



**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING  
ON THE CONSERVATION AND  
MANAGEMENT OF MARINE TURTLES  
AND THEIR HABITATS OF THE INDIAN  
OCEAN AND SOUTH-EAST ASIA**

CMS/IOSEA/MOS9/Doc.12.5  
28 May 2024

9<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE SIGNATORY STATES  
Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania, 24-27 June 2024  
Agenda Item 12.5

**KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

*(Prepared by the Secretariat and Advisory Committee)*

1. In 2020, the Secretariat and Advisory Committee (AC) developed proposals on how to use the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the MOU in 2021 to put a spotlight on the MOU both internally and externally and at the same time tackle the implementation of a number of activities foreseen in the Work Programme 2020-2024. In a letter to all Signatory States in December 2020, we outlined these plans, with many successfully implemented in the anniversary year (see e.g. Doc.10.3 [Lessons Learnt from World Sea Turtle Day 2021](#)).
2. One activity foreseen was to conduct an online survey for the IOSEA constituency (both past and present) to review the performance of the MOU in its 20 years, identify what went well and where we could have tried a different approach, and identify lessons-learned for the coming years. This survey was to cover particularly the service provided by the different bodies of the MOU to its constituency and the overall success of the MOU in its mission.
3. When the Secretariat and AC went into more detail in their discussions, it became clear that in order to design a meaningful questionnaire, it would be helpful to define Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the MOU first. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are quantifiable parameters used to gauge an organization's overall long-term performance versus a set of objectives.
4. As a first step, the Secretariat investigated whether other similar organizations did such evaluations before so we might learn from them. However, all that could be found were reviews focusing on purely institutional matters such as units in the Secretariat or Committee structure, so not well suited for a very small organization, and asking a different question than the one to be answered, i.e. "How well has the MOU fulfilled its role?".
5. In this research, the Secretariat reviewed Cvitanovic et al. (2021) [Understanding and evidencing a broader range of 'successes' that can occur at the interface of marine science and policy](#), where an evaluation going in the right direction had been conducted for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). In consultation with the AC, the Secretariat decided to base the draft KPIs on the methodology applied there. The Secretariat also undertook consultations within and sought comments from the Secretariats of the CMS Family of agreements, given that the mandates of CMS, the legally-binding Agreements, and the Memoranda of Understanding are all similar.

6. Following several rounds of consultation with the AC, the proposed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to measure the performance of the MOU are presented in Annex 1.
7. Each KPI is linked to one or more objectives in the Conservation and Management Plan (CMP) of the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU. The KPIs have been divided into five areas of impact, following the method presented by Cvitanovic et al. (2021):
  - I. Impacts on the Organization
  - II. Impacts on People
  - III. Impacts on Knowledge
  - IV. Impacts on Policy
  - V. Impacts on Ecosystems
8. The KPIs suggested in this document should NOT be viewed as questions, but rather as statements that if true, would indicate that the MOU is fulfilling its mandate successfully. Given the difficulty of assigning numerical values to the KPIs, we will use mostly qualitative metrics to measure them. These are based mainly on the level of satisfaction of the Signatory States and other stakeholders with the services and support provided by the MOU, as well as their perception on how successful (or not successful) the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU has been in achieving its goals.

### **Development of a Survey Based on the KPIs**

9. Once the KPIs have been agreed upon, the next step will be to create a short and simple questionnaire with questions designed to get specific feedback relating to a few select KPIs where feedback is wanted, prompting suggestions for improvement where relevant.
10. The '*examples of indicators that could be evaluated*' presented on the table are just suggestions (NOT questions) and can be changed and adapted depending on what exactly we wish to evaluate. From the long list of KPIs proposed in Annex 1, most likely only a few will be turned into questions. Some indicators may be combined, others might elicit more than one question, or not included in the questionnaire at all.
11. The questionnaire will be supplemented by background information provided by the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU Secretariat to assist respondents. Information relevant to the questions asked will be given in the form of summaries and/or graphs, and could include e.g.:
  - a) Graph showing Signatory accession over the years
  - b) Graph showing attendance of IOSEA Signatories to past meetings
  - c) Number of IOSEA sub-regional groups established
  - d) Number of meetings conducted per working group
  - e) Summary of scientific, technical, and policy publications offered by the MOU Secretariat (e.g., species reports, online library, FlipperTag database, etc.)
  - f) Contributions by Signatories vs MOU's expenditure
  - g) Agreed budgets for IOSEA Secretariat operations vs. amounts received by CMS for said budget items
  - h) Number of newsletter recipients at present
  - i) List of tools available to the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU community
  - j) Information on recent website traffic, analytics
  - k) Information about the Advisory Committee (membership, countries where members work, length of term, key areas of expertise, extent of involvement with IOSEA)

- l) List of populations or expected populations for every region with an assessment of worse, neutral, or better off after 20/25 years
  - m) Number of stocks or suspected stocks that have the minimum required baseline knowledge
  - n) Number of stocks or suspected stocks that have any population trend data with a moderate confidence.
12. For the questionnaire, some questions will be general, but others might be directed specifically at Focal Points, scientists, or NGOs. It is important that the questions are designed to pick both positives and negatives, avoiding biases. Customer satisfaction survey-style questions could be used in some instances, such as multiple choice or open-ended when applicable, for example:
- To what extent do you agree with the following statement?  
  
*Strongly agree – somewhat agree – neither agree nor disagree – somewhat disagree – strongly disagree*
  - How helpful do you find[X]?  
  
*Not helpful at all – barely helpful – neither helpful nor unhelpful – somewhat helpful – very helpful*
13. While the AC is ideally placed to continue to take the lead in the development of this questionnaire, input from Signatory States, the Marine Turtle Task Forces and other stakeholders engaged closely with the MOU will be crucial for making it as useful as possible. This could be facilitated by establishing a working group led by the AC Chair or his/her designate.

**Action requested of MOS9:**

- Take note of the draft Key Performance Indicators developed for the MOU as presented in Annex 1
- Decide on further steps including the potential establishment of an AC-led working group and decide how this should be reflected in the Work Programme 2024-2028 (see Doc.7.1)

<b>Draft Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU</b>	
<b>I. IMPACTS ON THE ORGANIZATION</b>	
<b>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</b>	<b>Objective of CMP</b>
<p><b>1. Organization recognition and trust:</b> The organization is considered credible and legitimate as a provider of scientific and policy advice.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency of requests from Signatories for scientific, technical and/or policy advice*</li> <li>• Signatories' willingness to contact the Secretariat when they need scientific, technical and/or policy advice*</li> <li>• Satisfaction of Signatories with the advice provided.</li> <li>• Recommendations to others to get involved with the MOU</li> <li>• Outcomes of IOSEA meet the expectations of the aims and goals of IOSEA</li> </ul> <p><i>* Questionnaire should have different questions for scientific, technical and/or policy advice function and policy advice function</i></p>	6
<p><b>2. Strong and fruitful relationships:</b> Development, presence, and maintenance of relationships with diverse stakeholders (i.e., governments, scientists, administrators, decision-makers, resource users, community groups, industry, and non-governmental organizations). Focal Point and stakeholders' acceptance and support.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction with the amount of contact (email, meetings in person and/or online) between the Secretariat and the Signatories</li> <li>• Level of engagement from Signatories with different IOSEA initiatives (e.g., number of countries that got involved with World Sea Turtle Day 2021 – 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary IOSEA)</li> <li>• Involvement of stakeholders from different sectors, strengthening cross-agency cooperation</li> <li>• Establishment and composition of national networks</li> </ul>	6

<p><b>3. Organizational priorities:</b> The MOU covers all the areas and topics that it's intended to. Key activities reach all parts of the MOU area that need it and clear priorities are identified and tackled. Expansion to work with new groups of decision-makers when new priorities are identified.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation of representatives of the IOSEA MOU (Secretariat, AC, Focal Points) in new fora</li> <li>• Satisfaction of Signatories with new priorities of work brought forward by the AC</li> </ul>	6
<p><b>4. Successful delivery of MOS:</b> Agenda items are relevant, the interval between MOS is appropriate. The intersessional processes are adequate to ensure implementation. Time and resources dedicated to organizing the MOS are worth the effort.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of interest of the respondents (Focal Points and other stakeholders) in participating at the MOS</li> <li>• Satisfaction with the agenda items proposed</li> <li>• Satisfaction with the frequency of the MOS</li> <li>• Overall perception of the 'usefulness' of the MOS (worth the time, resources, and effort dedicated by the Secretariat, AC, and participants)</li> <li>• Satisfaction with the level of implementation of the Work Programme (based on progress reports provided by the Secretariat)</li> <li>• Outcomes from MOS meet expectations (e.g., adoption of Work Plan at MO8)</li> </ul>	6
<p><b>5. Scientific integration and collaboration:</b> Collaborative and diverse culture, bringing together scientists from different disciplines, geographical locations, and organizations.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction with the composition of the AC (diversity in terms of gender, discipline, geographic representation)</li> <li>• Satisfaction with the scientific, technical, and/or other advice provided by the AC and the degree to which it reflects diverse views</li> <li>• Level of collaboration with other organizations, synergies being used while avoiding duplication (e.g., with other MEAs, IOTC, Nairobi Convention, IUCN SSC MTSG, UNDP, Research Institutions).</li> </ul>	6

<p><b>6. Financial security:</b> The funding of the MOU is adequate to fulfil the activities it has set to do in the text of the MOU and the CMP, as well as in the subsequent Work Plan.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of satisfaction with meetings and other activities for which funding is used*</li> <li>• Level of motivation of Signatory States to contribute financially**</li> <li>• Number of activities included in the budget that are high priority for the countries, and that have been funded***</li> <li>• Satisfaction with the level of funding (e.g., is it adequate or are expectations of funding higher? (for SS to be able to grant funding)</li> <li>• The funding model is adequate or varied funding models should be considered (e.g., other external funds)</li> </ul> <p><i>* The agreed budget, contributions, and expenses will be provided in the questionnaire</i></p> <p><i>** It would be important to find out if Signatory States consider it useful to give money to the MOU, and their reasons for wanting or not wanting to contribute, and what could be changed to motivate them to do so. If they can't contribute financially, find out if there is something we can do to help them do it</i></p> <p><i>*** The questionnaire should be used to find out what activities need attention</i></p>	<p>6</p>
---	----------

II. IMPACTS ON PEOPLE	
Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Objective of CMP
<p><b>7. Expansion of personal networks:</b> Focal Points and other stakeholders have established relationships with relevant contacts within their own countries (e.g., through national networks) and in the IOSEA region (scientists, administrators, NGOs, peers, e.g., via sub-regional task forces) thanks to the MOU.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal perception of the role of the MOU in expanding personal and professional networks, nationally, regionally, and internationally</li> </ul>	5 and 6
<p><b>8. Increased individual learning and knowledge and sharing of such information:</b> The Focal Points and other stakeholders are well informed on IOSEA issues and continue learning about new developments in the region affecting the conservation and management of marine turtles and their habitats.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction of FPs and other stakeholders with the information provided and capacity-building opportunities offered within the context of the MOU (e.g., website, communications from the Secretariat, meeting documents and other written communications, workshops, etc.)</li> </ul>	4

<p><b>9. Increased levels of personal satisfaction:</b> The Focal Points (and other stakeholders) feel supported by the bodies and mechanisms established within the IOSEA MOU (Secretariat, AC, MOS, MTTFs -marine turtle task forces-, etc.). Ideally, they feel like they are having tangible impacts on the management of marine turtles and their habitats.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of personal satisfaction of FPs and other stakeholders derived from working with the MOU (e.g., do they feel that through their participation in the MOU they have contributed to the conservation of marine turtles and their habitats in their country and/or the region?)</li> <li>• Level of satisfaction with the support received from the bodies and mechanisms established within the IOSEA MOU, i.e.,             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Secretariat, AC, and MOS provide FPs and country representatives with the necessary information and tools for them to understand and defend turtle interests within their government and other fora; or</li> <li>b) the different stakeholders are able to bring their ideas and issues to the attention of the AC*.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>* This would be turned into two different questions</i></p>	<p>4 and 5</p>
<p><b>10. Increased public awareness:</b> Members of the public are more aware of the threats – and opportunities - facing marine turtles and their habitats in the region. [It is not possible for us to determine if the MOU has contributed to this, but it would be useful to know the general perception of FPs and other stakeholders (not correlated to the MOU), as well as sourcing ideas for communication initiatives to continue enhancing public awareness within the framework of the IOSEA MOU].</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPs and Stakeholder’s perception on the current level of public awareness in their country/region</li> <li>• FP and Stakeholder’s perception on whether and/or how much public awareness has increased (in their country/region) since their involvement with the MOU*</li> </ul> <p><i>* This could be used as an opportunity to ask FPs and other stakeholders to provide ideas for communication products, and to find out if there is anything that the MOU can do help increase public awareness in the region.</i></p>	<p>4</p>

III. IMPACTS ON KNOWLEDGE	
Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Objective of CMP
<p><b>11. Information exchange:</b> There are coordinated efforts within the MOU to collect and compile data from different countries, and to disseminate scientific and/or technical information among nations, institutions, and organizations regionwide (e.g., FlipperTag database, online library, species reports).</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction with the quantity, quality, and usefulness* of scientific and technical information (provided through national reports, MOS documents, technical information on the IOSEA website, online library, FlipperTag database, TurtleNet and species reports) from the region made available to the countries by the MOU**</li> <li>• Perception of the relevance and accuracy of scientific information presented to the Signatories at the MOS</li> </ul> <p><i>* Each of these would be turned into separate questions if this point were to be included in the questionnaire</i>  <i>** An overview of the different information tools made available by IOSEA (both old and new website) will be provided with the questionnaire. As unfortunately not everything is on the new website yet, we need to keep in mind that this may bias answers. There could be different questions to assess a) whether the respondents are aware of these tools; b) how often they use them; and c) what other resources they might like to see in the future</i></p>	<p>1 and 3</p>
<p><b>12. Increased effort to expand the available knowledge base</b> in relation to marine turtle biology and management, including traditional knowledge. The MOU supports studies and monitoring programmes aimed at gathering information on marine turtle populations and determining main threats.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How useful the guidance provided by the Advisory Committee has been in helping to direct research and promote good scientific standards in the countries</li> <li>• Existence of new (since signing the MoU) national mechanisms (e.g., national networks) to gather traditional knowledge</li> <li>• Extent to which traditional knowledge is included in discussions (formal or informal) and National Reports</li> <li>• Usefulness of the MOU as a platform for bringing attention to new/emerging marine turtle issues</li> <li>• Usefulness of the MOU as a platform for stimulating discussions and collaborative research and monitoring programmes in and among Signatory States</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>

IV. IMPACTS ON POLICY	
Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Objective of CMP
<p><b>13. Evidence-informed decision-making processes:</b> The decision-making process is based on scientific evidence. The results of scientific research are included in the advice provided to decision-makers, which is ultimately integrated into countries' legislation.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which the advice provided through the MOU communication channels is directly reflected in national policy and legislation</li> <li>• Extent to which the guidance provided by the Secretariat and the AC and MTTFs is helping countries to achieve their conservation goals</li> <li>• Extent to which outcomes of MOS are helping countries to achieve their conservation goals</li> </ul>	5
<p><b>14. Timely advice:</b> the advice is provided within the time frame required by a specific decision-maker for a specific purpose.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of satisfaction with the response times of the Secretariat and AC, when requesting specific advice</li> <li>• Level of satisfaction with the response times of other Signatory States representatives in relation to subregional plans and meetings, and other subregional events</li> </ul>	5
<p><b>15. Effective communication</b> with decision-makers working in other relevant national government sectors (fisheries, environment, marine planning): The advice is understood and can be applied to their context.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which decision makers (fisheries, environment, marine planning) understand and draw upon advice to inform their thinking and processes</li> <li>• Focal Point's understanding on who they must talk to, and whether they have the necessary information to talk to other relevant sectors in their government</li> </ul>	5

<p><b>16. Alignment between advice provided and advice needed:</b> The advice provided aligns with what is needed by the Signatories. The IOSEA framework provides added value, it fills a gap that other Organizations don't (e.g., IOTC, Nairobi Convention).</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived added value provided by the IOSEA MOU at covering information and advice needs, that other instruments related to conservation of marine turtles and their habitats yes in the region don't</li> <li>• Adequacy of answers provided to information requests (through the different communication channels of the MOU)</li> <li>• Extent to which the goals of the MOU as adopted by the MOS, are consistent with national conservation goals (e.g., FPs feel that their input is taken seriously at the MOS)</li> </ul>	<p>5</p>
<p><b>17. Adaptive management of marine turtles and their habitats:</b> There are immediate positive impacts related to the improvement of conservation policies. Marine turtles and their habitats are managed sustainably.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement of policies at the national level since signing the MOU</li> <li>• Improvement of international policies (e.g., CMS, IOSEA, CITES, other) since signing the MOU</li> <li>• Perceived role of the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU in the introduction and improvement of new conservation practices related to species and habitat management</li> <li>• Improvement in management practices relevant to marine turtle conservation</li> <li>• Improvement in subregional and regional cooperation toward the above goals</li> </ul>	<p>1,2 and 5</p>

V. IMPACTS ON ECOSYSTEMS	
Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Objective of CMP
<p><b>18. Recovery of marine turtle populations and restoration of habitats:</b> There is evidence that the conservation status of marine turtles and their habitats in the region has improved in the last 20 years. It is not possible to determine if and/or how much the MOU has contributed to this, but it would be interesting to get FPs and stakeholder’s perception (not correlated to the MOU) on the overall situation [improvement, neutral, or decline] in the conservation status of turtle populations and their habitats.</p> <p>Examples of indicators that could be evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of improvement (or neutral, or decline) in the conservation status of management units and habitats directly relevant to each FP and stakeholder, or in each subregion, over the past 20 years*</li> <li>• Existence of evidence of a slower rate of decline in populations numbers and habitat quality derived from better management</li> <li>• Existence of populations and habitats in a worse state over the last 20 years.</li> </ul> <p><i>* Information will be provided to respondents including a list of populations or expected populations with an assessment of worse, neutral, or better off after 20 years. Not directly related to IOSEA but provides a measure.</i></p>	<p>2</p>

Note: This document is **NOT** a questionnaire. It is a list of possible KPIs to help assess the performance of the IOSEA Marine Turtle MOU and the satisfaction of Signatory States and other stakeholders with the services provided by the MOU bodies. The questionnaire will be developed at a later stage and should be short and simple. The questionnaire will only include questions on a few selected points (amongst all the points presented) selected for feedback from Signatory States and other stakeholders.