**Table S2** PA management variables used in this study, with sample sizes (number of PAs)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Management Characteristic | Data provenance | Description | Sample size (PAs) |
| Non-scored characteristics |
| IUCN category | PP and PA managers | IUCN Protected Area management category was provided by PA managers, or the UNEP-WCMC World Database on Protected Areas (http://www.protectedplanet.net) | 21 |
| Area  | PP and PA managers | Area (km2) was calculated in ArcGIS, from PA shapefiles downloaded from the UNEP-WCMC World Database on Protected Areas (<http://www.protectedplanet.net>) and corrected, where necessary, based on input by PA managers or researchers | 21 |
| Human population density | Calculated for this study | Human population density around PAs based on human population data from the AfriPop Project ([www.afripop.org](http://www.afripop.org)). A 5km buffer was created around each PA in ArcGIS, and the population density (people/km2) within this buffer calculated. | 21 |
| Budget  | METT | The Annual PA operating budget (excluding staff salaries)  | 12 |
| Permanent staff number | METT | The total number of permanent staff employed by the PA | 12 |
| Patrol Staff number | METT  | In many of the PAPACO-led METT evaluations, PA managers provided details of the number of patrol staff employed by the PA. This information was given in the ‘comments’ box for the scoring of ‘Staff Numbers’. | 11(not available for Oti- Mandouri) |
| Scored characteristics |
| Current Budget | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There is no budget for management of the protected area1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management3: The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area | 12 |
| Security of Budget | METT | Scored 0 – 3:0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding2: There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding3: There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle | 11 (answer missing for WAP) |
| Fees | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected1: The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs2: The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area3: There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas | 12 |
| Staff numbers | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There are no staff1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site | 12 |
| Equipment | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There is little or no equipment and facilities1: There is some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate2: There is equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management3: There is adequate equipment and facilities | 12 |
| Management plan | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There is no management plan for the protected area1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented2: An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other problems3: An approved management plan exists and is being implemented | 12 |
| Annual work plan | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: No regular work plan exists1: A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan’s targets 2: A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan’s targets, but many activities are not completed3: A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan’s targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed | 12 |
| Boundary demarcation | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users2: The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated3: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated | 12 |
| Law enforcement | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)2: The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain3: The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations | 12 |
| Visitor Facilities | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There are no visitor facilities and services1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved3: Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation | 12 |
| Research | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area1: There is some *ad hoc* survey and research work2: There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management3: There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs | 12 |
| Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area1: There is some *ad hoc* monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management3: A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management | 12 |
| Condition assessment | METT | Scored 0 – 3: 0: Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded1: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted3: Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact  | 12 |