1. Self-Assessment Checklist

Day, J.C, & Laffoley, D.d'A., 2006. Self-assessment checklist for building networks of MPAs. WCPA IUCN.

Background

This easy to use self-assessment checklist, based on the best practice guide, is designed to enable those engaged in designing or managing MPA networks and will assist national and regional authorities to determine progress towards the establishment of effective MPA networks.

Undertaking this assessment can be useful for a number of reasons:

- It will enable you to assess progress against what is regarded as 'best practice', and will therefore enable you to determine what may be required to achieve a more effective and efficient MPA network;
- It can help you evaluate performance toward long-term network objectives as articulated in this report; furthermore if the assessment is conducted periodically, it will assist in assessing actual progress.
- It can be used to justify more resources to improve management effectiveness against certain principles (or the improvements required to progress towards the 'best practice' level).

It may also prove useful for:

- Reporting progress (eg. toward the WSSD 2012 goal) in a standardized way.
- Assisting in the collation of valuable information in a comprehensive and systematic way, and enables broad level comparisons between MPA networks.

How to use this checklist

To use this checklist, simply review the statements against each of the principles, and choose whichever statement is the best approximation or corresponds most closely with your **current** situation**.** The higher you score against the principle, the more effective is your current approach to achieving that principle. If you assess each statement realistically and honestly as either a 0, 1 or 2, then you will be able to determine what might be expected to progress to a higher level of management effectiveness. This will enable you to gauge your progress and the effectiveness of your approach against currently perceived 'best practice', and to understand where the gaps (or weaknesses) are that should be addressed as future priorities. Regular use of the checklist can then be used to track progress towards the overall end goal of an effectively established and lasting MPA network.

The checklist has been ordered so some of the 'easier' principles that are simpler to assess are listed first; those listed towards the end of the checklist are more nebulous and hence may be harder to assess, but are nevertheless important to address in implementing effective MPA networks.

If you want to determine an overall score for your MPA network, mark the corresponding score for each principle/criteria in the column marked 'Your score' and then add the total of all scores. Calculation of a final score can assist in an overall rating between MPA networks but also highlights which key area(s) require greater emphasis to achieve 'best practice'. The 'comments' section should be used to record additional information and notations about how you are addressing that particular principle or your current practice.

There is some 'overlap' between some of the principles/criteria; these reinforce the importance of certain elements that are important for effective networks. In order to better understand whether or not a particular principle is relevant to your MPA Network, you may find it useful to refer back to the Case Studies cited throughout the longer document illustrating key principles.

Note that this checklist may also be applied at different scales; wherever an asteric (*) occurs in the checklist, you can specify the scale at which you are making your assessment; for example, you may want to make the assessment at the following scales:

- NATIONAL SCALE
- REGIONAL SCALE
- LOCAL SCALE

Suggestions for amendments/improvements to the checklist will be gladly accepted; please contact any of the authors listed at the front of this publication. In developing this checklist we have drawn on the principles and approaches of other existing checklists and we therefore acknowledge the role of the following in helping shape this approach:

- Staub, F and ME Hatziolos (2004) Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas. The World Bank, Washington DC, USA 30 pp.
- Mangubhai, S (nd) Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Management Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas in the western Indian Ocean. Report produced for IUCN supported by NORAD. 37pp.
- Corrales, L (2005) Manual for the Rapid Evaluation of Management Effectiveness in Marine Protected Areas of Mesoamerica. PROARCA, The Nature Conservancy, Technical Document No 17, 54 pp.
- Micronesians in Island Conservation (MIC) Network (2004). Effective Conservation Programs Scorecard. The Nature Conservancy, unpublished document, 14pp.

Public education, communication & awareness (Broader consideration #6) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Virtually the entire community (including the local communities and the wider public) are very familiar with the MPA network and the managing agency (or agencies)	**3**		
Most of the community has some awareness of the MPA network and the managing agency(-ies)	**2**		
Part of the community has some awareness of the MPA network, and the managing agency.	**1**		
The community has little or no awareness of the MPA network or the managing agency	**0**		
The community (including the local communities and the wider public) are familiar with the objectives of the MPA network.	**Bonus 1**		
Scientific & information management considerations (Best Practice #4 and 12# and Broader consideration #3) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
All available scientific, social and economic information is used to support planning and management, and it is regularly updated and used for effective decision-making.	**3**		
There is some scientific, social and economic information to support planning and management, and whatever is available is used for decision-making.	**2**		
There is limited scientific, social or economic information to support planning and management, but it is rarely used for decision-making.	**1**		
There is little or no scientific, social or economic information base to support planning and management, or the available information is not used for decision-making.	**0**		
There is an ability to incorporate new information into subsequent planning or for ongoing management tasks	**Bonus 1**		
Size and shape (Ecological Design Criteria #7) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Specific consideration was given to the size and shape of your MPA network when it was designed and implemented in order to maximize the effectiveness of the network to achieve its ecological objectives.	**3**		
Some consideration was given to the size and/or shape of your MPA network when it was designed, but no consideration overall to achieving its ecological objectives.	**1**		
Little or no consideration was given to the size and/or shape of your MPA network when it was designed; NOR any consideration of the effectiveness of the network to achieve its ecological objectives.	**0**		
Consideration was given to minimise edge effects of your MPA network when it was designed	**Bonus 1**		

Resilience (Ecological Design Criteria #7) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network has been specifically designed so 30% or more of the area* is free from extractive activities or habitat-altering activities, or other significant human-induced stresses.	3		
Between 10-30% or the area* is free from extractive activities or habitat-altering activities, or other significant human-induced stresses.	2		
Only a small part the area* (<10%) is free from extractive activities or habitat-altering activities, or other significant human-induced stresses.	1		
Virtually none, if any, of the area* is free from extractive activities or habitat-altering activities, or other significant human-induced stresses.	0		
Your MPA network has been specifically designed to maximize the resilience of the network in the face of long-term geophysical and/or biochemical changes.	Bonus 1		
Precautionary design (Ecological Design Criteria #4) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network is configured to take into consideration all or most of the known threats occurring within the wider area*.	3		
Your MPA network considers several of the known threats occurring within the wider area*	2		
Your MPA network considers a couple of the known threats occurring within the wider area*.	1		
Your MPA network does not consider any of the known threats occurring within the wider area*	0		
Your MPA network has been effectively designed to cope with a lack of comprehensive data.	Bonus 1		
Stakeholder participation (Best Practice #3) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
A wide range of stakeholders (including local and regional stakeholders) were directly involved in planning the network, and assist the managers by being involved in virtually all of the planning and management decisions for your MPA network	3		
Some stakeholders (ie local and/or regional) assist the managers by contributing either input and/or directly in most of the planning and management decisions for your MPA network	2		
Some stakeholders (local or regional) have some involvement, and assist the managers by having some input into some planning and management decisions for your MPA network	1		
No stakeholders (local or regional) had input into planning your MPA network, nor do they assist the managers to make any planning and management decisions for the network.	0		
A wide range of stakeholders (including local and regional stakeholders) are directly involved in decision making, e.g. through active participation in a formal capacity.	Bonus 1		

Political will & leadership (Broader consideration #5 and Best Practice #2) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
There is clear and effective leadership, commitment and support at both the political and agency levels, with a shared vision and capacity to achieve success.	3		
There is clear or effective leadership at both the political and agency levels, but only some limited capacity to implement the necessary strategies.	2		
There is some leadership at either the political or agency levels, but an inadequate capacity to implement the necessary strategies.	1		
There is no clear and effective leadership or commitment at either the political or agency levels, and no shared vision or capacity for success.	0		
There is political support from all relevant levels of government for your MPA network, with politicians and/or legislators involved in the planning process and aware, and supportive, of the requirements for ongoing management.	Bonus 1		
Clearly defined objectives (Best Practice #1) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
There is a range of clear, achievable and measurable objectives (including ecological, social and economic objectives) defined for the MPA network and derived from the legislation;	3		
There are various objectives for the MPA network which are clear, achievable and measurable; addressing at least two of the relevant aspects in the necessary range (ie. ecological, social or economic objectives);	2		
There are some objectives for the MPA network; but only one or two can be considered as clear, achievable and measurable; AND your objectives do not address the necessary range (ie. ecological, social and economic objectives).	1		
There are no clear objectives for your MPA network.	0		
These objectives were determined through an open, transparent and balanced process involving a wide range of stakeholders	Bonus 1		
Viability (Ecological Design Criteria #3) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network includes many self-sustaining viable no-take areas, which are all geographically dispersed within the wider area* ensuring viability at all levels (ie at the ecosystem, species and genetic levels) irrespective of natural cycles of variation	3		
Your MPA network includes some no-take areas geographically dispersed within the wider area*, some of which are self-sustaining.	2		
Your MPA network includes a few no-take areas geographically dispersed within the wider area*.	1		
Your MPA network includes only a single no-take area, or does not include any no-take areas within the wider area*.	0		

Permanence (Ecological Design Criteria #5) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network has the backing of an efficient combination of legislative instruments (eg statutes, laws, regulations) and administrative instruments (eg policies) at various levels (local/state/national), that collectively provide long-term protection for the MPA network and ensure its viability.	3		
Your MPA network has some legislative instruments (eg statutes, laws, regulations) and/or administrative instruments (eg policies), that collectively assist in protecting the MPA network.	2		
Your MPA network has some backing by way of legislative instruments (eg statutes, laws, regulations) or administrative instruments (eg policies), but some of these may be varied by governments and/or ignored by officials.	1		
Your MPA network has little or no backing by way of any legislative instruments or administrative instruments, and its viability may be affected by any adverse activities occurring either within, or adjacent to, the area.	0		
Your MPA network has the backing of an efficient combination of legislative instruments that can extend outside the spatial domain of the MPA network if external threats need to be addressed	Bonus 1		
Compliance & enforcement (Broader consideration #9) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
A survey or other effective means indicates that over 75% of all your MPA users are aware of, understand, and comply with the regulations.	3		
Realistic estimates indicate that between 50-75% of all your MPA users are aware of, understand, and comply with the regulations.	2		
Realistic estimates indicate that between 25-50% of all your MPA users are aware of, understand, and comply with the regulations.	1		
Less than 25% of all your MPA users are aware of, understand, and comply with the regulations.	0		
Integrated management framework (Best Practice #5) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network fits within a clear integrated and holistic framework, including both planning and management at differing scales (ranging from national planning frameworks, through to regional/local planning and site planning).	3		
Your MPA network has some integration of planning and management at differing scales.	2		
Your MPA network has some integration of planning and management activities; OR there is some coordination across relevant jurisdictions and agencies.	1		
Your MPA network does not have a clear integrated framework for either planning or management, or there is little or no coordination between relevant agencies.	0		
A high level of management coordination exists across all relevant jurisdictions and agencies (including across the land–water interface), as well as between users/sectors.	Bonus 1		
The airspace above, the seabed below and the adjoining terrestrial influences may all be considered either by effective planning and/or management regimes or legislative controls	Additional Bonus 1		

Adaptive management (Best Practice #6) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network is readily able to incorporate changes such as new information becoming available (eg. from 'in-the-field' experience, or as a result of changing external circumstances).	**3**		
Your MPA network has some ability to incorporate some changes when new information becoming available (eg. 'in-the-field' experience, or as a result of changing external circumstances).	**2**		
Your MPA network does not have management systems nor any monitoring arrangements to determine system responses and provide a basis for adaptive management; NOR is it able to incorporate changes such as new information becoming available.	**0**		
Your MPA networ*k* has effective management systems that implement policies (ie specifying locally appropriate actions), as well as monitoring arrangements to determine system responses and provide a sound basis for adaptive management.	**Bonus 1**		
Economic & social considerations (Broader consideration #1) Best Practice examples		**Your score**	**Your comments**
The design and implementation of your MPA network continues to consider the economic and socio-cultural setting, as well as the real benefits and costs of the network (including both tangible and intangible benefits and costs);	**3**		
The design and implementation of your MPA network initially considered the economic and socio-cultural setting, as well as the real benefits and costs of the network (and may have included tangible and intangible benefits and/or costs).	**2**		
Some consideration was given to the economic and socio-cultural setting, or to the benefits or costs, when your MPA network was initially designed.	**1**		
No consideration was given to the economic or socio-cultural setting, or to the benefits or costs, when your MPA network was initially designed, and little/no consideration occurs during implementation.	**0**		
Your MPA network has addressed the need for structural adjustment or compensation for lost benefits from foregone economic opportunities.	**Bonus 1**		
Spatial & temporal considerations (Broader consideration #2) Best Practice examples		**Your score**	**Your comments**
The design of your MPA network considered a wide range of spatial and temporal considerations including ecological processes, connectivity and external influences; and managers continue to consider these as part of ongoing implementation.	**3**		
The design of your MPA network did consider some spatial and temporal issues; and managers continue to consider each of these issues as part of ongoing implementation.	**2**		
The design of your MPA network did consider one or more spatial or temporal issues; and some of these are still considered by managers in the ongoing implementation of the network.	**1**		
Spatial and temporal issues were not considered in the design or in the ongoing implementation of your MPA network.	**0**		
There is good historical baseline information (or historic data) to determine whether there are 'shifting baselines' for a range of issues.	**Bonus 1**		

Institutional & governance considerations (Broader consideration #4) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network has well established mechanisms for the vertical integration between all levels of government (eg. national, state and local), and horizontal integration among agencies with different mandates, as well as involving local communities, Indigenous people and regional groups.	3		
Your MPA network has some mechanisms for the vertical integration between different levels of government, and horizontal integration among agencies with different mandates, as well as involving local communities, Indigenous peoples and regional groups.	2		
Your MPA network has some legislative and administrative arrangements, but these do not provide both effective vertical integration between different levels of government, and horizontal integration among agencies.	1		
Your MPA network has little or no mechanisms for the vertical integration between different levels of government, nor for any horizontal integration among agencies with different mandates.	0		
Your MPA network has an effective legislative and administrative framework, including a 'nested governance' structure operating simultaneously at multiple scales and levels (integrating local aspirations, national strategies and/or international obligations).	Bonus 1		

Replication (Ecological Design Criteria #2) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network includes spatially-separated replicates of no-take areas within 80% or more of the ecoregions occurring within the wider area* (ie almost all known ecoregions within your network have replicates to spread any risk).	3		
Your MPA network includes spatially-separated replicates of no-take areas within 25 - 80% of the ecoregions occurring within the wider area*	2		
Your MPA network includes some spatially-separated replicates of no-take areas, but they occur in less that 25% or less of the ecoregions occurring within the wider area*	1		
Your MPA network does not have any spatially-separated replicates of no-take areas within any ecoregions	0		
Systematic replication occurring throughout every ecoregion in the networks, e.g. cross shelf and long-shore replication	Bonus 1		

Monitoring & assessment (Broader consideration #7) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, with progress against most if not all the objectives of the MPA network being monitored regularly and objectively, with the results being widely disseminated and used in adaptive management.	3		
There is an agreed and implemented monitoring program, and progress against some of the objectives of the MPA network is objectively monitored periodically, with the results publicly available and/or used in adaptive management.	2		
There is some ad hoc monitoring and progress against at least one of the objectives of the MPA network has been monitored and/or publicly reported.	1		
Progress against the objectives of the MPA network is rarely monitored AND no assessment of MPA effectiveness has ever occurred or been reported.	0		

Connectivity (Ecological Design Criteria #6) Best Practice examples		Your score	Your comments
Your MPA network has been purposefully designed to maximize all or most of the known ecological processes (spatial and/or temporal) known to occur in the area*	**3**		
Your MPA network was purposefully designed and does consider some of the known ecological processes (spatial and/or temporal) known to occur in the area*	**2**		
Your MPA network was purposefully designed and does consider a few (one or more) of the known ecological processes (spatial and/or temporal) known to occur in the area*	**1**		
The design of your MPA network took little or no account of any known ecological processes known to occur in the area*	**0**		
Your MPA network has been purposefully designed to maximize and enhance most of the linkages between individual MPAs in the network.	**Bonus 1**		
Sustainable financing (Broader consideration #8) Best Practice examples		**Your score**	**Your comments**
Your MPA network has a well-developed and periodically audited program of long-term funding (assessed, and if necessary, increased against a recognised financial index) in order to meet both core costs and emerging issues.	**3**		
Your MPA network has an adequate program of long-term funding for core costs and able to seek funding for emerging issues.	**2**		
Your MPA network has poor and spasmodic program of long-term funding to meet core costs, and is sometimes able to seek funding for emerging issues.	**1**		
Your MPA network doest not have a well-developed or periodically audited program of long-term funding.	**0**		
The budget in your MPA is well managed; and all staff understand the financial situation.	**Bonus 1**		
Representativeness (Ecological Design Criteria #1) Best Practice examples		**Your score**	**Your comments**
Your MPA network includes representative examples of 80-100% of known marine habitats and/or ecological processes within the wider area* (ie 80-100% of all known ecoregions are within your network).	**3**		
Your MPA network includes representative examples of between 30-80% of the habitats and/or ecological processes known in the area*.	**2**		
Your MPA network includes representative examples of 10 -30% of the known habitats and/or ecological processes known in the area*.	**1**		
Your MPA network comprises only one or two types of marine habitat known in the area* (eg. only coral reefs are protected in the network)	**0**		

Examples of Best Practice

Public education, communication & awareness

Virtually the entire community (including the local communities and the wider public) are very familiar with the MPA network and the managing agency (or agencies)
The community (including the local communities and the wider public) are familiar with the objectives of the MPA network.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef Local Marine Advisory Committees
USA – Channel Islands NMS Working Groups & Sanctuary Advisory Committees

Scientific & information management considerations

All available scientific, social and economic information is used to support planning and management, and it is regularly updated and used for effective decision-making.
There is an ability to incorporate new information into subsequent planning or for ongoing management tasks

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef Science and Research Program and Research Priorities
Australia - CRC Reef Report Making a Difference

Size and shape

Specific consideration was given to the size and shape of your MPA network when it was designed and implemented in order to maximize the effectiveness of the network to achieve its ecological objectives.
Consideration was given to minimise edge effects of your MPA network when it was designed

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Biophysical Operating Principles

Resilience

Your MPA network has been specifically designed so 30% or more of the area* is free from extractive activities or habitat-altering activities, or other significant human-induced stresses.
Your MPA network has been specifically designed to maximize the resilience of the network in the face of long-term geophysical and/or biochemical changes.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Biophysical Operating Principles

Precautionary design

Your MPA network is configured to take into consideration all or most of the known threats occurring within the wider area*.
Your MPA network has been effectively designed to cope with a lack of comprehensive data.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Threats

Stakeholder participation

A wide range of stakeholders (including local and regional stakeholders) were directly involved in planning the network, and assist the managers by being involved in virtually all of the planning and management decisions for your MPA network
A wide range of stakeholders (including local and regional stakeholders) are directly involved in decision making, e.g. through active participation in a formal capacity.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Public involvement in RAP

Political will & leadership

There is clear and effective leadership, commitment and support at both the political and agency levels, with a shared vision and capacity to achieve success.
There is political support from all relevant levels of government for your MPA network, with politicians and/or legislators involved in the planning process and aware, and supportive, of the requirements for ongoing management.

Examples

Clearly defined objectives

There is a range of clear, achievable and measurable objectives (including ecological, social and economic objectives) defined for the MPA network and derived from the legislation;
These objectives were determined through an open, transparent and balanced process involving a wide range of stakeholders.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Biophysical Operating Principles
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Social –Economic Operating Principles
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Evaluation of extent to which operating principles implemented

Viability

Your MPA network includes many self-sustaining viable no-take areas, which are all geographically dispersed within the wider area* ensuring viability at all levels (ie at the ecosystem, species and genetic levels) irrespective of natural cycles of variation

Examples

Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Zoning maps showing no-take (green) zones

Permanence

Your MPA network has the backing of an efficient combination of legislative instruments (eg statutes, laws, regulations) and administrative instruments (eg policies) at various levels (local/state/national), that collectively provide long-term protection for the MPA network and ensure its viability.

Your MPA network has the backing of an efficient combination of legislative instruments that can extend outside the spatial domain of the MPA network if external threats need to be addressed

Examples

Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Legislation and Regulations

Compliance & enforcement

A survey or other effective means indicates that over 75% of all your MPA users are aware of, understand, and comply with the regulations.

Examples

Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Day-to-day Management

Integrated management framework

Your MPA network fits within a clear integrated and holistic framework, including both planning and management at differing scales (ranging from national planning frameworks, through to regional/local planning and site planning).

A high level of management coordination exists across all relevant jurisdictions and agencies (including across the land–water interface), as well as between users/sectors.

The airspace above, the seabed below and the adjoining terrestrial influences may all be considered either by effective planning and/or management regimes or legislative controls.

Examples

Australia – Great Barrier Reef - How Federal and State agencies cooperate in managing the Great Barrier Reef

Adaptive management

Your MPA network is readily able to incorporate changes such as new information becoming available (eg. from 'in-the-field' experience, or as a result of changing external circumstances).
Your MPA network has effective management systems that implement policies (ie specifying locally appropriate actions), as well as monitoring arrangements to determine system responses and provide a sound basis for adaptive management.

Economic & social considerations

The design and implementation of your MPA network continues to consider the economic and socio-cultural setting, as well as the real benefits and costs of the network (including both tangible and intangible benefits and costs);
Your MPA network has addressed the need for structural adjustment or compensation for lost benefits from foregone economic opportunities.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Social- economic considerations in RAP
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - 'Measuring the Economic & Financial value of the GBRMP' (Report by Access Economics)

Spatial & temporal considerations

The design of your MPA network considered a wide range of spatial and temporal considerations including ecological processes, connectivity and external influences; and managers continue to consider these as part of ongoing implementation.
There is good historical baseline information (or historic data) to determine whether there are 'shifting baselines' for a range of issues.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Biophysical Operating Principles

Institutional & governance considerations

Your MPA network has well established mechanisms for the vertical integration between all levels of government (eg. national, state and local), and horizontal integration among agencies with different mandates, as well as involving local communities, Indigenous people and regional groups.
Your MPA network has an effective legislative and administrative framework, including a 'nested governance' structure operating simultaneously at multiple scales and levels (integrating local aspirations, national strategies and/or international obligations).

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - How Federal and State agencies cooperate in managing the Great Barrier Reef

Replication

Your MPA network includes spatially-separated replicates of no-take areas within 80% or more of the ecoregions occurring within the wider area* (ie almost all known ecoregions within your network have replicates to spread any risk).
Systematic replication occurring throughout every ecoregion in the networks, e.g. cross shelf and long-shore replication.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Evaluation of extent to which operating principles implemented

Monitoring & assessment

A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, with progress against most if not all the objectives of the MPA network being monitored regularly and objectively, with the results being widely disseminated and used in adaptive management.

Examples
Australia – Australian Institute of Marine Science – Environmental Change
Australia – Australian Institute of Marine Science – Status and Trends

Connectivity

Your MPA network has been purposefully designed to maximize all or most of the known ecological processes (spatial and/or temporal) known to occur in the area*
Your MPA network has been purposefully designed to maximize and enhance most of the linkages between individual MPAs in the network.

Examples
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Connectivity 'The Blue Highway'
Australia – Great Barrier Reef - Biophysical Operating Principles

Sustainable financing

Your MPA network has a well-developed and periodically audited program of long-term funding (assessed, and if necessary, increased against a recognised financial index) in order to meet both core costs and emerging issues.
The budget in your MPA is well managed; and all staff understand the financial situation.

Examples

Representativeness

Your MPA network includes representative examples of 80-100% of known marine habitats and/or ecological processes within the wider area* (ie 80-100% of all known ecoregions are within your network).