Assessment Framework and Criteria

For

Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE) of National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries in India

2020-21

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

NAME OF THE PROTECTED AREA

1. Context

CONTEXT				
1.1 Are the values of the site well documented, assessed and monitored?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Values not systematically documented, assessed or monitored.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Values generally identified but not systematically assessed and monitored.	Fair (Score 5)			
Most values systematically identified and assessed and monitored.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All values systematically identified and assessed and monitored.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Values would also include geo-morphological, historico-cultural and faunal and floral species.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Gazette Notification of PA, 2. Management Plan, 3. Scientific information (through research publications/ popular articles/ reports) on biodiversity values, 4. Website mentioning the values of the site, 5. Working Plan, 6. Any other relevant document				

CONTEXT				
1.2 Are the threats to site values well documented and assessed?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Threats not systematically documented or assessed.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Threats generally identified but not systematically assessed.	Fair (Score 5)			
Most threats systematically identified and assessed.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All threats systematically identified and assessed.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: This assessment should be based on number, nature and extent of threats. Threats within and outside PA should both be considered. Impacts, if any on the population abundance of key species may be indicated in the remarks.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. No. of villages/ human settlements, 3. Human and livestock populations in and around PA, 4. Developmental projects, 5. Any other relevant document				

CONTEXT				
1.3 Is the site free from human and biotic interference?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
The site has extensive human and biotic interference.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
The site has some human and biotic interference.	Fair (Score 5)			
The site has little human and biotic interference.	Good (Score 7.5)			
The site has no human and biotic interference.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: This assessment should be based on existence of human settlements/ villages; livestock grazing, cultivation, encroachments etc., resource extraction/ livelihood dependence of local communities and should reflect the overall interference due to all the above factors. Number and size of human settlements/ enclaved villages and their impacts on the site may be indicated in the Remarks.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. No. of villages/ human settlements, 3. Human and livestock populations in and around PA. 4. Details of village been relocated from the core area, 5. Status of Forest Rights Act implementation including formation of committees like FRC, SDLC, DLC receipt and disposal of claims with respect to area, 6. Any other relevant document				

2.   Planning

PLANNING				
2.1 Is the site properly identified (NP/WLS) and categorized (in terms of zonation) to achieve the objectives?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Site not identified correctly or categorized.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Site identified correctly but not categorized.	Fair (Score 5)			
Site identified correctly but not systematically categorized.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Site identified correctly and systematically categorized with proper zonation plans.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Management prescriptions for various zones (Core, Buffer, Tourism and **ESZ** etc.) may be carefully assessed.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Notification on the core area; buffer zone, in case any of these are not yet approved, the copies of the proposals may be collected, 3. **ESZ Notification,** 4. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.2 Does the site have a comprehensive Management Plan?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No relevant Management Plan in place.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Management Plan exist but not comprehensive.	Fair (Score 5)			
Site has a comprehensive Management Plan.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Site has a comprehensive, science based Management Plan prepared through a participatory process.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Is the Management Plan consistent with WII Guidelines or not? The extent to which the concerns of the stakeholders, if any have been incorporated in the Management Plan may be commented upon.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The approved Management Plan, 2. In case it is not available, then Annual Plans, 3. Evidence of consultation with stakeholders while preparing Management Plan, 4. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.3 Is the Management Plan routinely and systematically updated?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No process in place for systematic review and update of Management Plan.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Management Plan sometimes updated in adhoc manner.	Fair (Score 5)			
Management Plan routinely and systematically updated.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Management Plan routinely, systematically and scientifically updated through a participatory process.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The assessment take into account the copies of mid-term review of Management Plan				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Period of Management Plan, 2. Report on Mid-term review of Management Plan, 3. Evidence of involvement of stakeholders while revising Management Plan, 4. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.4 Does the management plan elaborate on safeguarding the threatened biodiversity values?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
The plan does not safeguard the threatened biodiversity values.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
The plan safeguards a few threatened biodiversity values.	Fair (Score 5)			
The plan safeguards a large number of threatened biodiversity values.	Good (Score 7.5)			
The plan safeguards all threatened biodiversity values.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Remarks need to elaborate on the kind of safeguards and how they work or are intended to work				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Species/ Ecosystem based protection plan for protection of threatened biodiversity, 2. Management Plan, 3. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.5 Are stakeholders given an opportunity to participate in planning?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Little, if any opportunity for stakeholder participation in planning.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Stakeholders participate in some planning.	Fair (Score 5)			
Stakeholders participate in most planning processes.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Stakeholders routinely and systematically participate in all planning processes.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The result of participation must show in the field and not merely reported as a routine exercise. Further, is there a system/scope of putting the draft Management Plan in Public Domain in place?				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Details of Stakeholder committee, 3. List of meetings and minutes on various management issues conducted with range of Stakeholders, 4. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.6 Are habitat restoration programmes systematically planned and monitored?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Habitat restoration programmes are entirely adhoc.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Limited planning and monitoring programmes are in place for habitat restoration.	Fair (Score 5)			
Habitat restoration programmes are generally well planned and monitored.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Habitat restoration programmes are thoroughly planned and monitored.	Very good (Score 10)			

Explanatory note: This assessment should be primarily based on habitat management programmes in relation to habitats for species that are threatened (IUCN categories), are habitat specialists, subjected to seasonal movements, wide ranging with emphasis on the breeding and rearing habitat and may include factors such as food, water, shelter (all connotations). Habitat structure, composition, unique patches of vegetation and sensitive sites, sources of water and their distribution are integral. Corridors within buffer zone are critically important. For example, all riparian habitats. Have these been addressed? Is there a planning process in place? What is the extent of 'invasive species in the Site? Are there any measures to reduce/ remove them? Have these been successful?

Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Habitat management plan, 3. Evidence of regular monitoring of various habitats, 4. Any other relevant document

PLANNING				
2.7 Does the site has an effective protection strategy?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Site has no protection strategy.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Site has an adhoc protection strategy.	Fair (Score 5)			
Site has a comprehensive protection strategy but is not very effective.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Site has a comprehensive and very effective protection strategy.	Very good (Score 10)			

Explanatory note: This assessment takes *inter-alia* into account the nature of threats, the number and location of patrolling camps and foot and mobile patrolling, needs that relate to available manpower, terrain difficulties, practicability of area coverage, readiness to contain specific threats with necessary support and facilities. Is there any coordination with other wings of the Forest Department/ Police/ Customs etc.? Are these effective?

Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Protected Plan, 3. A map showing the location of patrolling/ anti-poaching camps and strategies for these efforts, 4. Details of intelligence network and system of information flow, 5. Offence Register, 6. Any other relevant document

PLANNING				
2.8 Does the management plan integrate the site into a wider ecological network/ landscape following the principles of the ecosystem approach?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
The plan does not integrate the site into a wider network/ landscape.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
The plan makes some limited attempts to integrate the site into a network/ landscape.	Fair (Score 5)			
The plan integrates the site generally quite well into a network/ landscape.	Good (Score 7.5)			
The plan fully integrates the site into a wider network/ landscape.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Assessment needs to consider the scope of opportunities on the landscape scale that exist. Consider whether any attempts have been made and what are these? Have all the important corridors been identified? What actions are planned/implemented for their security? Have the Forest Working Plans and Forest Development Corporation Plans within the identified landscapes taken cognizance of such new requirement? What kind of relationship exists with the District Administration and other Line Departments? Does the Site get any funds from these agencies?				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Documentation/ Map on the linkages with neighboring forest divisions 3. Any other relevant document				

PLANNING				
2.9 Is there a mechanism to manage the protected area to adapt to climate change and DRR to increase its resilience?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
There is no mechanism to manage the protected area to adapt to climate change and DRR to increase its resilience	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Groundwork in process to develop mechanism of assessing likely impacts of climate change and DRR	Fair (Score 5)			
Preliminary actions initiated to assess likely impacts of climate change and DRR, but not translated into management plans	Good (Score 7.5)			
Mechanism has been institutionalized through management plans, to manage the protected area to adapt to climate change and DRR to increase its resilience	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The evaluator should look the mechanism of adaptation to avoid fire, flood, disaster etc.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Description of the site in State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC), 2. Integration of Climate Action Plan with Management Plan 3. List of innovative activities adapting to Climate Change, 4. Any other relevant document				

3.   Inputs

INPUT				
3.1 Are personnel adequate, well organised and deployed with access to adequate resources in the site?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Few, if any, personnel explicitly allocated for PA management.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some personnel explicitly allocated for PA management but not systematically linked to management objectives.	Fair (Score 5)			
Some personnel explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Adequate personnel explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: This assessment should *inter-alia* be based on number of personnel allocated for attainment of PA objectives at the Range, Round, Beat and Patrolling camps levels or as relevant to the needs (sanctioned posts *vis- a- vis* existing personnel and needs beyond the sanctioned strengths. It is possible that posts have last been sanctioned several years back that do not now account for the current needs)				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Number of sanctioned staff (cadre wise), no. of staff in place and the existing vacancies and age of staff, 3. Any other relevant document				

INPUT				
3.2 Does the site have trained manpower resources for effective PA management?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Very few trained officers and frontline staff in the site.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Few trained officers and frontline staff, who are posted in the site.	Fair (Score 5)			
A large number of trained officers and frontline staff are posted in the site.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All trained managers and frontline staff posted in the site.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Indicate % of trained staff in various categories. i.e. Higher Management: ACF/ DCF/ CF/ CCF; Frontline Staff: Range Officer; Beat Officer; Forest Guard; Casual Daily Labour (CDL); Others.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Number and details of staff trained in wildlife management, 2. Interaction with frontline staff posted in the site, 3. Any other relevant document				

INPUT				
3.3 Are resources (vehicle, equipment, building, technology etc.) adequate, well organised and managed with access to adequate resources?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Few, if any, resources explicitly allocated for PA management.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some resources explicitly allocated for PA management but not systematically linked to management objectives.	Fair (Score 5)			
Some resources explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Adequate resources explicitly allocated towards achievement of specific management objectives.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: These form a variety of resources. These may be segregated into immovable (structures) and movable categories and each further may be considered under the essential and desirable categories. It is best to start with what are the minimum needs to attain each objective, what is available and manner of use/deployment. The proportions of the 'essentials' and 'desirables' along the importance gradient of objectives would serve as pointers for score categories. Specific remarks would be vitally important.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The list of vehicles/ field equipment/ buildings/ **technology for both protection and for ecological monitoring (MSTRIPES, APPs etc.)** 2. Details of sanctioned resources and available resources, 3. Any other relevant document				

INPUT				
3.4 Are resources (human and financial) linked to priority actions and are funds released timely?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Resource allocation is adhoc, funds are inadequate and seldom released in time and not utilized.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some specific allocation for management of priority action. Funds are inadequate and there is some delay in release, partially utilized.	Fair (Score 5)			
Comprehensive planning and allocation that meets the most important objectives. Generally funds released with not much delay and mostly utilized.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Comprehensive planning and allocation of resources for attainment of most objectives. Funds generally released on-time and are fully utilized.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Obtain details of funds released by MoEFCC and their utilization by site in the last 3 years and indicate them under 'Remarks'. Also comment on the problems associated with funds and their mitigation.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The details of funds released by Central Govt. and their utilization for the last three years, 2. The details of funds released by State and their utilization for the last three years. 3. Details of funds through other sources (Departmental fund/ foundations), 4. Any other relevant document				

INPUT				
3.5 What level of support is provided by other institutions?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
External Institutions contribute nothing for the management of the site.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
External Institutions make some contribution to management of the site but opportunities for collaboration are not systematically explored.	Fair (Score 5)			
External Institutions contributions are systematically sought and negotiated for the management of some site level activities.	Good (Score 7.5)			
External Institutions contributions are systematically sought and negotiated for the management of many site level activities.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Details of contributions External Institutions such as Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), NGOs any other such bodies				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The information on details of such Institutions working in the area and type of support they are providing, 2. Any other relevant document				

INPUT				
3.6 Does PA manager considers resources (human and financial) to be sufficient?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Resources insufficient for most tasks.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Resources sufficient for some tasks.	Fair (Score 5)			
Resources sufficient for most tasks.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Resources are in excess for most tasks.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Evaluation based on AFS, regular transfer and posting of staff				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Discussion with PA Manager, 2. Assessment of sanctioned, released and utilized budget, 3. Any other relevant document				

## 4.	Process

PROCESS				
4.1 Is PA staff performance management linked to achievement of management objectives?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No linkage between staff performance management and management objectives.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some linkage between staff performance management and management objectives, but not consistently or systematically assessed.	Fair (Score 5)			
Performance management for most staff is directly linked to achievement of relevant management objectives.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Performance management of all staff is directly linked to achievement of relevant management objectives.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Has the PA staff received award/ appreciation from any agency in the last 3 years?				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The details of staff working in the area for a long period and have received their next promotion with information on whether promotions are linked with the performance of the staff. 2. List of staffs who have received awards/ appreciation from any agency in last 3 years, 3. Any other relevant document				

PROCESS				
4.2 Is there effective public participation in PA management?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Little or no public participation in PA management.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Opportunistic public participation in some aspects of PA management.	Fair (Score 5)			
Systematic public participation in most aspects of PA management.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Comprehensive and systematic public participation in all important aspects of PA management.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Participation would include Conservation & awareness programmes, Census operations, Intelligence gathering, Forest fire control etc.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Details of support received from local communities in PA management, 2. Various workshops and meetings organized in and around PAs, 3. Any other relevant document				

PROCESS				
4.3 Is there a responsive system for handling complaints and comments about PA management?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No systematic approach to handling complaints.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Complaints handling system operational but not responsive to individual issues and limited follow up provided.	Fair (Score 5)			
Coordinated system logs and responds effectively to most complaints.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All complaints systematically logged in coordinated system and timely response provided with minimal repeat complaints. OR Complaint mechanism exists but no complaints received in last three years	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Number of queries made and response thereof under the Right to Information (RTI), Act in the last 3 years may be compiled				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Information about handling of complaints/ comments etc. and their disposal system 2. Complaint registers maintained at PA, 3. Any other relevant document				

PROCESS				
4.4 Does PA management addresses the livelihood issues of resource dependent communities especially of women?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No livelihood issues are addressed by PA management.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Few livelihood issues are addressed by PA management.	Fair (Score 5)			
Substantial livelihood issues are addressed by PA management.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Livelihood issues of resource dependent communities especially women are addressed effectively by PA managers. OR There is no dependency on the PA resources by the local communities	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The information/ documentation on work done to address livelihood issues of resource dependent communities – eco-development works. Results of eco-development activities and other initiatives undertaken by the management for assisting the local communities.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Details of employment provided by the PA to local communities in last 3 years, 2. Details of finance mobilization thru SHGs and types schemes implementation thru SHGs, 3. Any other relevant document				

PROCESS				
4.5 Does the site have a mechanism for cross-sectoral/ inter-sectoral linkages for effective management of the PA				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
The site has no system or mechanism in place for cross-sectoral/ inter-sectoral linkages with other departments.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
The site has a system for cross-sectoral/ inter-sectoral linkages with other departments but not effective	Fair (Score 5)			
The site has a system for cross-sectoral/ inter-sectoral linkages with other departments but it is partially effective	Good (Score 7.5)			
The site has a system, which is institutionalized for effective management of PA	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The assessment should be based on checking of all schemes/ programme of the various agencies integrated for PA management				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Details of scheme/ programme running with various agencies during last 3 years, 2. Any other relevant document				

5.   Output

OUTPUT				
5.1 Is adequate information on PA management publicly available?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Little or no information on PA management publicly available.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Publicly available information is general and has limited relevance to management accountability and the condition of public assets.	Fair (Score 5)			
Publicly available information provides detailed insight into major management issues for most PAs or groups of PAs.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Comprehensive reports are routinely provided on management and condition of public assets in all PAs or groups of PAs.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Does the Site has a website? If yes, is it comprehensive, well-managed and periodically updated?				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Website, 2. Social media, 3. Awareness raising publications, 4. Copies of the coverage of the protected area and its various initiatives in local press if any., 5. Any other relevant document				

OUTPUT				
5.2 Are visitor services (tourism and interpretation) and facilities appropriate for the relevant protected area category?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Visitor services and facilities are at odds with relevant PA category and/or threaten PA values.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Visitor services and facilities generally accord with relevant PA category and don't threaten PA values. OR The geography and the location of the PA does not warrant any visitor facility at the site	Fair (Score 5)			
All visitor services and facilities accord with relevant PA category and most enhance PA values.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All visitor services and facilities accord with relevant PA category and enhance PA values.	Very good (Score 10)			

Explanatory note: Include the existence and quality of visitor and interpretation centers, including skills and capabilities of personnel manning these, site related publications, films, videos; arrangements of stay (including places serving refreshments and food owned and managed by site), watch towers and hides including safety factors, vehicles assigned for visitors including riding elephants, if any and their deployment, drinking water, rest rooms, garbage disposal, attended and self-guided services in the field, visitor feedback on the quality of wilderness experience. Details of numbers of visitors/ tourists(both domestic and overseas) coming in the last 3 years and the revenue earned may be compiled

Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. Tourism Plan, 3. Details of facilities provided to the visitors.4. Nature Interpretation Centre, 5. Any other relevant document

OUTPUT				
5.3 Are research/ monitoring related trends systematically evaluated and routinely reported and used to improve management?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Little or no systematic evaluation or routine reporting of trends.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some evaluation and reporting undertaken but neither systematic nor routine.	Fair (Score 5)			
Systematic evaluation and routine reporting of management related trends undertaken.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Systematic evaluation and comprehensive reporting of trends undertaken and attempts made at course corrections as relevant.	Very good (Score 10)			

Explanatory note: Not all site attracts projects and researchers and with exceptions, little research takes place on the site own steam because of systemic limitations. However, monitoring of some critical issues is expected e.g. population of tiger, co-predators and prey with insights into their demography and distribution (some opportunistic sampling by sightings, signs and spatial distribution during assessment would be extremely useful in terms of expert impression and as a pulse), monitoring incidence of livestock grazing, fires, weeds, sources of water, a variety of illegal activities typically associated with the reserve, wildlife health (e.g. epidemics, immunization of livestock) regeneration and change in vegetation, visitors and their activities, offence cases, ex-gratia payments etc. Details of number of research projects in the last 3 years, institutions involved, salient outcomes may be collected and used in awarding scores.

Indicative reference documents: 1. Details of research and monitoring conducted and supported by PA during last 3 years, 2.

No. of permission granted for research, 3. Any other relevant document

OUTPUT				
5.4 Is there a systematic maintenance schedule and funds in place for management of infrastructure/assets?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
No systematic inventory or maintenance schedule.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Inventory maintenance is adhoc and so is the maintenance schedule.	Fair (Score 5)			
Systematic inventory provides the basis for maintenance schedule but funds are inadequately made available.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Systematic inventory provides the basis for maintenance schedule and adequate funds are made available.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: The information on maintenance of infrastructure and other assets (store, building, road, vehicle, registers etc.). Building register/building maintenance register.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Maintenance register of infrastructure and resources, 2. APO, 3. Any other relevant document				

6.   Outcomes

OUTCOMES				
6.1 Are populations of threatened species especially key faunal species declining, stable or increasing?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Threatened/ endangered species populations declining. OR No population estimation of the key faunal species done.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some threatened/ endangered species populations increasing, most others stable.	Fair (Score 5)			
Most threatened/ endangered species populations increasing, most others stable.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All threatened/ endangered species populations either increasing or stable.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: This needs to practically relate to the natural ecosystem potential rather than being driven merely by numbers and visibility. The assessment score may be elaborated under remarks. Comments on the population trends may be made under Remarks.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Management Plan, 2. The details on population estimation of important wildlife population conducted by the Management in last three years including Annual Wetland Bird Count, 3. Any other relevant document				

OUTCOMES				
6.2 Have the threats to the site being reduced/ minimized or is there an increase?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Threats to the Site have not abated but have enhanced.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some threats to the Site have abated, others continue their presence	Fair (Score 5)			
Most threats to the Site have abated. The few remaining are vigorously being addressed OR The Site dos not face many threats because of its terrain and location.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All threats to the Site have been effectively contained and an efficient system is in place to deal with any emerging situation	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note:				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Assessment of all threats during last 3 years, 2. Any other relevant document				

OUTCOMES				
6.3 Has the site been effective in the mitigation of human-wildlife conflicts?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Human-wildlife conflicts are rampant.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Site has been able to mitigate few human-wildlife conflicts.	Fair (Score 5)			
Site has been able to mitigate many human-wildlife conflicts.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Site has been able effective in mitigating all human-wildlife conflicts. OR There is no Human-wildlife Conflict at or around the site.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Details of compensation paid for human injury/ death and property damage in the last 3 years may be collected.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. The details of last three years on man-animal conflicts as well as compensation etc. paid. 2. Number of forest/ wildlife offences in last three years and stages, 3. Any other relevant document				

OUTCOMES				
6.4 Are the expectations of visitors generally met or exceeded?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Expectations of visitors generally not met.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Expectations of many visitors are met. OR The visitors are not allowed at the site because of the terrain and location.	Fair (Score 5)			
Expectations of most visitors are met.	Good (Score 7.5)			
Good expectations of most visitors are met.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: Is there any system of receiving/ analyzing visitor feedback?				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Tourist visitation data of last 3 years. 2. Visitor's book maintained at important rest houses/ interpretation centers. 3. Tourist feedback registers, 4. Social Media, 5. Any other relevant document				

OUTCOMES				
6.5 Are local communities supportive of PA management?				
Assessment criteria	**Rating/ Score**	**(Tick ✓)**	**Reference document(s)/ Photos**	**Remarks**
Local communities are hostile.	Poor (Score 2.5)			
Some are supportive.	Fair (Score 5)			
Most locals are supportive of PA management.	Good (Score 7.5)			
All local communities supportive of PA management. OR There are no local communities in or around the PA.	Very good (Score 10)			
Explanatory note: There could be many reasons for disenchantment. It could be real because of managerial neglect or the managerial efforts could be appropriate but there could be local elements/organizations who would like to keep the dis-affectation simmering for their own ulterior motives. Likewise, success could be entirely because of the efforts of managers or they might be fortunate in striking partnerships with credible NGOs. Assessment may take the prevailing causes into account.				
Indicative reference documents: 1. Results of eco-development activities and other initiatives undertaken by the management for assisting the local communities, 2. Discussion with local communities, 3. Any other relevant document				

MEE Score Card

Framework Element Number	Framework Element Name	Number of Questions (a)	Maximum Mark per question (b)	Total (a x b)	Marks obtained for the Element	Overall Score
1.	Context	03	10	30		**%**
2.	Planning	09	10	90		
3.	Inputs	06	10	60		
4.	Process	05	10	50		
5.	Outputs	04	10	40		
6.	Outcomes	05	10	50		
Total		**32**		**320**		