How can the Conservation & Sustainable Development Program at the MacArthur Foundation adapt the monitoring and evaluation techniques used by grantees and others to suit their needs?

Emma Brigham
External Relations and Grant Manager
Aga Khan Foundation

MacArthur
Foundation

Executive Summary

The MacArthur Foundation's Conservation and Development Program's (CSD) has seen a growing number of grantees include a social component to their conservation interventions. Macarthur wants to better understand the overlaps between conservation and development and incorporate this learning into the development of a new 2011-2020 CSD strategy. This White Paper considers how:

- Organisations view the mutual interests of conservation and development, and;
- Organisations measure the social impacts of their activities, and;
- MacArthur can better understand their grants' social impacts and maximise social benefits.

Conservation is increasingly seen as a social process. Most conservation interventions aim to address social issues and livelihoods in some way but many organisations continue to grapple with the issues involved because a small, but important, part of the conservation community sees social issues as being of secondary importance to global conservation priorities. As MacArthur positions itself for engaging with social and conservation issues over the next ten years it should reflect on where it perceives the relative importance of local stakeholders to be, and, consider in whose interest conservation activities are undertaken – the interests of local custodians or for the 'global good'?

Opportunities for the foundation to engage are to:

i. Promote collaborative relationships between the development and conservation communities, with a focus on process as much as outputs.
ii. Advocate donors recognise the overlapping interests of conservation and development.
iii. Build a grant portfolio that balances the foundation's interests in conservation and development.
iv. Ensure social interventions are underpinned by a rights-based approach.

Both the conservation and the development organisations interviewed highlighted a range of challenges in assessing the social impacts of interventions. These stemmed from the cost, complexity, time-frames involved and difficulties of attribution related to social impact assessments. However, interviewees also noted similarities in their approaches to tackle these, including that a variety of tools are necessary, that the local context is very important and that there are no quick fixes for social assessments.

If the foundation wishes to collate useful social impact data from grantees then the most meaningful contribution it can make is to build grantees' capacities to collect the key information in the first place. There are several approaches that the foundation should consider at the project design and at project evaluation stages.

At the project design stage:

i. Identify relevant 'dimensions of change' and core principles;
ii. Interventions are underpinned by a Theory of Change;

At the evaluation stage (from output orientated approaches to process orientated approaches):

i. Grantees report against high-level indicators;
ii. Request qualitative information;
iii. Sampling projects or activities;
iv. Simultaneously assess multiple grants for their social impacts;
v. Introduce peer reviews;
vi. Grantees sign up to certain 'principles' of M&E.

Contents

1. Aims and Objectives

In the last 10 years, staff at the MacArthur Foundation's Conservation and Sustainable Development Program (CSD), have seen an increasing overlap of conservation and development agendas. Many conservation interventions now include a social component and conservation is seen, increasingly, as a social process. As CSD staff devise and articulate their new strategy they are interested in exploring these overlaps and gaining a better understanding of how their grantees, and others, perceive the issues involved. Therefore the aims and objectives of this White Paper are:

- To discuss with a range of stakeholders how their organisations currently view the mutual interests of conservation and development, and;
- To examine how organisations that have interventions which include a social component, measure the social impacts of those activities, and;
- Make recommendations for how MacArthur can strengthen their internal framework for understanding the social impacts of their grants and maximising social benefits.

2. Conservation and development

The role and value of biodiversity in supporting the livelihoods of poor people has been widely debated for over 25 years (Roe, 2008, p491). Today there is a strong recognition of and concern for the social impacts of conservation interventions. Many conservation projects now address some of the social issues related to their interventions in order to engage local stakeholders and rights-holders of the natural resources in question; they engage with livelihoods and human needs in order to provide social benefits to deliver conservation outcomes (FFI/BL/AWF workshop, 2007 p1).

Many of the conservationists interviewed noted that they still grapple, to some extent, with how social issues and livelihood concerns are included into their work. They explained that there is a constituency within many conservation organisations - particularly within WWF - who feel that the protection of biodiversity should be seen as an end in itself. It should neither be distracted by the needs and interests of local people nor should donors dilute the funds available for conservation by requiring a social component. This constituency is motivated by a desire to conserve natural resources, and social issues are seen as being of secondary importance. A number of interviewees commented on how this discourse has undermined the establishment of a more united group calling for suitable, rigorous frameworks for assessing social impacts.

As MacArthur defines how it will engage with the overlapping interests of conservation and development there are issues to reflect upon and opportunities to consider.

2.1 Issues to reflect upon

2.1.1 Conservation for whom?

It is important to identify where local people 'fit' within a conservation project, i.e. ask 'conservation for whom' (Phil Franks at Care). It was noted that historically conservation has mostly been undertaken by northern organisations for the 'global good'; this can detach external interventions from their local context and can relegate the importance of local people. In order to address the social issues, related to their activities, conservation organisations therefore need to examine in whose interest they are acting. Furthermore they need to acknowledge that local stakeholders are the primary custodians of local natural resources and have a right to shape any changes being advocated.

Conservationists need to develop a nuanced, pluralistic understanding of the stakeholders involved.

2.1.2 Collaboration is difficult but necessary

Collaboration represents one way that conservation and development practitioners can benefit from the skills and experience of each other. However, collaboration can be challenging; organisations have different cultures and visions and bringing these together can be hard. Collaboration between organisations operating in different sectors is likely to be even more challenging because people are likely to have "different world views" (Studd, WWFUK). Also there may be a perception that collaboration may generate a competition for funds or donor relationships.

There are examples of collaboration between development and conservation organisations, but these are small in number and are often not truly collaborative. One notable exception is the relationship between WWFUS and Care. Both parties noted the difficulties they have overcome and the time taken (ten years) to get to the solid relationship they have now.

Increasingly, though, collaboration is seen as being necessary. Conservation and development interviewees acknowledged that addressing the threats posed by climate change may "finally provide the 'glue' to bind the conservation and development communities together" (Roe, 2008, p500). This was an argument that was felt quite strongly amongst development practitioners; indeed as the CEO of ActionAid USA said that the development and conservation communities "do not have the luxury of not working together" (Peter O'Driscoll, 2010).

2.2 Opportunities to consider

2.2.1 Bring conservation and development practitioners together

The MacArthur Foundation could "facilitate a space" to bring practitioners from both sectors together in a way that encourages and rewards collaboration. Often NGOs may be interested in collaborating but donor opportunities can make this difficult. MacArthur could provide practical and conceptual reasons to work together and the process of collaboration could be as important as the outputs generated.

The areas which ActionAid suggested there to be overlapping interests between the conservation and development communities, and, therefore obvious issues to collaborate on included:
  i. Climate change;
  ii. Biofuels / agrofuels;
  iii. Sustainable agriculture and land use;
  iv. Water (agricultural use and pollution).

2.2.2 Advocate a more cohesive donor approach

The MacArthur Foundation has access to and can engage other donors in a way that NGOs cannot. WWFUK, Care and ActionAid suggested that although donors recognise the merits of combining social and environmental agendas, funding opportunities often remain focussed on one sector or another. Therefore interviewees suggested that MacArthur could use their access to promote a more coherent approach to the needs of conservation and development. This could involve articulating the challenges grantees face when their funding does not facilitate meeting a combined conservation and development agenda.

2.2.3 Incorporate a Rights-based approach

The development practitioners interviewed all expressed the view that taking a rights-based approach to development would provide a solid foundation for maximising the social co-benefits of MacArthur grants.

In short, ActionAid defines a rights-based approach as one that enables poor people to fulfil their individual needs because they are empowered, able to negotiate, feel dignified and have choices. "It requires that rights-holders living in poverty are fully involved and take action in determining their needs and the responses that will be provided to answer them" (ActionAid). It puts people at the heart of social changes. Adopting a rights-based approach would not mean that MacArthur grants would only address only social issues, but that, where social issues are relevant, local people would be involved and included in a way that is meaningful and positive. This might include local stakeholders being involved in helping define a project's 'indicators of success'.

2.2.4 Pursue a balanced grant portfolio

The Packard Foundation intentionally funds a combination of social and environmental projects. As a donor they recognise the importance of supporting pure conservation initiatives as well as financing interventions that contain social and biological objectives. In selecting grantees, they seek to maintain, what they feel is, a balance between conservation priorities, social priorities and a blend of both.

As MacArthur explores the options for their next strategic plan one choice would be to identify an appropriate balance between projects that look at pure conservation, pure development and those that combine both. The fact that MacArthur has hitherto provided funds for pure conservation initiatives was acknowledged by the conservationists interviewed as being notable and valuable within the broader donor landscape. Pursuing a balanced portfolio would allow MacArthur to continue to provide these important funds as well as supporting more integrated initiatives. MacArthur would require more robust social impact data from those projects that include a social component, whilst only requiring biological measures from those that do not.

3. How do organisations measure the social impacts of their interventions?

Monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment is about understanding and judging the value of what you and/or others have done (Pinder, 2007, pp22-24). Social impact assessments are challenging for development and conservation organisations alike because:

- Quantitative and socio-economic data are expensive and time-consuming to collect;
- Interventions are often complex, non-linear processes that are hard to control and the results are hard to measure and attribute;
- Impacts – the long term changes caused by a project – often take longer than the duration of a grant to become evident;

For conservation organisations social impact assessment is particularly challenging because:

- Conservationists are often not skilled in social data collection (FFI/BLI/AWF Workshop, 2007, p3). Therefore they are "often struggling to demonstrate the impact of their biodiversity conservation interventions on people because of inadequate monitoring and evaluation, a lack of capacity to undertake social monitoring and/or a lack of appreciation of the range of applicable tools and processes" (FFI/BLI/AWF Workshop, 2007, p1).

- Attributing complex social changes to natural resource or ecological interventions – as opposed to explicitly social interventions – provides an additional layer of complexity (Phil Franks at Care).

There was widespread agreement among those interviewed that the conservation community should incorporate social issues into their interventions; however there was also consensus about the challenges involved in working on and measuring social issues. The organisations interviewed had a framework in place for capturing social data but each of the conservation organisations felt their approaches were piecemeal and, to varying degrees, unsatisfactory. As summed up by the head of M&E at the African Wildlife Federation (AWF) "our general view is that we have not been able to properly capture the social impacts of conservation interventions at the household level". The development organisations expressed similar, although milder frustrations, and ActionAid appeared to be the organisation most satisfied with the approach they are rolling out.

3.1 Examining social impacts
Interviewees identified a number of factors as being relevant for those examining social issues.

A variety of assessment approaches are necessary
There is no blueprint for assessing social impacts. Social issues are extremely complex and one size will not fit all (Turrall and Studd, 2009, p23). Different tools are relevant for different situations and a portfolio of methods helps triangulate results (Turrall and Studd, 2009, p23). Furthermore, having different tools available – preferably ones that can provide a mix of qualitative and quantitative data on results – will provide a richer and more accurate picture (FFI/BLI/AWF Workshop, 2007, p1).

Importance of local context
To be useful in identifying social impacts, M&E approaches should analyze the local linkages between poverty, peoples' livelihoods and environmental issues and aim to involve local stakeholders in analysing how groups may have been affected by an intervention. Thus "methodologies should be adopted and adapted to local circumstances" (Turrall & Studd, 2009, p10). However this means that consistency and uniformity are hard to achieve both within an organisation and between organisations.

There are no quick fixes for social assessments
Social impact assessments take time and resources. ActionAid's experience suggests organisations should cease looking for the "quick fix" because there is not one; furthermore the problem is not that we are missing the correct approaches– simple questions suffice and critical thinking, investment in time for reflection, systematic thinking, planning and monitoring are the basics." (Exchanges, Issue 3, 2008, p4).

4. How can MacArthur strengthen their understanding of the social impacts of their grants?

CSD staff articulated their desire to feel more confident that projects are not doing social harm. They articulated their concern that the necessary systems are not in place to tackle this. Staff explained that they wish to feel more confident that their grants are not doing social harm. Their new strategic plan provides an opportunity to address this gap.

However, the informational gaps in MacArthur's project management framework should not be overstated. MacArthur *does* have a framework to collect impact data, albeit a loose one.

Also, based on discussions with CSD staff it seems there is a limited audience for M&E data within the Foundation itself and, consequently, there is a natural tendency to avoid collecting information which is unlikely to be used.

Discussions with other donors revealed that they are not able to collect much more robust social data either. Bernd Cordes, Program Officer at the Packard Foundation, explained that they ask grantees to report against 10-12 high-level indicators intended to capture some of the conservation and social impacts of a project, however some grantees are unable to meet this limited requirement. In addition, Claudio Volonte, Chief Evaluation Officer at the M&E unit of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), explained that they are grappling with similar issues. The MacArthur Foundation is therefore not very different from similar organizations in the extent to which it has been able to monitor and evaluate social issues and impacts.

Donors and grantees continue to struggle with how to collect useful social impact data. Therefore, the question is not just how MacArthur should collect information from grantees but, more fundamentally, how it can enable its grantees to collect and use that information in the first place. A logical place to start would be for MacArthur, as a donor, to strengthen its grantees' capacity to effectively and systematically collect, measure and assess the social impacts of their interventions. Such investment could yield tangible returns, since grantees' abilities to learn from and scale up their social impacts corresponds to their ability to first evidence that impact.

Detailed below are a range of approaches that should be considered; some are more output orientated while others are more process orientated. Given the extent to which grantees find social impact assessment to be challenging a process orientated approach would provide the most sustainable, meaningful long-term contribution. The approaches are broken down into those that might be included at the project design stage and those that are relevant at the evaluation stage. A number of the approaches are mutually reinforcing.

4.1 At the project design stage
"Good programme planning and analysis prior to implementation is fundamental" (WWFUK).

4.1.1 Identify relevant 'dimensions of change' and core principles
MacArthur's grantees are diverse organisations with different M&E frameworks in place pursuing varied agendas. Therefore any framework MacArthur uses to examine the social changes stimulated by their grants needs to embrace this diversity. One option is to use a 'dimensions of change' framework. MacArthur would identify the dimensions of change that they are interested in and the principles they believe should guide interventions. This would allow MacArthur to identify the areas (dimensions) where they seek positive changes, but it would recognise that grantees will deliver and measure these changes in a range of different ways. Grantees would need to acknowledge that they will neither be able to, nor expected to, deliver change in all areas during one grant.

An example of the dimensions of change that MacArthur might be interested in could include:
- **Changes in natural resource management and land use.**
  Natural resources are being managed more effectively and in collaboration with relevant local and national stakeholders.

- **Changes in local, national and global governance structures.**
  Grantees are stimulating positive changes in policy and decision-making at different levels.

- **Changes in local community capacity to sustainably manage their natural resources.**
  Local communities are informed, empowered and able to participate in the management of their natural resources. Have interventions done no social harm?

- **A reduction in the decline of important locally and globally identified species.**
  Are interventions reducing the decline of critical species and addressing the threats to those species?

- **Changes in gender inequalities.**
  Have the interventions contributed to greater equality between men and women?

Grantees would report against the dimensions of change that are relevant to their intervention(s), by and large, in ways that match their existing M&E frameworks and systems. This approach contrasts with, though is not mutually exclusive with, having grantees report against a set of standardized indicators. (See section 4.2.1 below for a discussion.)

4.1.2 Interventions are underpinned by a Theory of Change

Many interviewees – Packard, GEF, Save the Children, ActionAid – referred to the usefulness of articulating a theory of change. A theory of change includes many of the characteristics of existing planning tools, but is more nuanced, less linear and allows those who use it to thoroughly examine and articulate how sustainable change will happen. "It becomes your blueprint for effecting change" (Myers, STCF). Bernd Cordes, at Packard, explained how many grantees, when asked to go through the process, often realise where there are gaps in their intervention logic.

Adopting this approach would mean that MacArthur would require grant applications to be based upon a well thought-through logic for change and grantees would provide a "clear rationale of what changes in whose lives the programme is trying to influence" (Turrall & Studd &, WWFUK, p10). The theory would identify the 'impact drivers', those elements that are essential for ensuring the desired impacts. To be relevant to MacArthur, a grantee's theory of change would need to address those dimensions of change which MacArthur is interested in.

MacArthur Program Officers would assess whether a grantee's theory of change holds up to scrutiny. Assessing the impact of a grant could take a number of different forms; grantees could be asked to report on:

- The robustness of the theory that underpinned their project and where they may have changed it. They should also report on the unintended consequences – positive and negative – that have resulted.

- The extent to which the impact drivers they identified are in place.

- Evidence of whether the assumptions and risks associated with the articulated theory of change exist.

4.2 At the evaluation stage

The recommendations below are presented with the more output- based suggestions first, followed by those that are more process based.

4.2.1 Grantees report against high-level indicators

Reporting against high-level indicators is the route the Packard Foundation has chosen. MacArthur would identify 10-15 high-level indicators, including those that would capture social changes, which grantees would measure and report on in their annual reports. This would provide MacArthur with a composite set of indicators for all grantees.

Although this is an approach used by many donors there are several disadvantages. For some grantees the process of reporting against indicators might be cost effective and fairly straightforward, but for many it would be intensive in terms of both time and money. For MacArthur, the data would not be particularly informative because it would have no real context. And when it comes to social data, indicators have significant limitations; "much of what matters in people-centred development (such as empowerment, self-confidence, leadership) cannot be measured easily, if at all, via a limited set of indicators" (Gujit, cited in ActionAid, 2010, p8). For grantees, this type of approach can compel grantees to 'work to the indicators' rather than delivering a more coherent, challenging intervention.

4.2.2 Request qualitative information

Case studies could provide a rich source of qualitative information which illuminate 'why' certain changes have taken place. They can be useful in capturing complex social changes within a local community. MacArthur would require grantees submit 3-5 case studies along with their annual reports to illustrate the social issues being tackled by the intervention.

The case studies submitted to MacArthur could also assist in strengthening conservation practice by simultaneously being submitted to 'Conservation Evidence'. This is an online journal, managed by the University of Cambridge, which aims to "to improve global nature conservation practice by sharing knowledge as to the effectiveness of conservation management interventions" (www.conservationevidence.com). Contributing grantees' case studies would support improved conservation practice and institutional learning about the social costs and benefits of conservation.

The main disadvantages of this approach is that, to be useful it can be relatively expensive for grantees because staff will need training in how to gather and present relevant qualitative information. Also, the quality of the case studies provided to MacArthur could vary enormously.

4.2.3 Sampling projects or activities

A number of grantees – WWFUK, Save the Children, AWF – suggested that sampling is a useful tool for assessing social impacts. MacArthur could require that grantees report on the social impacts of a sample of their activities. This would mean that that the grantee would not have to invest significant resources in a comprehensive impact assessments but could examine a sub-group in some detail. MacArthur would need to be clear that they want grantees to report on the success stories as well as the failures. This approach could be complemented by the use of case studies.

4.2.4 Simultaneously assess multiple grants for their social impacts

To gain a more nuanced and detailed understanding of the social impacts of interventions it can be useful to look at multiple grants; examining the impact of a project undertaken by one organisation can also be useful but narrow. MacArthur could conduct external, thematic impact assessments every five years to evaluate the social impacts of a range of grants which address a similar set of issues. This would provide a more useful scale of evaluation and ActionAid suggested it could also provide more meaningful results.   The process could also be shaped into also being an opportunity for information-sharing across the grantees involved.

4.2.5 Introduce peer reviews

Peer reviews can provide an opportunity for encouraging collaboration between organisations as a way of examining social issues. They can also be a very useful tool for documenting and validating best practices.

MacArthur would organise for 3 organisations to peer-review another organisation's approach to a particular issue – e.g. managing small grants programs, social impact assessments, local communities and PAs, etc. This would provide an uncompetitive opportunity for organisations to explore an issue that they are likely to only see from their organisational perspective. The Head of M&E at ActionAid suggested that this can provide a tremendous opportunity for organisational learning and building collaboration.

4.2.6 Grantees sign up to certain 'principles' of M&E

Requiring that grantees sign up to certain principles of M&E would allow MacArthur to invest in their grantees' M&E systems and capacities in a very meaningful way. The approach is not prescriptive and so would be appropriate given the diversity of grantees and the varied M&E frameworks they have in place. Also, it would provide a framework for decision-making which would enable grantees to design locally appropriate assessment methodologies (Corrigan, *draft*, p51). This would assist grantees to improve their capacity for social impact assessments which would benefit both MacArthur and grantees' other donors. It would also sit well alongside MacArthur's interest in maintaining hands-off, long-term relationships with grantees.

MacArthur would identify those principles which, as a donor, are seen as important. These would be very high level given the diversity of grantees. They might include:

- Collecting disaggregated information.
  How do you collect information that takes into account the different social groups affected by your interventions?

- Reliability of findings.
  How do you triangulate your results?

- Engaging local stakeholders.
  How do you include and involve local stakeholders? What participatory processes do you use?

- Supporting organisational learning.
  How does the information generated by your M&E systems feed into operational and organisational learning?

MacArthur could provide a certain % of the grant (in addition to the grant) to allow the grantees to build and invest in their M&E systems so as to meet the principles identified above. A MacArthur Program Officer would agree the terms for how these funds are spent and so they could be tailored to the needs of an individual grantee.

A major advantage of this approach is that it would support grantees to put certain competencies in place for evaluating social outcomes and impacts without generating a great volume of impact data for Program Officers to appraise. Furthermore MacArthur would be able to demonstrate its diligence in enabling grantees to evaluate social impacts and address whether they are doing any harm. MacArthur could also ask grantees, in their annual report, to lay-out what they consider the main social benefits and costs of their interventions. The capacity building resources provided by MacArthur would enable grantees to be better positioned to do this.

5. Conclusions, recommendations and implications

In recent years there has been an increasing overlap between the interests of the conservation and development communities. Furthermore, many conservation initiatives now include a social component. As they devise their new ten year strategy, MacArthur wants a better understanding of how these interests overlap and how they can improve their framework for measuring and understanding their grants' social impacts.

Conservation is a social process (Springer, 2009, p26) which can contribute to people's livelihoods and poverty (BirdLife, p7). There are numerous challenges involved in building a more collaborative relationship between these two communities. It has been suggested that increasing collaboration is vital if we are to effectively address the threats posed by climate change. As MacArthur defines its role for the next ten years there are definitely certain actions they can take to facilitate collaboration.

All the interviewees – conservation and development alike – reflected on the challenges involved in measuring the social impacts of their interventions. Nevertheless they were able to identify some common characteristics that contribute to providing a more solid foundation for identifying social issues.

There are different approaches which MacArthur should consider at the project design and evaluation stages – some focussing more on outputs and others on processes. Given the extent to which organisations are grappling with how to conduct effective social impact assessments the most meaningful contribution MacArthur can make on this issue is to invest in processes rather than outputs. In other words, MacArthur would recognise that the processes which a grantee goes through to develop more rigorous social impact assessment frameworks is as important as the data they produce at the end. An example of this type of approach might be that MacArthur clarifies what social changes they are interested in and makes resources available to grantees to put in place organisationally and locally relevant tools and frameworks. Given the challenges and complexities of carrying out social impact assessments this sort of approach would be entirely appropriate.

As MacArthur moves forward it would seem important to clarify:

- Why the interest in the social impacts? Is it to be accountable (do no harm), is it to identify innovative approaches and promote good practice or is it because MacArthur recognises that conservation is a social process and local rights-holders are key to delivering responsible, effective solutions for natural resource management?

- How does MacArthur define success? Are successful grants those that deliver what grantees agreed to in their grant agreements or, those that try to do that but acknowledge the messiness and complexity of addressing social issues? Is success when grantees are more capable organisations? Is success when MacArthur facilitates collaboration and so shape a more dynamic conservation and development community?

- How important is M&E? If MacArthur wants to know, and empower its grantees to identify the outcomes and impacts of their activities, then this needs to underpin the entire project planning process. Grantees need to have clear intervention logic, evaluation systems in place and time to 'think'.

6. References

ActionAid (2008). 'Sharing our lessons on the Global Monitoring Framework'. *Exchanges, Newsletter of the IASL community.* Issue 3.

BirdLife International (2006). *Livelihoods and the environment at Important Bird Areas: listening to local voices*. BirdLife International. Cambridge, UK.

Conservation Evidence 'Home'. Page viewed on 28th March 2010. www.conservationevidence.com.

Corrigan, C., *et al*, (draft, unpublished). 'Social Assessment of Protected Areas: a review of rapid methodologies. *A report for the Social Assessment of Protected Areas Initiative.*

FFI/BLI/AWF Workshop (2007). 'Measuring the impact of livelihoods initiatives in a conservation context'. *Summary of a multi-sectoral workshop held at Clare College, Cambridge, UK*.

Gujit, cited in ActionAid (2010). 'Monitoring Framework for Rights to End Poverty'. *Internal ActionAid Discussion Paper on Approaching M&E*.

Pinder, R., (2007) TU870 Part 3, *Capacities for Managing Development*. Open University, Milton Keynes.

Roe, D., (2008). 'The origins and evolution of the conservation-poverty debate: a review of key literature, events and policy processes'. *Oryx*. vol 42, no. 4, pp491-503.

Springer, J. (2009). 'Addressing the social impacts of conservation: lessons from experience and future directions'. *Conservation and Society* vol. 7, no. 1, pp 26-29.

Turrall, S. and Studd, K. (2009). *Capturing change in people's lives and livelihoods within programmes*. *Learning from good practice and experience of conservation/development organisations to inform WWF practice.*

7. Appendices

Appendix 1. A list of interviewees.

Organisation	Contact person
Development organisations and donors	
ActionAid	Peter O'Driscoll, *Executive Director, AA USA* Laurie Adams, *Head of International IASL, AA Johannesburg*
Care	Phil Franks, *Poverty, Environmental and Climate Change Network Coordinator, Care*
Save the Children	Diana Myers, *Director, International Program Leadership Save the Children USA*
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	Claudio Volonte, *Chief Evaluation Officer, Global Environment Facility*
Packard Foundation	Bernd Cordes, *Program Officer, Packard Foundation*
Conservation organisations	
WWF	Kate Studd, *Design and Impact Team, WWFUK* Jenny Springer, *Director Indigenous Peoples, Livelihoods and Governance, WWFUS*. Mike Mascia, *Science & Evaluation, WWFUS*
BirdLife International	David Thomas, *Director, Site Support Unit*. Hazell Thompson, *Assistant Director for Network & Capacity Development*.
International Institute for Environment & Development (IIED)	Dilys Roe, *Senior Researcher, Natural Resources Group*.
African Wildlife Foundation	Joanna Elliott, *VP for Program Design*
Conservation International	Frank Hawkins, *VP for Africa Program* (*Despite numerous attempts to engage Mr Hawkins I was unable to formally interview him. I was led to believe that CI is still in the process of examining how, as an organisation, it intends to address these issues.*
Monitoring & Evaluation	
Development M&E specialist	Jon Kurtz, *Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant*

Appendix 2. Other useful resources

Name	Description	How to access it
Social Assessment of Protected Areas: a review of rapid methodologies. *A report for the Social Assessment of Protected Areas.*	This report – still in draft – is the result of 3 years work by a number of development and conservation NGOs (UNEP WCMC, Care, TNC, IIED, WCPA, CEESP). The report is 109 pages long and provides an extremely comprehensive review of social impact assessment tools and the issues organisations face when using them to assess the social issues related to protected areas.	Contact Dilys Roe at IIED to request a draft copy.
Capturing change in people's lives and livelihoods within Programmes. *Learning from good practice and experiences of conservation/ development organisations to inform WWF Practice.*	This is a report from WWF UK (Susanne Turrall & Kate Studd). It reviews how different organisations approach the issue of social impact assessments, makes recommendations to WWF and provides a brief description of the main tools used.	Email Kate Studd for a copy - KStudd@wwf.org.uk
WWF Poverty Cluster Briefing Papers (1-5)	These five briefing papers address a range of issues related to poverty and conservation, including how WWF is addressing the issues, what other organisations are doing, opportunities and emerging priorities.	Ask Kate Studd or Judy Oglethorpe for a copy.
Biodiversity, climate change and poverty: exploring the links. An IIED Briefing.	Authored by Hannah Reid and Krystyna Swiderska in February 2008, this short paper provides a useful overview of the many ways in which poverty and biodiversity are inextricably linked and how addressing both is key to tackling climate change.	IIED website.
'Supportive to the core' by the Institute for Philanthropy, Sept 2009.	Puts forward reasons why core support to grantees is very beneficial. Includes 3 case studies.	www.instituteforphilanthropy.org
Livelihoods and the environment at Important Bird Areas: *Listening to local voices.*	This is a clear and useful publication which captures how BirdLife International understands the links between conservation, poverty and development. It uses a number of case studies to illustrate key points.	Ask David Thomas for a copy (David.Thomas@birdlife.org)

Appendix 3. List of recommendations made by interviewees

Some of the main interview responses to:

- How the MacArthur Foundation can enable grantees to better measure their social impact?
- What can the MacArthur Foundation do to contribute to enabling the conservation community to more effectively incorporate social issues where they are relevant?

Save the Children	Use a 'Theory of Change' approach, and use this to articulate how you understand sustainable change will happen. Ensure grantees have clarity about: • What success will look like? • How they will know it when they see it? Sampling – don't ask grantees to report on every evaluation, but on a sample of them.
WWF US (Mike Mascia)	Targeted examination of the big questions associated with highly contested strategies (what are the ecological and social impacts of MPAs? Fisheries certification? Communal conservancies? Etc). Donors are the only ones who are really positioned to make this work happen, since they have the greatest stake in understanding what works, what doesn't, and why. Support for evidence-based, evaluative approaches (what works, why they work, how they work, etc). Provide training and capacity-building in a tailored way for field staff; build capacity for M&E.
ActionAid USA	Identify issues of mutual interest to both communities: • Climate change • Biofuels/ agrofuels (prices, tenure, climate change) • Sustainable agriculture and land use • Water (large-scale agriculture and pollution from agriculture) Suggests that MacArthur focus on process and output. Could do this by providing opportunities that are of interest to the development and conservation community. They should actively promote collaboration. The outputs would be meaningful but *as importantly* the process of working together could be informative and useful too.

BirdLife	It's all about the threat analysis; ensure grantees have carried out a thorough problem/threat analysis. 'Do no harm' approach.
Packard Foundation	• Use high-level indicators • Intentionally have a balanced portfolio of projects – x% conservation, x% development and x% dev and cons. • Theory of change is a useful approach and can provide a bedrock which can be adapted to suit local circumstances.
African Wildlife Foundation	Recognise the value of anecdotal information (storytelling) Providing funding to look at cost-effective methodologies for socio-economic approaches that can be used in relatively small projects. Facilitate a learning environment, in which conservationists can learn from social practitioners (and visa versa)
WWF UK	1. Encourage collaboration (e.g. WWF US-Care) 2. Fund technical expertise on the social side (political scientists) to provide analysis for conservation interventions. 3. Fund to help assess what aspects of poverty affect biological degradation and how to address it.
Care	Important to ask 'conservation for whom?' It used to be that it was for 'humanity' (i.e. a more northern-dominated agenda) which often tended to overlook the losers of a project. They are the voiceless ones. It would be useful to talk in terms of conservation being undertaken for different reasons, a more nuanced approach which recognised local and global motivations. A pluralistic approach. 1. Adopt a 'do no harm' philosophy. 2. Operational level: support initiatives with a broader constituency; work with communities as *legitimate* conservationists; support projects where local people are key. 3. Strategic level: Explore conservation at a macro level; sustainable development paradigms and look at the political economy and the politics behind conservation. Act as an advocate at high-donor table for greater connectivity between conservation and development (Bretton Woods)