EEN Forum 2009 Notes, 6/8/2009 1 p.m.
By: Cristina Martinez, clm6q@virginia.edu, 804-605-1942

Session 1: Evaluation and Conservation Planning (Room 308)

Speakers:
Devra Kleiman, Zoo-Logic, LLC
Andrew Knight, Stellenbosch University, South Africa
David Callahan, MSI-Inc.

Devra: Evaluations of endangered species programs: the golden lion tamarin as an example

Single endanger species evaluation: rare, why they occur, and how different
- For total non land acquisition, total endangered species expenditure was half billion dollars
- There were 55 species that were spent of a million dollars
- Look an annual program costs from 2004… talking about a million to two million dollars for endangered species a year
- The vast majority evaluations have simply not been done
- It is jut not part of recipe for saving endangered species
- An evaluation we did: some of the good things that happened, some the things learned
- Gold lion tamarins (GLTs): flagship species that come from an area about an hour of a half from Rio de Janeiro
    o One of the most urbanizing environments in Brazil
    o It is challenge to try to do conservation species recovery in this kind of environment
    o Thought maybe only 100 in 1972 and few in zoos
    o Since '72… until had evaluation in '87 been a lot of gringos and Brazilians involved in the program
  - Started captive breeding
  - GLT conservation program activities
    o The captive population
        ▪ Captive breeding
    o The wild population: field research on population
    o Reintroduction and translocation
        ▪ Reintroduction in '84 and translocation '93
    o The habitat
    o Capacity building and outreach
  - Strategic Planning
    o 1983 on
    o Go and plan and go and plan and rarely look back
    o In 97 the Smithsonian gave her money for an evaluation
  - The Evaluation Team
  - The Evaluation Process
    o Surveys of zoos
    o Self reports by chief coordinators

- o Evaluation Team had meetings and interviews with
  - ▪ Donors
  - ▪ Brazilian staff
  - ▪ Invested stakeholders
  - ▪ Non-invested stakeholders
- Process Issues
  - o The evaluation team was not impartial nor objective but they understood the issues
  - o Evaluation team was not paid: no final report ever completed, thus no closure
  - o Evaluation team inbred, highly placed, and not evaluators by training or experience, but they were motivated b/c no one in endangered species communities had done it in that point
- **Results and positive benefits from recommendations**
  - o Authority to Brazilians and local non profit NGO
  - o Emphasis on conservation value of research activities
  - o Focus on foreign relationships Brazilian university
  - o Looking a social economic issues
- **Lessons learned**
  - o Individual investment in a conservation program may be someone's career
  - o Impartiality and independence is need
  - o You don't get something from nothing: pay them
  - o An evaluation team should be diverse
  - o Know who the final audience is
  - o Understand the historical context of the program
- **Value of ES Evaluation and Future: Value of Evaluation for endangered species**
  - o The process results in improvement occurring as you go along in the evaluation
  - o When you come from outside often you can see things that the people inside can't see or deal with
  - o More common, when a program is failing they call for an evaluation: ex black footed ferrets
  - o There is a huge amount of money being spent on this
  - o It is impossible to find out how many species programs have been evaluation by external evaluators
  - o Fish and Wildlife service: doing an internal evaluation every 5 years on all of their programs
  - o Need a mechanism for bringing in review on a periodic basis every 5 or 10 years to look to see the impact

Question from audience
Who are the donors for the project? And how did the react to the 25 year long term projections
　　　Donors: Smithsonian, wildlife fund, conservation international, a number of zoos and NGOs
　　Long term projects: they did not focus on them

David Callahan: The Usefulness and Limitations of Using Evaluation to Improve the Management of Conservation Programs: Experiences from Evaluation of the Fish and Wildlife Service national Wildlife Refuge and Endangered Species Programs

- National Wildlife Refuge system: 550 refuges, largest conservation management system in the world
- Also works with the Endangered Species programs
- GPRA: the Government Performance Results act: was passed in 1993 and required all federal agencies to identify outcome based strategies
- PART: a tool to help link performance to budget allocation consideration, and builds on the concepts and requirements of GPRA
- The manage for the refuge system evaluation was to assess the programs effectiveness in achieving its mission as defined by the strategic plan containing eleven strategic outcome goals
- The purpose for endangered species: assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the program
- Methodology: multi-method approach
  - Review of internal databases
  - Site visits/ case studies (sampling)
  - Surveys: partners and staff (internal view /bias)
    - Electronic online survey mechanism
    - Large staff surveys for both organizations
    - Partner customer survey
  - Literary review
- Results base management, results based management culture
  - Define program goals and objectives→ identify performance indicators→ develop a program monitoring plan → collect data→ analyze performance data→ conduct evaluation confirm data/ fill gaps→ make decisions revisit strategy
  - Apply these steps to project and program design and management
  - Adaptive management: people are referring to biological studies, what is happing with the habitat and species
  - Results based management = adaptive management
    - Is an adaptive management process
- Performance monitoring: tells us what is happening
  - Logic models: hierarchy of objectives goals and projected in a way that shows causality between actions and goals
  - Monitoring tends to focus on the extent to extent goals being achieved
- Evaluation: why or why not things are being achieved
- **Need evaluation to figure out why: why achieving things or why not**
- Talked about evaluation context
  - Had objectives that were not ranked or prioritized… caused difficulties
  - Endangered species and no formal goals or objectives… had no performance indicators
  - Collecting data but not organizing the data
  - Endangered species: virtually not information upon which to build evaluation assessment… did not have a good monitoring system… problematic
  - Refuges had 120 performance indicators: way too much

- Did not realize it was too much b/c only collected and never analyzed
- Data does not match
- Definitions do not match
- Aggregations don't make sense

- **Programmatic Benefits of Evaluation**
  - Refuge system
    - Used as an opportunity to refine and clarify strategy
    - Performance measures being revised
    - Evaluation/performance issues are not receiving national/ director attention on an annual basis
  - Endangered species
    - Will lead to development of program objectives performance indicators
    - Will lead to a revision of handbook: SOPs and possibly policy revisions
    - National work teams formed to address performance issues and implant solutions on topical basis

- **Tangible Results**
  - Get more funding
  - Making more positive changes to the program

Question:
  With the refuge system they were not included to undertake these evaluations. But now they have internalized this and made it part of their culture. So it has had an effect of changing their behavior and using evaluation data

Andrew
Successful but not effective? Systematic conservation planning in South Africa
  - Not an evaluator, but will have to become one
  - Donors want to know of money is being spent effectively
  - Systematic conservation planning: a way to determine how to allocate resources effectively in the landscape
  - Sub disciple of conservative biology which aims; to minimize the loss of biodiversity.. through the selection of areas for conservation action that achieve explicit targets by ensuring that implementation of these actions occurs by willing and effective stakeholders
  - Historically the disciple has been analyzing data to implement action
  - Its all about efficient resources allocation
  - South Africa: Tony Rebelo was the first in SA to reuse it
  - Innovations
    - Ecological and evolutionary processes
    - Target setting
    - Planning for implementation
  - It is being mainstreamed into government… applied by SAN Parks and Ezemvelo-KZN Wildlife for reserve expansion
  - Enshrined in legislation in South Africa
    - Local areas have to have a systematic plan
- GLT conservation program activities
- The Apparentness of "success"

- o Internationally well regarded, well-written of
- o Plans cover most of the country
- o Integration of plans into legislation
- o Large increases in conservation agreements and projected area extent
- o Adoption of the mainstreaming approach by the World Bank
- **The Reality of Effectiveness**
  - o **Difference between success and effectiveness**
  - o Too many plans: confusion
  - o Plans overlap: confusion, technical challenges
  - o Plans superseded: confusion, sovereignty issues
    - ▪ Providences also decided that they wanted their own plans as well
  - o Conservation agreements way under targets (but good by international standards)
  - o Reserve expansion fraught with farm worker relocation issues
    - ▪ Rural lands owned by white people, and worked on by black people and when the reserve expansion goes on… could be dealing with 100 or thousand of farm workers who have been dislocated
  - o Lesions learnt: plans not implemented in new process several of these lesions significantly compromise effectiveness
- Three examples
  - o Example 1: Cape Lowlands
    - ▪ Not effective b/c not hitting their targets
    - ▪ Are the targets right?
    - ▪ Not strategically focused on really important areas
  - o Example 2: Western Cape
    - ▪ Good example of overlap: no talking of people doing the plan
    - ▪ Too many plans and no person whose responsibility it is to decide what they should be doing
  - o Example 3: Plan Uptake in the Easter Cape
    - ▪ First issue: confusion around the right plan to use
    - ▪ Inappropriate nature of CAPE irreplaceability map
    - ▪ Poor uptake of plans in low capacity municipalities
    - ▪ Decision by officials overridden by politicians
- Myth of Success
  - o Failure to recognize the knowing doing ap
  - o People are very busy lots of produce
  - o Reporting using log frame: outputs versus outcomes… did a map or report but that is not necessarily things that contribute to space conservation directly
  - o **No regular evaluations: hide the reality**
    - ▪ **Importance of evaluation**
  - o **No long term monitoring: hides the reality**
  - o **No explicit learning process**
- Conclusions
  - o South Africa's adoption of SCP appears successful
  - o In reality biodiversity is probably not being conserved
  - o Busy-ness does not equate to usefulness: we need evaluations
  - o Success does not constitute effectiveness: choose indicators carefully

Devra: very difficult to set goals that you know are achievable… part of the problem is that we don't know what is achievable. No idea of the timeframe. Hard to know what goals and objectives are achievable

David: There is not enough money to do everything in conservation. There is not enough money to address all of the endangered species… lay out objectives and see what you can reasonably achieved… have to focus you money on some things over others