

SOM Table 1: METT Adaptations

Organisation/country	Comments	Source
GEF	The GEF has developed several versions of the METT for tracking its biodiversity investments (see box 1).	www.thegef.org/gef/BD_tracking_tool
Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)	Based on the structure of the METT, the CEPF tracking tool aims to monitor civil society organisations' capacity to effectively plan, implement and evaluate actions for biodiversity conservation.	https://www.cepf.net/sites/default/files/CEPF-Operational-Manual-updated-2017.pdf
Carpathian Countries Protected Areas Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (CCPAMETT)	The CCPAMETT was an online tool developed to be used on an annual basis. The tool was an output of the Protected Areas for a Living Planet Project carried out by WWF Danube-Carpathian Programme together with partners from the regional and local level and supported by the Swiss MAVA Foundation (2007–2011). Versions were available in English, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Slovakian, Ukrainian, but all the links to the CCPAMETT seem to be broken.	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cristian_Remus_Papp/publication/306255142_Carpathian_Protected_Areas_Management_Effectiveness_Tracking_Tool/links/57b4c65408ae19a365faf3e9/Carpathian-Protected-Areas-Management-Effectiveness-Tracking-Tool.pdf
PARCC METT	An adaptation for the PARCC project, which focused on methodologies for assessing climate change impacts.	Belle et al., 2012
WWF Tanzania	METT+ Social, included a range of social questions.	See: Stolton & Dudley, 2016
METT – South Africa (METT-SA)	The METT was adapted for use in 230 protected areas in South Africa. The questions relating to the indicators have been rephrased to better reflect South African circumstances and legislation.	Cowan et al., 2010; SEF, 2012; Hockings et al., 2015
NAMETT	The METT adapted for use in Namibia was implemented in 20 protected areas in 2004, 2009 and 2011.	MET, 2014
WB/WWF Biofuels Environmental Sustainability Scorecard	Developed to provide an indication of whether a proposed biofuel project is likely to have a (net) positive or negative impact on the environment. There is no evidence that the tool has been used.	World Bank/World Wildlife Fund, 2008
Ramsar Site Management	Resolution XII.15 of the 12 th Conference of Parties (COP12) to the Ramsar Convention formally approved	Ramsar, 2015

Organisation/country	Comments	Source
Effectiveness Tracking Tool (R-METT)	the R-METT for evaluating and ensuring the effective management and conservation of Ramsar Sites.	
Indian METTR	The National Tiger Conservation Authority (NTCA), a statutory body under the Indian Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change, and the Wildlife Institute of India have been carrying out assessments of Tiger Reserves in India since 2006. From 2011 an assessment system which shares many elements with the METT has been used.	Mathur et al., 2014
Bhutan METT +	The basic METT with additional guidance and questions including a more detailed threat assessment. Used in all protected areas in Bhutan in 2015 and 2016.	Lham et al., 2019
Conservation Internationals CI-METT	A slight adaptation of WWF's original METT, prepared by CI staff in charge of developing a site-monitoring methodology within the organisation's Monitoring Outcomes framework.	Pauquet, 2005
Arabian Peninsula	An adaptation was used in 7 protected areas in the peninsula.	Anon, 2009
Score Card to Assess Progress in Achieving Management Effectiveness Goals for Marine Protected Areas	Multiple use, for example in 172 MPAs in the Persian or Arabian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman and the south eastern coasts of Oman located in the Arabian Sea (Van Lavieren and Klaus, 2013).	Staub & Hatzios, 2004
Self-assessment checklist for building networks of MPAs	A version adapted for use on marine protected areas.	Day & Laffoley, 2006
Scorecard for management capacity and effectiveness assessment for forest reserves in China	A Chinese version of the METT.	Authors have version but current status unclear
Reflective Co-assessment Scorecard	An adaptation which focuses on cooperative behaviour as an essential precondition for effective management and that encourages reflective co-assessment of cooperative relationships.	Roux et al., 2011.

Organisation/country	Comments	Source
ASEAN Heritage Parks	An adaption for Asia, which included additional output indicators related to the success of the protected area in reducing or combating illegal activities and success in providing ecosystem services. A selection of protected areas were visited as part of a verification process. The scoring system was also adapted.	Inciong et al., 2013
Enhanced METT	Used in 61 protected areas in the Philippines. The enhanced METT focused primarily on process, introducing key informant interviews, focus group discussions, validation meetings, and feedback discussions with local stakeholders, summary and analyses by regional cluster groups followed by validation and consultation with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, local government units, and civil society organisations.	Guiang & Braganza, 2014
Papua New Guinea (PNG METT)	An adaptation to suit PNG (see case study).	Leverington et al., 2016
METTPAZ: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas managed by the Zambia Wildlife Authority	Adaptations include a score for the threat assessment. The results of the assessments using the METTPAZ were studied by the GEF to assess whether improved METT scores correlated with improvements in biodiversity outcomes (Zimsky et al., 2010).	Mwima, 2007