

## **NETWORK EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT TOOL (NEAT)**

The Network Effectiveness Assessment Tool (NEAT) is a tool for evaluating existing inter-local government alliances that are implementing joint coastal resource management (CRM) efforts. It was initially developed for MPA networks (Horigue *et al.* 2012), but has been modified to be applicable to all alliances collaborating for coastal resource management. It is a self-assessment tool that aims to evaluate the performance of the network and identify its strength and weaknesses. Joint actions can include fishery/coastal law enforcement, information education and communication campaigns, monitoring and evaluation, MPA establishment and implementation, and regular feedback mechanisms (e.g. Annual Forum, State of the Coast reporting, etc.) which are being implemented towards common vision and goals. Similar to the MPA Management Effectiveness Assessment Tool (MPA MEAT), NEAT adopts key indicators and thresholds to determine management levels and good practices.

Because it is a self-assessment tool, the application of the NEAT should be done by the members of the network through consensus-building. The results can be used to gauge to effectiveness of the network in achieving its goals and to plan for adjustments that will improve management. Furthermore, these can also be used by external groups or development organizations to prioritize key areas where support is most needed, as well as for linking with incentive systems (e.g. MSN Most Outstanding Network).

**NETWORK INFORMATION**

<b>Name of Network:</b>	
<b>Network objective(s):</b>	
<b>Date established (based on legal document):</b>	
<b>Areas covered: (barangay/municipality/city/bay/gulf)</b>	
<b>Network members: (local government/people's organization)</b>	
<b>Institutional Head: (focal person/committee)</b>	
<b>Management Committee/s: (include description of membership)</b>	
<b><i>For networks with MPA program component:</i></b>	
<b>Total number of MPAs within the network (shortlist of names of the MPAs per municipality):</b>	
<b>Total area of MPAs within the network:</b>	
<b>MPA types/zones:</b>	
<b>Ecosystems protected:</b>	

*\*Please include maps, coordinates etc. of your individual MPAs.*

<b>Level 1 – NETWORK IS ESTABLISHED</b>			
Criteria/ Guide Questions	Allowable Points	Actual Points	Remarks/ Means of verification
<b>1.1 Formal agreements for collaboration (Memorandum of Agreement)</b> <i>The network has a formal agreement among member local government units to work together.</i>			
1.1.1 Memorandum of agreement (MOA) among participating local government units drafted	0 or 1		
<i>Has the memorandum of agreement listing the participating local government units and specifying the areas of collaboration been drafted? Other formal agreements can be considered.</i>			
1.1.2 MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT SIGNED AND NOTARIZED*	0 or 3		
<i>Has the memorandum of agreement listing the participating local government units and specifying the areas of collaboration been signed by all parties and duly notarized? Other formal agreements can be considered.</i>			Signed and notarized copy of the memorandum of agreement
1.1.3 Operational protocols for the network drafted	0 or 1		
<i>Has the network drafted its detailed operational protocols that will be followed by the management body? This can be included in the Memorandum of Agreement.</i>			Draft or final copy of operational protocols
1.1.4 Operational protocols for the network finalized and approved	0 or 1		
<i>Has the network finalized its detailed operational protocols? Has it been approved by the network and duly ratified by each of the member local government unit?</i>			Approved document showing the operational protocols
<b>1.2 Network management body formed and functional</b> <i>The network has organized a core group with representation from all the member local government units.</i>			
1.2.1 Management body determined and identified	0 or 1		
<i>Has the organizational structure of the management body for the network been finalized? Have the members of each committee/sections in the structure been identified?</i>			Organizational structure; list of possible members
1.2.2 MANAGEMENT BODY FORMED AND ROLES CLARIFIED*	0 or 3		
<i>Has the management body been formally organized? Have the roles of each member been clarified and explained?</i>			Organizational structure with roles and responsibilities indicated in the MOA or by-laws; Appointment papers
1.2.3 Management body regularly met	0 or 1		
<i>Has the management body started to regularly meet after network formation? The different member groups should have representatives in the meetings.</i>			List of attendees and minutes of meetings
<b>1.3 Network funds and financial management system in place</b>			
1.3.1 BUDGET ALLOCATION FOR AT LEAST ONE YEAR*	0 or 3		
<i>Has each member local government unit allocated funds from its regular budget as contribution to the network at least for the first year of implementation?</i>			Approved work and financial plan; Approved LGU annual investment plan

1.3.2 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FINALIZED*	0 or 3		
<i>Has the financial management system for the network been finalized? Does it include clear disbursement, accounting, auditing and reporting mechanisms?</i>			Document detailing the financial management system; Minutes of meeting; Resolution for adoption of the network and members
<b>1.4 Planning and implementation of a network action plan</b> <i>The network has planned and initiated joint activities that are beneficial for all the member local government units.</i>			
1.4.1 Network action plan drafted	0 or 1		
<i>Has a joint work or action plan for the network been drafted? Are the strategies/activities related to main area/s for collaboration identified?</i>			Draft of the work plan; Minutes of planning meeting/workshop
1.4.2 INITIAL JOINT ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED*	0 or 3		
<i>Have there been activities/programs that were jointly conducted by the network members based on the agreed area/s of collaboration?</i>  <i>Examples of activities are joint seaborne patrolling, enforcement planning, IEC campaigns, organization of a monitoring team, MPA establishment, etc.</i>			Documentation of activity (pictures, minutes, materials, etc.); Reports; IEC/enforcement/monitoring plan
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR LEVEL 1</b>	<b>21</b>		
<i>Thresholds are in BLOCK CAPITALS with asterisks. Minimum score of 16 points and all the thresholds should have been met to pass this Level.</i>			

<b>Level 2 – NETWORK MANAGEMENT IS EFFECTIVELY STRENGTHENED</b>			
Criteria/ Guide Questions	Allowable Points	Actual Points	Remarks/ Means of verification
<b>2.1 Joint legislations (Harmonized Ordinances)</b> <i>The network has facilitated the enactment of harmonized ordinances among the member local government units.</i>			
2.1.1 Harmonized CRM-related ordinance drafted	0 or 1		
<i>Has a harmonized CRM-related ordinance to be adopted among member local government units been drafted?</i>  <i>Examples are fisheries ordinance, MPA ordinance, ecotourism ordinance, etc.</i>			Draft or final copy of ordinance/s
2.1.2 HARMONIZED CRM-RELATED ORDINANCE APPROVED*	0 or 3		
<i>Has a harmonized CRM-related ordinance been approved and enacted by all the member local government councils of the network?</i>			Final copy of ordinance/s
<b>2.2 Network management body fully functional</b> <i>All members/committees of the network are functional and competent in their respective roles.</i>			
2.2.1 MANAGEMENT BODY REGULARLY MEETING (AT LEAST QUARTERLY) WITH CONSISTENT ATTENDANCE*	0 or 3		
<i>Does the management body meet regularly? Do all of the core members of the management body attend most of the meetings? Do all member municipalities have representatives in each meeting?</i>  *Core members should attend at least >50% of meetings in order to facilitate ease of discussion and conflict resolution.			List of attendees and minutes of meetings
2.2.2 Management body trained and skilled	0 or 1		
<i>Have the members of management body undergone relevant trainings and skills enhancement workshops to help them fulfill their tasks?</i>  <i>Examples include leadership trainings, enforcement trainings, proposal-making, team-building, etc.</i>			Minutes of trainings; Certificates of completion/participation
2.2.3 Performance assessment of the management body initiated	0 or 1		
<i>Performance assessment of the management body should be included in the management plan and conducted after network formation for baseline information.</i>			Documentation of performance evaluation/ assessments
2.3 Funds regularly allocated, accessed and used	0 or 1		
<i>Have the individual contributions of each municipality been regularly allocated, accessed and used for network activities?</i>			Work and financial plan; Financial reports; Approved LGU annual investment plan
2.4 Sustainable financing plan prepared	0 or 1		
<i>Has the network prepared a plan outlining sustainable financing strategies and activities?</i>			Draft proposals: Sustainability plan
2.5 Discussions with external groups for possible technical and financial support initiated	0 or 1		

<i>Has the management body initiated meetings and discussions with various government and non-government organizations for possible support?</i>		Minutes of meetings; Contracts/ agreements
<b>2.6 Network strategic plan prepared</b> <i>The management body has prepared at least a 5-year strategic plan with its vision, mission and goals.</i>		
2.6.1 Strategic plan for the network drafted	0 or 1	
<i>Has the management body drafted at least a 5-year strategic plan with VMG, objectives, strategies and activities?</i>		Minutes of meetings; copy of draft management plan
2.6.2 NETWORK STRATEGIC PLAN APPROVED*	0 or 3	
<i>Has the strategic plan for the network been finalized and approved?</i>		Final copy of management plan; Network resolution approving the management plan
2.7 JOINT ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED REGULARLY*	0 or 3	
<i>Are the activities indicated in the approved strategic plan being conducted regularly by the responsible person/group?</i>		Documentation reports;
2.8 Regular reporting and feedback mechanisms conducted	0 or 1	
<i>Has the management body implemented reporting and feedback mechanisms about network activities among the member local government units (e.g. annual forum, general assembly, presentation to Municipal/City Councils, etc.)?</i>		Minutes of meetings; Documentation of activity;
2.9 Monitoring systems established	0 or 1	
<i>Have indicators for determining network effectiveness been established?</i>  <i>For example, violations monitoring for joint enforcement activities, monitoring of status/management levels of MPAs within the network, etc.</i>		Monitoring plan with indicators; Minutes of meetings
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR LEVEL 2</b>	<b>21</b>	
<i>Thresholds are in BLOCK CAPITALS with asterisks. Minimum score of 15 points and all the thresholds should have been met to pass this Level.</i>		

<b>Level 3 – MPA NETWORK MANAGEMENT IS EFFECTIVELY SUSTAINED</b>			
Criteria/ Guide Questions	Allowable Points	Actual Points	Remarks/ Means of verification
3.1 Memorandum of agreement, operational protocols, strategic plans and/or ordinances reviewed and updated	0 or 1		
<i>Have the memorandum of agreement, operational protocols, strategic plan and/or ordinances been reviewed and updated in response to emerging needs and challenges of the network?</i>			Updated/amended MOA, strategic plan, ordinances and/or protocols
<b>3.2 MANAGEMENT BODY REGULARLY MEETING (AT LEAST QUARTERLY) WITH CONSISTENT ATTENDANCE*</b>	0 or 3		
<i>Has the management body been meeting regularly for the last 5 consecutive years? Do all of the core members of the management body attend most of the meetings? Do of the municipalities have representatives in each meeting?</i>			List of attendees and minutes of meetings
<i>*Core members should attend at least &gt;50% of meetings in order to facilitate ease of discussion and conflict resolution.</i>			
<b>3.3 Sustainable financing strategy established</b> <i>The network has been able to consistently access and use funds both from internal and external sources.</i>			
<b>3.3.1 FUNDS CONSISTENTLY ACCESSED AND USED IN THE LAST 5 CONSECUTIVE YEARS*</b>	0 or 3		
<i>Have the contributions of each local government unit been consistently allocated, accessed and used for network activities in the last 5 consecutive years?</i>			Financial statements; LGU annual investment plans
3.3.2 Fund sourcing activities regularly conducted	0 or 1		
<i>Has the network been able to outsource and/or generate funds for network activities (e.g. grants, revenues, public-private partnerships)?</i>			Documentation of activities; Partnership agreements/ contracts
3.4 Expansion of the network initiated	0 or 1		
<i>Has the management body discussed or initiated the possible expansion of the network (e.g. include new municipalities, additional areas for collaboration)?</i>			Minutes of meetings
<b>3.5. PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF THE MANAGEMENT BODY CONDUCTED REGULARLY*</b>	0 or 3		
<i>Performance assessment of the management body should be included in the management plan and conducted regularly.</i>			Documentation of performance evaluation/ assessments
3.6. Reporting and feedback system in place	0 or 1		
<i>Is a system for reporting and feedbacking of network accomplishments (e.g. annual forum, general assembly, presentation to Municipal/City Councils, etc.) being implemented?</i>			Documentation of activity; Minutes of public hearings and presentations
<b>3.7. BENEFITS FROM JOINT ACTIVITIES OBSERVED IN THE MEMBER BARANGAYS/MUNICIPALITIES/CITIES*</b>	0 or 3		
<i>Benefits depend on the goals and objectives of networking. These can include improved LGU enforcement due to joint enforcement and/or IEC activities, strengthened and sustained MPAs within MPA networks, etc.</i>			Enforcement logbooks or reports; Consolidated status reports of MPA/ CRM implementation of member LGUs
<i>NOTE: Clarify benefits from networking vs. from individual efforts of members.</i>			
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR LEVEL 3</b>	<b>16</b>		
<i>Thresholds are in BLOCK CAPITALS with asterisks. Minimum score of 13 points and all the thresholds should have been met to pass this Level.</i>			

<b>Level 4 – NETWORK MANAGEMENT IS EFFECTIVELY INSTITUTIONALIZED</b>			
Criteria/ Guide Questions	Allowable Points	Actual Points	Remarks/ Means of verification
4.1 Political support from the provincial councils, regional entities or congressional districts	0 or 1		
<i>The Provincial Government, Regional Council (if present) or Congressional District has committed to give the network full institutional support to strengthen collaboration and implementation. Political support can mean budget, personnel or technical assistance.</i>			Contracts; MOA/MOU; SP Resolution; Executive Order; Annual investment plans
4.2 INCORPORATION OF NETWORK STRATEGIC PLAN INTO BROADER DEVELOPMENT PLANS*	0 or 3		
<i>The network strategic plan is incorporated within the long-term LGU or provincial development plans (e.g. CLUP, PDP, CDP etc.)</i>			Higher level plan/s where network activities have been integrated
4.3 MANAGEMENT BODY REGULARLY MEETING (AT LEAST QUARTERLY) WITH CONSISTENT ATTENDANCE*	0 or 3		
<i>Has the management body been meeting regularly for the last 7 consecutive years? Do all of the core members of the management body attend most of the meetings? Do the municipalities have representatives in each meeting?</i>			List of attendees and minutes of meetings
<i>*Core members should attend at least &gt;50% of meetings in order to facilitate ease of discussion and conflict resolution.</i>			
4.4. PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROGRAM LINKED TO AN INCENTIVE SYSTEM*	0 or 3		
<i>Recognition/awards from the network are being regularly given to outstanding members, law enforcers, etc.</i>			Awards/recognition received; announcement of competition
4.5 Expansion of the network conducted	0 or 1		
<i>Has the management body conducted the identified areas for expansion (e.g. include new municipalities, additional areas for collaboration)?</i>			Minutes of meetings
4.6 NETWORK IS FINANCIALLY SELF-SUSTAINING*	0 or 3		
<i>Funds (whether from internal and/or external sources) have been efficiently used to cover operating costs of the network in the last 7 consecutive years.</i>			Audited financial report for the last 7 years; Work and financial plans
<i>Include revenue-generated funds</i>			
4.7 Sustained benefits observed among members due to network activities	0 or 1		
<i>Observed benefits from networking have been sustained among member barangays/municipalities/cities.</i>			Enforcement logbooks or reports; Consolidated status reports of MPA/ CRM implementation of member LGUs
<i>Benefits can include reduced illegal fishing due to joint enforcement and/or IEC activities, sustained and institutionalized MPAs within MPA networks, etc.</i>			
<b>TOTAL SCORE FOR LEVEL 4</b>	<b>15</b>		
<i>Thresholds are in BLOCK CAPITALS with asterisks. Minimum score of 13 points and all the thresholds should have been met to pass this Level.</i>			