roles and responsibilities
- existence of documents describing the purpose and expected functioning of the protected area (e.g., a vision, a list of specific objectives, a management plan, a set of rules for operations) and adherence to them in implementation and practice;

- existence of documents (e.g., mandates, memoranda of understanding, contracts) establishing the scope of authority and responsibilities and the specific roles and lines of reporting for the protected area governing bodies and staff;

- degree of recognition and understanding among the rightsholders and stakeholders regarding their own roles, rights and responsibilities towards the protected area, including conservation and sustainable use issues (e.g., exact timing and levels of allowed uses of resources, sharing of tourism revenues), and procedural issues (e.g., meetings of governing bodies, conflict resolution mechanisms);

- degree of consistency between the views of the protected areas governing bodies and rightsholders and stakeholders at large on issues concerning the rights and responsibilities of each party;

- extent to which the roles, rights and responsibilities agreed to be held by the protected area governing bodies and by rightsholders and stakeholders at large are being carried out and honoured;

- satisfaction of members of the protected area governing bodies and rightsholders and stakeholders at large about the fairness, appropriateness and feasibility of the roles, rights and responsibilities assigned to each party.

Reporting system and responsiveness to public concerns
- existence and use of mechanism(s) for reporting to overseeing bodies and the public at large about relevant protected area decisions and management operations;

- level of satisfaction of overseeing bodies about the submitted quality and timeliness of reports;

- degree of satisfaction among rightsholders, stakeholders and the general public about the quality and timeliness of protected area information communicated to them;

- acknowledgement by protected area governing bodies of specific concerns and demands voiced by rightsholders, stakeholders and the media;

- extent of appropriate responses provided by protected area governing bodies to the specific concerns and demands voiced by rightsholders, stakeholders and the media;

- existence and effective operation of reporting mechanisms for holding decision-makers accountable.

Resource allocation

- correspondence between actual allocation of financial and human resources and the allocation budgeted in governance decisions and management plans;

- level of investment dedicated to make protected area information accessible to rightsholders, stakeholders and the public in general.

Performance evaluation and reporting

- existence and use of protected area evaluation procedures (e.g., for management effectiveness and governance quality);

- existence and use of clear performance evaluation criteria, mechanisms and procedures (including feedback) for the protected area governing bodies and staff;

- degree to which rightsholders and stakeholders are involved in the performance evaluation (e.g., in its design, information generation, analysis, validation, presentation, and decisions on corrective action) and/or know about it;

- existence of occasions and avenues (e.g., regular meetings, dedicated web sites) where performance records are made accessible and information can be solicited;

- length of time the performance evaluation programme has been operating (continuity versus spot-checking);

- degree to which positive corrective action is taken (e.g., changes made to plans, programmes or decisions) taken as a result of performance evaluations.

Rewards and sanctions

- existence of concrete and appropriate rewards and sanctions to compensate good or discourage negligent performance by the protected area governing bodies and staff, and to secure respect for agreed rules;

- use of rewards and sanctions in consistent ways responding to fair assessment of behaviour and met or unmet responsibilities;

- existence of communication avenues (e.g., regular meetings, web sites) where performance records can be made accessible and questions and issues can be raised.

Feedback
- existence of cases in which civil society groups and the media have openly congratulated and rewarded, and/or questioned, the protected area decision makers and managers on the basis of performance information available to them;
- existence of cases in which civil society groups and the media managed to affect protected area decisions or rules on the basis of performance information available to them.

Independent institutions for accountability
- existence of one or more independent institutions (e.g., ombudsperson, human rights commission, auditing agency) with the authority and capacity to oversee and question the action of the protected areas' governing bodies and staff;
- existence of reports including recommendations and operating orders from such institutions;
- extent of proper follow-up to such reports on the part of the protected area governing bodies and staff.

Indicators related to the principle of Fairness and Rights

Equitable distribution of costs and benefits
- specific mention of 'equity' as a core value in governing protected areas;
- existence and use of a regulatory framework defining property, access and use rights to natural resources within protected areas;
- existence of specific mechanisms designed to compensate for protected area-related costs incurred by rightsholders and stakeholders(e.g. compensation payments, alternative areas for the exercise of rights, access to alternative sources of livelihoods or incomes) ;
- degree to which rightsholders and stakeholders perceive that protected area decision-making processes are fair;
- degree to which rightsholders and stakeholders consider that the distribution of the costs and benefits of establishing and managing the protected area were or are fair.

Safeguarding local livelihoods
- extent and distribution of the social, cultural and economic impact on livelihoods (of establishing and managing protected areas;
- number of initiatives with protected area-related support geared to enhance the livelihoods of local rightsholders and stakeholders (e.g., subsidised tree-planting in buffer areas, jobs for local residents, training and credit for local income generation initiatives);
- trends in poverty and vulnerability related to the presence of protected areas;
- extent of local in-migration or out-migration related to the presence of protected areas;
- extent to which rightsholders and stakeholders impacted by protected areas receive fair compensation (e.g., specific resource use quotas and licenses, concessions, permits, access and land use agreements, a proportion of protected area revenues).

Dignity and decency
- existence of specific codes of conducts to safeguard human rights in protected area operations;

- instances and reports of people (including transgressors of protected area rules) that have been treated harshly, humiliated or exposed in cruel and culturally inappropriate ways;

- instances of specific complaints by human rights organisations (e.g., because of forced or uncompensated resettlement of protected area residents);

- evidence of sanctions and reparatory measures in response to the above.

Fairness in dealing with staff and temporary employees
- correspondence between performance evaluation results and rewards and sanctions offered to staff and temporary employees;

- instances of protest for unfair treatment of staff (e.g., discrimination in hiring and promotions, uncompensated overtime).

Rule of law
- existence and accessibility of written rules and regulations for protected areas;

- existence of enforcement mechanisms to ensure that such rules are respected impartially and consistently, including for repressive and punitive actions for violators;

- existence of fair judgement and appeal mechanisms for the transgressors of the protected area rules and regulations;

- degree to which relevant actors (including human rights groups) perceive the protected area governing bodies as applying the "rule of law";

- complaints about social discrimination in the hearing and judgements related to the protected area rules and regulations;

- statistical analyses of protected area rule offenders and related sanctions (e.g. ,comparative number of repressive and punitive actions taken towards different rightsholders and stakeholders with respect to the same number and type of infractions).

Respect of substantive rights
- acknowledgement of existing legal and customary rights to land, water and natural resources affected by the establishment and management of the protected areas, including individual rights of landowners and collective rights of resident indigenous peoples and local communities;

- existence and completeness of lists of rightsholders and related claims (legal and/or customary) to land, water and natural resources in protected areas and evidence of providing meaningful answers to them;

- evidence of efforts and due process to recognise and redress past neglect of substantive rights resulting from the establishment of protected areas;

- level of rightsholders and stakeholders satisfaction with the way past neglects of substantive rights have been redressed;

- trends in tenure change regarding land, water and natural resources within and in the surroundings of the protected areas;

- trends in livelihoods related to land, water and natural resources within and in the surroundings of the protected areas;

- trends in conflicts related to poor recognition of rights in protected areas.

Respect of procedural rights
- evidence of appropriate information sharing and consultation with affected rightsholders and stakeholders prior to them being impacted by the establishment and management of protected areas;

- existence of freedom of association and guaranteed freedom of speech, including with regard to protected area issues;

- level of organisation of rightsholders, including in national networks and federations, and their ability to take part in national governance processes for protected areas systems;

- presence and use of fair conflict management practices and non-discriminatory methods of recourse to justice in cases about protected areas,

- extent to which such recourse to justice incorporate local and traditional means and institutions;

- evidence of efforts and due process to recognise and redress past procedural injustices resulting from the establishment of protected areas;

- level of rightsholders and stakeholders satisfaction with the way past procedural injustices have been redressed and the way current conflicts are being managed and solved.

Human rights
- presence of clauses and measures in protected area legislation and rules that specifically refer to human rights;

- existence and accessibility of associations and organisations—including UN-associated organisations — devoted to the respect of human rights in the country;

- level of organisation of protected area rightholders and stakeholders to take part in national processes to uphold and defend their human rights;

- instances of complaints regarding violations of individual and collective rights, and gender equity values, in establishing, governing and managing protected areas.

Rights of indigenous peoples
- presence of clauses and measures in protected area legislation and rules that specifically refer to the rights of indigenous peoples;

- level of organisation of indigenous peoples, including in national networks and federations, to take part in national processes to uphold and defend their rights;

- level of public awareness of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the country and, in particular, level of awareness among the policy makers and the members of the governing bodies and staff of the protected areas;

- stringent requirement and specific processes to ensure that any proposed resettlement of indigenous peoples related to government-established protected areas is carried out exclusively on the basis of their Free, Prior and Informed Consent.

Active engagement of rightsholders and stakeholders
- evidence of rightsholders and stakeholders engaged in policy development for protected areas;

- existence of legal options that enable rightsholders and stakeholders to engage in establishing, governing and managing protected areas;

- trends of official recognition of voluntary conserved areas (ICCAs and private), from informal to full legal recognition;

- presence of a National Registry for Voluntary Conserved Areas (ICCAs and private);

- trends in voluntary conserved areas (ICCAs and private) that are documented, mapped and registered in dedicated national or international registries.