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Executive summary

The Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) is a new and improved tool for measuring, evaluating and improving the effectiveness of wildlife law enforcement patrols and site-based conservation activities. SMART offers a suite of best practices designed to efficiently collect, analyze, and report on anti-poaching efforts at a site level, which allows a protected area manager to identify hotspots where attention is needed, empower staff, and provide useful feedback to ranger teams and protected area management.

The Wildlife Conservation Society organized a 3-day SMART training workshop at Bishkek from 10 – 12 August 2018. The workshop engaged 16 senior conservation staff from protected areas, supervision agencies, UNDP and conservation NGOs from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia in discussions about how to use information generated through the SMART approach for adaptively managing and protecting important sites and landscapes, and the wildlife therein. The workshop was taught by Michiel Hötte and Antony Lynam, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and assisted by Igor Kolodin (WCS Russia), Odonchimeg Nyamtseren, and Ochiroo Lkhamjav (WCS Mongolia).

The workshop included the following topics: What is the “SMART Approach”?; Overview of SMART implementation, Assessing the suitability for implementing SMART at a site, Site-level protection assessment, Assigning roles, responsibilities and tasks, Designing a Conservation Area, Data collection protocols and manual, SMART Equipment and new techniques, Patrol data analyses, Feedback reports & meetings, Ranger incentive systems, SMART national strategy, Training workshops, Annual progress evaluation, and Future SMART developments.

The workshop was presented in Russian and English language, and was well received with all participants reporting they gained new knowledge about the SMART approach to protected area management, and learned new skills useful for their work. Participants were exposed to experiences in using SMART from other landscapes, the Russian Far East, Mongolia, and other Asian countries.

Аннотация

Инструмент пространственного мониторинга и отчетности (программа SMART) – это новый усовершенствованный метод определения, оценки и повышения эффективности антобраконьерских рейдов и природоохранных мероприятий на конкретной территории (напр., ООПТ). Программа SMART предлагает комплекс передовых методов, разработанных для эффективного сбора и анализа данных в ходе патрулирования с последующим составлением отчетов по конкретной территории. Это позволяет руководству ООПТ выявлять проблемные участки и «болевые точки», которые требуют особого внимания, поддерживать мотивацию инспекторов и обсуждать с ними как результаты проделанной работы, так и планы на будущее.

Специалисты Общества сохранения диких животных (WCS) провели в Бишкеке (Кыргызстан) трехдневный семинар по программе SMART с 10 по 12 августа 2018 г. В семинаре приняли участие 16 ведущих специалистов ООПТ, надзорных органов, Программы развития ООН и природоохранных общественных организаций из Узбекистана, Кыргызстана и Монголии. Обсуждались вопросы использования
информации, полученной в рамках программы SMART, в целях адаптивного управления и охраны важных территорий и обитающих на них диких животных. Семинар вели специалисты WCS Михил Хоттэ и Тони Линам при содействии Игоря Колодина (АНО ОСДЖК), а также Одончимега Нямтсерена и Очиру Лхамджава (WCS-Монголия).

На семинаре обсуждались следующие вопросы:

- Что такое программа SMART
- Реализация программы SMART
- Оценка возможности реализации программы SMART на конкретной территории
- Оценка охранных мероприятий на конкретной территории
- Распределение ролей, ответственности и определение задач
- Структура базы данных SMART для конкретной ООПТ
- Руководство по сбору данных и соответствующие процедуры
- Новые технологии и оборудование для реализации программы SMART
- Анализ данных, собранных во время рейдов
- Составление отчетов по результатам работы и их обсуждение с инспекторами
- Система поощрения инспекторов
- Национальная стратегия SMART
- Тренинги и семинары по программе
- Оценка достижений за год
- Дальнейшее развитие программы SMART

Семинар проводился на русском и английском языках. Участники остались довольны семинаром и отметили, что получили новую информацию о SMART-подходе к управлению ООПТ и приобрели новый опыт, который пригодится им в работе. Участников семинара ознакомили с опытом реализации программы SMART на Дальнем Востоке России, в Монголии и других азиатских странах.
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Introduction

SMART has rapidly become the global standard for protection monitoring and management and presently SMART is used in more than 600 conservation areas and 50 countries worldwide. The "SMART Approach" uses patrol monitoring data in management cycles that are aimed at step-by-step improvements in patrol quality. If applied properly, this approach can produce substantial improvements in protection. SMART monitoring makes it possible to measure trends in poaching pressures and other threats, and providing that protection capacity is sufficient, SMART can help to bring threats to wildlife and their habitat under control and secure the survival of threatened conservation target species.

However, successful introduction of SMART is difficult and many projects fail to achieve significant, long-term improvement of protection quality. Technical issues related to use of the SMART computer program can be difficult, but are rarely a significant barrier. More often problems arise due to inadequate motivation of enforcement staff, or even more commonly, an inability for the staff managing SMART to fully embrace changes needed in management approaches.

WCS organized a working on Optimizing protection using the SMART approach in Bishkek from 10-12 August 2018 at the Bishkek Boutique Hotel. This workshop was dedicated to presenting how to effectively use the SMART tools and technologies for protected area management. The workshop covered how to avoid pitfalls when using SMART and how to improve chances of successful implementation.

Training aims and objectives

In order for more governments to adopt the SMART approach one of the first steps is to raise capacity of senior officials who should know how they can make best use of information products from SMART for adaptive management. This is especially a challenge in Central Asia where governments are interested in SMART but have not yet setup any pilot sites.

The main goal of the workshop was to provide a basic understanding of the management processes associated with protection based on the SMART Approach. At the centre of this approach is the use of the Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART). Participation in this workshop was intended to provide a basic understanding for NGO staff, site protection managers and national conservation managers of the potential merits of SMART and how to develop management protocols to insure success in introducing SMART to individual sites, or to a regional or national SMART law enforcement program.

Although the various modules and technical aspects of the SMART computer program were briefly discussed, the workshop mainly focused on managerial issues related to the design and introduction of SMART-based protection monitoring and adaptive protection management. Participants learnt what SMART-based protection management entails and how it differs from traditional protection management. They learnt how to design and organise the various stages of introducing SMART to a conservation area.
Expected outputs from training

Workshop participants learnt how to:

- Assess if a conservation site is suitable for the introduction of SMART and they will learn how to address weaknesses and improve suitability before introduction of SMART starts.
- Understand the functionality of the SMART tool for designing tailor-made procedures for patrol data collection, data logistics, data entry and data quality management, data evaluation and feedback to patrol teams that fit the local circumstances at a particular conservation site.
- Timely spot and address various problems that often occur during the introduction of SMART.
- Organise and evaluate SMART patrol monitoring trial periods.
- Produce effective patrol reports and presentations, and organise effective feedback meetings with patrol teams.
- Pros & cons of SMART-based ranger incentive systems and options for the design of these systems.
- Conduct annual evaluations of SMART-based protection systems. What topics can be covered in these evaluations, what information sources can be used, and how evaluation reports can help optimise SMART-based protection at site-level and national level?
- Learn how the SMART approach is being implemented at conservation sites ranging from chaos to optimized management, from a range of case studies in Asia.

Training materials

For this workshop, we drew upon various materials for instruction. The main resources were a set of PowerPoints presentations that covered each of 15 modules. A total of five practical training exercises were provided and carried out by groups of two to five participants. A training handbook is in development and will be available for future trainings. Participants were provided with printed copies of the PPTs.

Roles and Responsibilities during the training

Trainers and coordinators

The training workshop was taught by Michiel Hötte and Igor Kolodin (WCS Russia Program) presenting in Russian language, and Antony Lynam (WCS Asia Program) speaking in English with translation by Tynys Myrsabekov, and with support from Odonchimeg Nyamtseren and Ochiroo Lkhamjav (WCS Mongolia).
Participants

Sixteen participants joined the SMART workshop (Annex 1) from Uzbekistan (Protected Areas Department, Bioinspection), Kyrgyzstan (Protected Areas Department), UNDP Kyrgyzstan, NABU and Panthera Foundation Kyrgyzstan. Seven trainers and assistants worked as a team to deliver the workshop.

![Workshop participants from the Kyrgyz and Uzbek Republics, Mongolia, Russia and Thailand.](image)

**Figure 1.** Workshop participants from the Kyrgyz and Uzbek Republics, Mongolia, Russia and Thailand.

Workshop Format and Content

The agenda for the workshop included 3 days of intensive instruction in the classroom (Annex 2). The workshop began with an introductory presentation about the philosophy of adaptive patrol management for law enforcement monitoring (LEM) and the role SMART plays in facilitating this, followed by 14 core training modules.

Training on each module consisted of an overview in plenary, followed by interactive discussion and group breakout sessions that enabled participants to work through the key concepts and learning steps, with the trainers circulating the room to provide assistance and answer questions as needed.

Fifteen training modules were covered including:

1. What is the “SMART Approach”?
2. Overview of SMART implementation
3. Assessing the suitability for implementing SMART at a site
4. Site-level protection assessment
5. Assigning roles, responsibilities and tasks
6. Designing a Conservation Area
7. Data collection protocols and procedures and manual
8. SMART Equipment and new techniques
9. Patrol data analyses
10. Feedback reports & meetings
11. Ranger incentive systems
12. SMART national strategy
13. Training workshops
14. Annual progress and evaluation, and
15. Future SMART developments

Each module concluded with a de-briefing in plenary and a summary of key concepts and things to think about for the future. Practical examples were given throughout the training based on the trainers’ experience from sites around the world, especially the Russian Far East and Mongolia Gobi region. Participants had many questions for the WCS staff working at these sites, and there was very active exchange of information and ideas among the participants in Russian language.

**Participant responses to the workshop**

A questionnaire was circulated to all participants at the end of the training (Annex 3). A total of 16 completed questionnaires were received. The main results are:

- 78% was the average score for questions about workshop quality (lowest 55% score - highest 100% score, based on 16 participants, see questions 2-6).
- 92% was the average score for trainer quality questions (lowest 78% score - highest 100% score, based on 11 participants, see question 7)
- 71% was the average score for SMART knowledge of workshop participants prior to the workshop (1 minimum and 3 maximum score, based on 15 participants, see question 1).

The most useful part of the workshop was (question 8):

- Questions-Answers, and slides
- General content (3x)
- Strategies for the implementation of SMART
- Module about analyses of monitoring data
- Staff performance evaluation criteria
- The most useful part of the workshop was the training part
- That I learned about SMART
- The practical training exercises
- Methods used in other countries
- Presentation by Igor and Michiel about how to do analyses and carry out monitoring
- Analysis of the suitability of a site

The least useful part of the workshop was (question 9):

- Nothing (2x)
- Explanation how SMART works (3x)
- How to improve the quality of protection at a PA
- Design of SMART protected area
- A large system for studying the first time and explaining
- Bonus system
- Processes of managing SMART

In the next workshop I would like to learn more about (question 10):

- About the results of SMART in other countries
- The use of GPS
- Technical aspects (2x)
- SMART Connect
- Various observations in PAs
- Community work (2x)
- Training in SMART data collection
- Power Point
- Work with maps, data analyses, teaching
- About financing and the costs of the program
- In practice, the same system, but much deeper

Additional thoughts or comments you would like to make about the workshop (question 11):

- Received good information, met with colleagues from other countries, and exchanged experience
- The seminar was conducted very well, professionally
- I think that SMART is much more useful and I got a lot of good knowledge
- I think it's interesting and effective to work with SMART
- I think SMART is more useful for us, so there should be more such trainings
- To hold more of these seminars, preferably where the program SMART already works
- The workshop was marvelously held, good quality, knowledgeable
- It was useful, but I believe that it is necessary to improve the system of SMART as a whole
- It is necessary to analyze the time and monetary costs
- Thanks a lot!

**Trainer’s comments on the workshop**

This was the first time offering this workshop. We were pleased to have the participation of officials and NGO staff from three Central Asian countries (Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Mongolia) and the Russian Federation. We felt the results were encouraging in terms of the interest in SMART and the potential for applying the SMART approach for adaptive management in Central Asia. The training modules were designed to make them beneficial for both NGO staff, local protection managers and staff from central conservation agencies and both for staff with prior experience with SMART and staff without experience. We plan to follow up with the participants to assist them in the next steps should their governments decide they want to pilot use of SMART in their protected areas.

Antony J. Lynam (Trainer)  
Email: tlynam@wcs.org

Michiel Hötte(Trainer)  
Email: mhotte@wcs.org
### Annex 1. Workshop participants - trainees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency and position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Musaev Almaz</td>
<td>Director, Department of Protection and Use of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mambetaliev Kumar</td>
<td>Deputy-Director, Department of Protection and Use of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nurmoldoev Sainudin</td>
<td>Department of Protection and Use of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yzak Uulu</td>
<td>Specialist, Department of Protection and Use of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Abdykerimov Nurlah</td>
<td>Executor of Chief Specialist, Department of Protection and Use of Natural Resources,</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Akhmedov Sarvar</td>
<td>Leading expert of Coordination of Regional Inspection Work Unit, Bioinspection</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Azimov Aziz</td>
<td>Leading expert of Protected Areas Unit, Bioinspection</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Murodov Murodali</td>
<td>State inspector of Gissar State Reserve, Protected Areas</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chinov Vakhob</td>
<td>Head of Chatkal State Biosphere Reserve inspection</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Matkarimov Khusanboy</td>
<td>Head of Ugam Chatkal State National Nature Park Inspection</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mukhitdinov Inomjon</td>
<td>Deputy-Director of Ugam Chatkal State Biosphere Reserve</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Delgertsetseg Buyantsogt</td>
<td>Director, Law Enforcement, Ministry of Environment, Nature and Tourism</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sultanov Melisovich</td>
<td>NABU</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tursuniyazov Kurmanbekovich</td>
<td>NABU</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rana Bayrackcismith</td>
<td>Panthera</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mirgul Amanalieva</td>
<td>UNDP Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 1 (ctd). Workshop participants - trainers and assistants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency and position</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Michiel Hötte</td>
<td>WCS Russia Program</td>
<td>Vladivostok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Antony Lynam</td>
<td>WCS Asia Program</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Igor Kolodin</td>
<td>WCS Russia Program</td>
<td>Vladivostok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ochiroo Lkhamjav</td>
<td>WCS Mongolia Program</td>
<td>Ulaanbaatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Odonchimeg Nyamtseren</td>
<td>WCS Mongolia Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tynys Myrsabekov</td>
<td>Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Emil Turusbekov</td>
<td>Training Coordinator, Snow Leopard Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2. SMART Workshop Schedule, 10-12 August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME/DAY</th>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>MODERATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.00 - 9.30 | Welcome & Introduction | - Participants and moderators introduce themselves  
- Presenting workshop topics, goals, activities/methods, perspectives and schedule | T. Lynam / M. Hötte |
| 9.30 - 10.00 | What is the “SMART Approach”? | - What makes SMART different from traditional protection management  
- 3 levels of adaptive management cycles | M. Hötte/I. Kolodin |
| 10.00-10.30 | Overview of SMART implementation | - Theory of change for SMART, global implementation sites/countries, case studies, SMART Partnership | T. Lynam |
| 10.30-11.00 | COFFEE BREAK | | |
| 11.00-13.00 | Assessing the suitability for implementing SMART at a site | - Site suitability indicators and how to apply them  
- workshop assignment: assess the suitability for SMART of a site you know well (and prepare a 10 minute presentation, discussing its suitability and what could be done to increase it) | M. Hötte/I. Kolodin |
| 13.00-14.00 | LUNCH | | |
| 14.00-16.00 | Site-level protection assessment | - Site-level law enforcement assessment, including threats assessment, capacity assessment, and patrol data management  
- How can the assessment be done and what can the results tell us? | T. Lynam |
- workshop assignment: conduct an assessment using the site level enforcement assessment tool for a site you know well (and prepare a 10 minute presentation about the site’s protection characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.20</td>
<td><strong>COFFEE BREAK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.20-17.00</td>
<td>Assigning roles, responsibilities and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dividing roles and responsibilities for the introduction phase (e.g. system design, purchasing equipment, data collection training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dividing SMART management tasks (e.g. data collection, storage, processing, reporting, feedback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. Hötte/ I. Kolodin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.00-11.00 | Designing a Conservation Area                | - Designing and configuring a Conservation Area in SMART  
- workshop assignment: using the SMART tool, design data categories and patrol types for a site you are familiar with (and prepare a 10 minute presentation about this) | T. Lynam / M. Hötte   |
| 11.00-11.20 | COFFEE BREAK                                 |                                                                             |                       |
| 11.20-13.00 | Data collection protocols and procedures and manual | - Designing data collection protocols and procedures in SMART  
- writing a data collection manual  
- Conducting and evaluating a data collection trial period  
Workshop assignment: using Cybertracker and SMART design a configured data model for a site you are familiar with | T. Lynam / O. Lkhamjav |
| 13.00-14.00 | LUNCH                                       |                                                                             |                       |
| 14.00-14.40 | SMART Equipment and new techniques           | - What devices are available for data collection, how many items are needed, brands, quality, approximate costs  
- Cybertracker; how it works, costs, advantages and disadvantages  
- Networking across conservation areas - SMART Connect | T. Lynam/ O. Lkhamjav |
| 14.40-16.00 | Patrol data analyses                        | - Types of basic analyses for periodic reports (patrol queries and summaries)  
- In-depth analyses, detecting long-term trends in patrol data  
- Other types of data that can inform management that can be brought into SMART; intelligence, community patrols, wildlife crime hotlines, independent incidents | M. Hötte/ I. Kolodin  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.20</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.20-17.00</td>
<td>Feedback reports &amp; meetings</td>
<td>- periodic patrol reports and meetings; formats and topics (showing and discussing examples from various reports)</td>
<td>M. Hütte/I. Kolodin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- patrol recommendations and setting patrol targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DAY 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.00-10.15     | Ranger incentive systems         | - Why do we need to incentivize rangers and ranger teams?  
- Under what conditions can incentive systems work (and when not)  
- Various types of incentive systems and how to use them (showing examples)  
- Workshop assignment: develop a set of patrol and result performance indicators (with individual weights) for a site you are familiar with. | M. Hötte/ I. Kolodin |
| 10.15-10.30    | COFFEE BREAK                     |                                                                                                                                         |                     |
| 10.30-11.00    | SMART national strategy          | - How can we scale up SMART across multiple protected areas?  
Advantages of national adoption?  
- How can central authorities stimulate and manage national adoption? What is required to make it a success? | T. Lynam            |
| 11.00-13.00    | Training workshops               | - Types of training needed: data collection training, basic and advanced user training, manager training  
- Preparing and conducting trainings  
- Building capacity at the site for training; training of trainers  
- Conducting and evaluating a data collection trial period | All facilitators    |
<p>| 13.00-14.00    | LUNCH                            |                                                                                                                                         |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.00-14.45</td>
<td>Annual progress and evaluation</td>
<td>- In-depth patrol data evaluation, evaluation of external factors (that the site cannot control)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Are biodiversity goals and protection targets being met? Are resources for patrolling sufficient? Are site goals still realistic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Considering changes in SMART monitoring and patrol management practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45-15.30</td>
<td>Future SMART developments</td>
<td>SMART events - poacher cam data</td>
<td>M. Hötte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMART case tracking tool - following cases from detection to prosecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMART ecological records - survey data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Options, benefits &amp; drawbacks, caveats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.30</td>
<td>Wrap up meeting</td>
<td>- Main conclusions and final discussion</td>
<td>T. Lynam / M. Hötte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3. Workshop Participants Evaluation Form

Participant Evaluation
SMART Management Workshop
August 2018

1. Did you have an understanding of SMART before the workshop? Circle the answer which you believe to be most accurate.
   yes / somewhat / no

2. Has your understanding of SMART increased as a result of the workshop? Circle the answer which you believe most accurate.
   1. I learned no new knowledge
   2. I learned a little more than before the workshop
   3. I learned a lot
   4. I learned a great deal

3. Has your appreciation of the usefulness of SMART as a tool for improving protection increased? Circle the answer which you believe most accurate.
   1. I don’t find SMART more useful than before the workshop
   2. I find it a little bit more useful than before
   3. I find it much more useful
   4. I find it very much more useful

4. The SMART approach to law enforcement monitoring is relevant and potentially useful for the conservation areas I work in
   1. not useful at all
   2. almost not useful
   3. neutral
   4. useful
   5. very useful

5. I would recommend the use of SMART to my organization
   1. strongly disagree
   2. disagree
   3. neutral
   4. agree
   5. strongly agree
6. Please give your opinion about the PowerPoint presentations. Circle the answer which you believe most accurate.
   1. not useful at all
   2. almost not useful
   3. neutral
   4. useful
   5. very useful

7. Please encircle what applies to the instructors.
   - Knowledgeable: yes / somewhat / no
   - Easily understood: yes / somewhat / no
   - Answered questions well: yes / somewhat / no
   - Provided useful examples: yes / somewhat / no
   - Allowed for participant interaction: yes / somewhat / no
   - Presented something useful/valuable: yes / somewhat / no

8. The most useful part of the workshop was:

9. The least useful part of the workshop was:

10. In the next workshop I would like to learn more about the following subjects:

11. Please add any additional thoughts or comments you would like to make about the workshop (if needed, use the back of you paper for additional space).

12. My main responsibilities at my work are (Please circle the most correct option):
    a) management of the protected area
    b) managing protection at a protected area
    c) leading a patrol team or other patrol activities
    d) supervision of protection at protected areas
    e) other