



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

SCAPES

LEARNING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT



MONGOLIA, 2014: WCS SCAPES Director David Wilkie talks with program staff on the Daurian Steppe.
Photo by Matthew Erdman for USAID

JANUARY 2016

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

OVERVIEW 2

FINDINGS..... 3

CONCLUSION..... 10

ANNEXES 10

 ANNEX I: SCAPES PROGRAM OVERVIEW 10

 ANNEX II: SCAPES LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL 11

 ANNEX III: SCAPES LEARNING ASSESSMENT PARTICIPANTS..... 11

 ANNEX IV: 2014 SCAPES ANNUAL MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY 12

 ANNEX V: BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS 14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainable Conservation Approaches in Priority Ecosystems (SCAPES) project—USAID’s largest global conservation initiative to date—was comprised of nine transboundary landscape-scale projects in 19 countries. Given the project’s ambition and geographic span, from the outset, it dedicated considerable time and effort to ensure that staff from all nine projects could learn from each other. SCAPES sought to do more than share information and best practices. “Learning” for SCAPES implied a dialogue across cultures and landscapes that would lead to conceptual and practical breakthroughs in transboundary conservation. One of the project’s primary ambitions was to “scale-up knowledge and impact to increase conservation success at sites, across the partnership, and among the global conservation community.”

Peer-to-peer learning was a centerpiece of the four annual meetings in the United States. Each gathering had a specific theme: sustainability, conservation and development, monitoring and evaluation, and innovation and reflection. This focused agenda allowed for deeper, grounded analyses of problems that were endemic to landscape-level conservation projects. And it helped ensure that the topics were relevant to all parties involved, some 35 practitioners per gathering.

SCAPES also supported specific learning programs focused on governance and climate change adaptation. Those topics were selected based on feedback from partner organizations at the beginning of the project. For both initiatives, a champion was selected among the partners, who then studied existing research, documented lessons learned from SCAPES, reviewed frameworks and offered recommendations for harmonization.

Finally, SCAPES implemented a Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) to encourage learning. The LFA is a survey-based tool that assesses the degree to which a project uses best practices such as written management objectives and performance metrics. It also helps to determine which factors limited landscape conservation prior to and during SCAPES support.

The annual meetings and partner-driven learning activities were successful on many levels. Participants especially appreciated the chance to meet colleagues from around the world tackling similar issues, and they enjoyed the collaboration that went into planning the agendas for the annual meetings. By sharing best practices and joining forces across landscapes, they also developed two innovative products—a governance tool and a climate change adaptation tool—that will be available to the larger development community.

As SCAPES neared its conclusion, it asked an independent evaluator to assess the performance of the learning program. Key recommendations for improvement revolved around how to better accommodate and involve field staff. Some participants felt that learning was often restricted to information dissemination, and that staff with limited English were not able to participate fully in the meetings in the United States.

Participants said the partner-driven learning activities were mainly focused in Washington, and field staff was not consulted enough as they were developed. Although field staff was exposed to the learning tools during the annual meetings, it is unclear how useful they were for their day-to-day work. In general, agendas should build on previous meetings and there should be more follow-up events.

The LFA was the most challenging element of the learning program. Although the tool has much potential, most partners were uncertain of its utility. Future work along these lines should be more standardized and integrated with other processes.

Project staff was most enthusiastic about cross-institutional learning. They suggested that such learning could be enhanced through exchange opportunities with other project sites; greater support for communications and knowledge management among SCAPES partner organizations; and improved distribution of tools and lessons learned to USAID missions, government agencies and the development community.

OVERVIEW

The Sustainable Conservation Approaches in Priority Ecosystems (SCAPES) program began in 2010 as partnership between USAID and four non-governmental organizations to conserve globally important biodiversity and provide leadership in developing, documenting and sharing state-of-the-art conservation practices. Nine transboundary landscape and policy initiatives implemented by African Wildlife Foundation, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, and a consortium led by Pact, Inc. teamed with Fauna & Flora International, BirdLife International and ACIDI-VOCA, apply innovative and tested methodologies to achieve conservation and development goals.¹ One of the core objectives for the SCAPES program was to “scale-up knowledge and impact to increase conservation success at sites, across the partnership, and among the global conservation community.”

A hallmark of the SCAPES program was the intentional focus on partner-driven learning throughout the life of the program. From the beginning, the SCAPES program set aside dedicated time and resources for learning activities including four annual meetings, two partner-driven learning programs (governance and climate change adaptation) and the implementation of a limiting factors analysis applied across the life of the project.

Learning Assessment Purpose and Process

In March 2014, Adult Learning Specialist Meredith Ferris from the Environmental Learning, Communication and Outreach (ECO) project was asked to partner with USAID and SCAPES to conduct a SCAPES learning assessment. The purpose of this assessment was to understand the overall impact of SCAPES learning investments and gather lessons learned. To do this, three sets of key questions were identified:

1. **Learning Experience:** Overall, what was the partners' experience of SCAPES learning activities?
 - a. What worked well?
 - b. What could have been improved?
 - c. What is worth it? Why or why not?
2. **Impacts and Fostering Ongoing Learning:** What impacts did the SCAPES learning component have on partner organizations' practices?

¹ For more details on the SCAPES program, please see Annex I or visit the [SCAPES project page](#).

a. What are the best ways to foster post-SCAPES (cross-institutional learning) learning (especially with field staff)?

3. **Embodiment of Learning Network Best Practices:**

To what extent did SCAPES learning embody the characteristics and employ the practices of successful USAID Learning Networks?

The following process was used to collect the data for this assessment:²

1. Identified key audiences for the assessment including USAID/E3/Forestry and Biodiversity Staff and SCAPES Agreement Officer Representatives (AORs) as well as SCAPES Implementing Partner representatives (including headquarter leads and field program staff).
2. Developed a common protocol of the key questions for qualitative data capture across interviews, focus groups and meeting discussions. (March 2014)
3. Conducted one focus group with SCAPES NGO representatives. (March 2014)
4. Conducted four interviews with USAID SCAPES AORs. (March – August 2014)
5. Held a 2- hour session on the learning assessment at the 2014 Annual SCAPES meeting to collect additional data from all SCAPES partners and share a brief overview of initial data themes. (June 2014)
6. Reviewed the qualitative data inputs from steps 3-5 to identify common themes related to the key questions. (July – August 2014)

This report is a summary of the key findings from the data collection process and review of key SCAPES and USAID Learning Networks Resource Center (<http://usaidlearninglab.org/learning-networks>) background documents.

² Please see Annex II for the data collection protocol, Annex III for a summary of the learning assessment participants and Annex IV for a list of key documents.

FINDINGS

I. Learning Experience

OVERALL IMPRESSIONS

The learning annual meeting and partner-driven learning activities within the SCAPES program were seen as “very useful” across SCAPES audiences. There was a strong desire to apply and continue to build on the learning done through SCAPES within partner organizations as well as cross-institutionally beyond the life of the project. Throughout interviews and focus groups, the opportunity to learn about other landscapes and discuss experiences and activities with a variety of partners was most often cited as the greatest benefit by all audiences. For partner members who had been involved in the predecessor program, the Global Conservation Program (GCP), USAID and NGO partners felt lessons learned about the GCP learning experience were applied in the implementation of SCAPES learning activities. In addition, interviewees and focus group participants cited a number of ways the learning process could have been enhanced, including specific follow-up after events, connecting regional partners and field staff, and dedicating more contract resources to learning overall.

ANNUAL MEETINGS

A core part of the SCAPES learning process was to hold annual meetings that brought together USAID and partner organization headquarters and field staff for learning and knowledge exchange. For each meeting, a cross-cutting theme was identified to drive the developed of the meeting agenda and objectives. This process was done in collaboration between USAID AORs and SCAPES partner organization representatives with opportunity for comments from field staff and support by USAID contractors for event logistics and facilitation. Each meeting was designed to be held for 3-4 days at a U.S.-based location, within two hours of Washington, DC. Each meeting included approximately 35 participants, including a mix of USAID AOTRs, select USAID/E3/FAB Office staff, partner organization lead representatives, select partner organization headquarters staff involved in SCAPES, and up to two field representatives for each landscape or policy scope. In total, four meetings were held:

- November 30 – December 1, 2010; Theme: Sustainability

- December 5 – 9, 2011; Theme: Conservation and Development
- March 18 – 22, 2013; Theme: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
- June 24 – 26, 2014; Theme: Innovation and Reflection

Of all the SCAPES learning activities, the annual meetings were viewed positively overall by field and U.S.-based staff across USAID and the partner organizations. In post-event evaluations and data gathering from the focus groups, interviews and 2014 Annual Meeting session, participants appreciated the bringing together of individuals from across the world, learning about the other landscapes, sharing information and discussing connections in a variety of topics. Across annual meeting evaluations, participants noted highlights as:

- *“Interacting with such a diverse high-level group of practitioners from all across the world.”*
- *“Getting to know the work of other landscapes in order to understand different conservation realities and challenges.”*
- *“Getting a range of perspectives from several organizations. I appreciated having big chunks of time on a few topics, instead of all-too-common mix of lots of independent one hour sessions.”*
- *“The annual meetings have been really unique for all of us. A lot of the field staff have never been to the U.S. and had the opportunity to talk to people working in conservation in other parts of the world. There are those ‘a-ha’ moments and connections on similar challenges.”*

Based on the lessons of GCP, USAID AORs and NGO partner leads attributed the success of the annual meetings to a few critical factors (illustrative quotes from data collection participants are included in italics):

- Collaboration between USAID and NGO Partners to develop each agenda.
- Identification of a specific topical focus for each meeting (e.g. Sustainability, Conservation & Development, M&E)
 - “[A highlight of the meeting was] the connection on conservation and development between multiple sessions – rather than themes being disjointed – helped us further the conversation and build during the week.”

- Inclusion of staff from all landscapes across regions.
 - “As always, the highlight of the SCAPES meeting is the coming together of so many partner organizations and sharing that happens.”
 - “Appreciated the exposure to others’ thoughts, challenges and experiences. Not just getting to know each other but a little deeper.”
- Being intentional to not develop list of follow-up actions post-meeting.

In addition, learning assessment audiences made a number of observations about what could have been done to improve the annual meetings. It was noted across the data gathering efforts that annual meetings focused on information dissemination and knowledge sharing rather than learning. Meeting goals and objectives were not focused on learning, agendas did not build on learning from one meeting to the next and the lack of meeting follow-up was not supportive of learning beyond the annual meeting itself. Some illustrative comments include:

- *“You would have a great topic and start on the edge of learning. We would get excited about it and there would be notes but no follow-up. The next agenda would start from scratch again and there were no learning outcomes or goals. I’m not sure they [the annual meetings] constitute learning but were more focused on information dissemination and sharing.”*
- *“It was very informal and an opportunity for learning but ‘one-off’. People took away from it what they could without there being any formal process.”*
- *“We needed to find better ways to get input from the field on agenda. We tell them ‘this is what the agenda will be’ and they say fine. This is a problem both USAID and our own organizations’ structures have.”*
- *“Often not designed with the field people in mind, headquarters (HQ) people get more benefit.”*
- *“Holding it in English sanctions many people in the field. Just managers qualify to attend. They bring the leadership side but not the technical side.”*

PARTNER-DRIVEN LEARNING ACTIVITIES

At the beginning of SCAPES, USAID and the partner organizations collaboratively brainstormed a list of possible learning initiatives to be undertaken over the life of the SCAPES program. Based on the GCP learning experience, there was agreement that taking on fewer learning initiatives with identified champions would lead to more successful implementation. To select the partner-driven learning topics, partners were asked to complete an online survey to indicate which topics they believed would be most beneficial to address for their organization and where people were willing to champion or be part of the learning initiative team. From this master list, the topics of governance and climate change adaptation were identified as the two key learning topics:

- **Governance:** Conservation organizations face multiple challenges dealing with poor and weak governance and lacked the tools to understand and measure the effectiveness of institutions governing natural resources. To fill the gap, SCAPES partners crafted a field-based tool to gauge conservation governance and use the information for capacity building and overall project planning with local stakeholders.
- **Climate Change Adaptation:** Mainstreaming climate adaptation practices for the conservation sector that integrates biodiversity, ecosystems and livelihoods. This activity was intended to be foundation work for a larger learning activity to foster better understanding of adaptation approaches and tools that can be applied at local, landscape and national levels and addresses both ecosystems and people.

Both activities included three key steps:

1. Review of existing research and/or case studies on the topic,
2. Documentation of current work and lessons from SCAPES partners to date in that area, and
3. Review of existing frameworks and providing recommendations for harmonization and/or gaps.

Out of both of these processes, SCAPES partner organizations recognized needed tools for the respective areas. With partner organization resources and USAID contract short-term technical assistance, the project was able to develop, pilot test and publically release the following documents and tools:³

- Guidelines for Assessing the Strengths and Weaknesses of Natural Resource Governance in Landscapes and Seascapes, June 2013
- SCAPES Partners: A Review of Field Based Common Ground on Adaptation, October 2012
- Climate Change Adaptation Tool (USAID has not yet released this tool)

In addition, across the SCAPES annual meetings, time was dedicated to presentations and/or updates on the status of the initiatives. Specifically in the 2011 SCAPES Annual Meeting, many participants directly mentioned the learning session on climate change adaptation as a highlight. One participant stated *“The climate change adaptation training was so useful for me and my work in my landscape.”*

Partner-driven learning champions and group members attributed the success of these initiatives to the following key factors (illustrative quotes from data collection participants are included in italics):

- Working on a small number of learning initiatives
 - *“In GCP, we tried to meet multiple objectives and ended up with a lot of things getting funded but people didn’t have enough time to devote to them.”*
- Picking topics that were relevant to the partner organizations
 - *“The reason governance and adaptation worked is that they were practical. They were valuable to my organization and we needed it anyhow.”*
- Identifying champions for each effort
 - *“We were really lucky, we had champions to drive [the learning initiatives] and they were committed to making them happen. Even divided champions would not have been the same.”*
 - *“In the end you need a decision-maker. You need to identify roles and responsibilities and what approach you are going to take for the initiative.”*

- Developing trust between the partner organizations
 - *“Factors that contributed to trust were that we had the same partners as with GCP and we meet a lot of [partner organization HQ staff and USAID staff]. If you really only came together with AID for the annual meeting, it would not have yielded the same outcome.”*
 - *“Overall the openness to collaborate was useful. Because SCAPES invited everyone to the table, we could discuss issues we were all struggling with in the field.”*
- Having operational support to make the learning activities happen
 - *“Having operations and follow-through support was important; we couldn’t have done the climate change adaptation or governance work without it.”*

Reflecting on the partner-driven learning initiatives, assessment participants also made some observations about what could have been enhanced. Both USAID AORs and partner organization HQ representatives agreed that these initiatives were mainly focused in Washington, DC and did not reach the field staff. While field staff was exposed to the initiatives during annual meetings, the data from this assessment is inconclusive as to how much field staff was consulted during the initiative processes and the extent to which they have used or plan to use the resulting documents and tools. In addition, these groups also highlighted the challenges of limited funding and resources for learning activities. In particular, partner organization HQ representatives shared the difficulties with not being able to tap into the partner organizations’ expertise and having to use outside contractors for technical support. As shared by participants, *“there is a structural issue that we don’t have funding support to tap into our own expertise,”* and *“we would have been able to move faster on our own with the right expertise then hire a consultant without the right expertise.”* In addition, it was noted that for many, the learning initiative work *“went beyond what we had originally planned in terms of LOE for learning.”* USAID staff shared similar thoughts including, *“[learning] was just 10 percent of the overall budget and contract support but still was not enough. Part of the challenge was not having enough paid staff time dedicated to it.”*

³These documents and tools can be found on the [USAID Biodiversity Conservation Gateway](#).

Overall, SCAPES partners summed up their experiences with the partner-driven learning initiative process in the following ways: *“it was invaluable even though the process was painful sometimes to consult and clarify what we should focus on”* and *“it has been wonderful and worth it, but it has been a lot of work.”*

LIMITING FACTORS ANALYSIS

The Limiting Factors Analysis (LFA) was developed for the evaluation of the GCP program but never used as part of it. The LFA is a survey-based tool intended to collect demographic respondent and program data as well as information around the following questions:

- The degree to which the management of a conservation program employs elements such as written management objectives, performance metrics/indicators, etc.
- The degree to which certain factors limited the conservation of a landscape/seascape prior to receiving SCAPES funding (e.g. design, management systems, stakeholder engagement, etc.)

As part of SCAPES, USAID and partner organizations further refined and utilized the tool to collect data about each site. Data was collected at baseline, midterm and the end of the project from each landscape, and information on the tool, as well as the data, was shared during the annual meetings. Overall, while some see the potential for this tool, partner organization staff from HQ and the field did not find the tool useful. Many people had a similar question of *“Are we doing anything differently from the information we got out of the LFA?”*

From the learning perspective, two reasons were cited for this overall assessment:

- Challenging to Design and Implement the LFA
 - *“The LFA was a difficult thing to do. We are asking field staff to enumerate things that are difficult to enumerate in black and white answers. We ended up with a baseline that was not particularly defined and the change was unperceivable.”*
 - *“The tool is so subjective and there was not a lot of standardization with people filling it out.”*
 - *“These are fast moving variables so an annual review is going to be pretty static.”*
 - *“Everything happened last minute; we gathered what we could, but then we never heard anything about it after.”*

- Lack of Action/Integration of LFA Analysis into other Processes
 - *“If it was worked into annual work plans with clear action elements at the end of each analyses about what we learned it may have been useful. But it was just noise with no idea of what you learned.”*
 - *“It would have been better if there was a more strategic approach to adaptive management as a learning topic. We should have focused more on M&E as a learning mechanism and integrating the Theories of Change from the beginning.”*

2. Impacts and Fostering Ongoing Learning

Impacts of SCAPES Learning on Partner Organizations

- *“The governance learning initiative has really come to fruition. It is being scaled up and used in a variety of contexts, has international exposure and I think the impact will be sustained over time. It was used in CARPE and tested there. It will be rolled out at the World Conservation Conference, and has a life of its own in a way.”*

Post-SCAPES Cross-Institutional Learning Support

Throughout the learning assessment process, partners expressed a strong desire for cross-institutional learning. Specifically, in the 2014 meeting discussion on the learning assessment, multiple groups highlighted an interest in site-based annual meetings and other site exchange visit opportunities to support field-to-field cross-institutional learning. Throughout SCAPES, only one cross-site visit was mentioned—between the Uysturt and the Daurian Steppe—at the field level. The majority of cross-institutional learning happened between HQ representatives around quarterly SCAPES meetings and the implementation of the partner-driven learning initiatives. Partner organization HQ representatives noted that cross-institutional learning opportunities and platforms beyond annual meetings were not supported in the SCAPES project design or implementation. As one participant shared, *“In the future, it would be better to work cross-institutional learning into the design so it is structurally supported and does not have to include HQ.”*

3. Embodiment of Learning Network Best Practices

In 2013, USAID's Office of Policy, Planning and Learning published a set of best practices for learning networks to be utilized Agency-wide. A review of the "Practices of Successful Learning Networks: Documenting Learning from the GROOVE Learning Network"⁴ was conducted and compared to data and background documents shared on SCAPES learning to assess the extent to which SCAPES embodied these best practices.

Characteristics of USAID-sponsored Learning Networks	Did the SCAPES learning network embody this characteristic? Yes (Y), No (N), To Some Extent(S)	Notes
Defined and finite group	Y	SCAPES partners were clearly defined from the beginning of the program and interested individuals were able to join various partner learning initiative topics.
Shared learning agenda	Y	An open process was held to brainstorm and select learning activities that were relevant to partner organizations.
Specified timeline	Y	All learning network activities had specified timelines and all deliverables from the learning activities were set to coincide with the end of the program.
Three levels of focus (organization, network, and industry and larger development community)	Y	SCAPES did focus on the three levels for the partner driven learning activities.
Integrated approach to the knowledge cycle	S	Attention was paid to knowledge generation and sharing to a great extent from the beginning of the learning topic identification. Attention to knowledge dissemination and application at the three levels were done but to a lesser extent.
Dedicated resources	Y	Resources were dedicated from the start of the program to support learning.
Deliverable commitments	Y	Each organization working on SCAPES provided resources and were obligated to complete learning deliverables.

⁴ A copy of the "Practices of Successful Learning Networks: Documenting Learning from the GROOVE Network" is available at http://usaidelearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/practices_of_successful_learning_networks_aug2013.pdf.

The chart below captures the analysis of this guides eight successful practices compared to the approaches used during the life the SCAPES program.

Practices of Successful Learning Networks	Did the SCAPES learning network embody this practice? Yes (Y), No (N), To Some Extent (S)	Notes
<p>1. Take advantage of opportunities for strategic learning at organization, network, and industry levels.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>From the start of SCAPES learning there was an intentional focus on strategic learning for all three levels. This was embodied through process such as the topic identification and selection process, the review of research and identification of missing tools needed in the development community and ability for organization to focus on what was most relevant for their work.</p>
<p>2. Focus intentionally on specifying desired outcomes.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>To a certain extent, SCAPES did go through the process of defining learning expectations, how they would work together, sharing previous experiences, creating an inventory of learning issues and questions and developing flexible workplans. Some elements that SCAPES did not put into practice (or that were not documented) include helping members to understand what a learning network is, goals and approaches and being intentional about reviewing the learning process and adaptive management of learning activities.</p>
<p>3. Be attentive to the evolution of the network over time.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>SCAPES learning activities and participants did evolve over time and help to refocus efforts. While intentional, some topics, like gender and other did arise toward the end of the contract but were not addressed because of time and resource issues. Overall SCAPES did pay attention to the flow and energy of partner organizations and USAID to continue learning over the life of the program.</p>

Practices of Successful Learning Networks	Did the SCAPES learning network embody this practice? Yes (Y), No (N), To Some Extent (S)	Notes
4. Make conscious choices about use of collective time.	S	SCAPES was very intentional in developing regular meeting structures like quarterly and annual meetings. Collaboration on annual meeting agendas between USAID and headquarters partner organization representatives was high. However, it was noted that communication and meeting planning around field staff needs may have been a missed opportunity.
5. Recognize that members of the group will play different roles over time.	Y/S	SCAPES learning activities and participants did evolve over time and help to refocus efforts in new directions. While some changes were more difficult (e.g., changes in champions), SCAPES partner-driven learning initiatives both were successful in moving from research to tool development organically and pulling in relevant people as needed. An area that may have required more attention would be to the field staff engagement and how learning may have needed to be adapted overtime for this audience (e.g., providing support for cross-site visits and hosting regional meetings).
6. Support and enable optimal group functioning through facilitation.	Y	Throughout the life of SCAPES, facilitation support was provided for all annual meeting and to help move forward the partner-driven learning initiatives.
7. Build a high level of trust among the members.	Y	Coming off a successful contract with GCP, many of the SCAPES partners as well as USAID had built a good foundation of trust that continued to grow throughout the life of SCAPES. It is clear in interactions that there is a high level of trust and complementarity seen between partner organizations. Annual and quarterly meetings were an essential part of this process.
8. Influence industry-level adaptation and practice.	Y,S	The governance and climate change adaptation initiatives both produced products that SCAPES partners felt strongly were needed in the broader development community. The governance tool has been shared and there are plans to continue to disseminate to the broader development community. At the time of this assessment, the climate change adaptation initiative has produced and shared a report and is hoping to share the tool publically in the winter of 2014. The annual meetings were not designed to influence industry-level adaptation or practice directly.

CONCLUSION

The thoughtful design and implementation of learning throughout the SCAPES program was, overall, seen as a success across USAID and partner organizations. SCAPES actively applied lessons learned from the GCP program to enhance and support learning through the annual meetings and partner-driven learning initiatives. The challenge for SCAPES partners will be beyond the life of the program—to find ways to continue to disseminate, apply and adapt the learning knowledge and products developed and enhance cross-institutional learning, especially at the field level.

ANNEX I: SCAPES PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Sustainable Conservation Approaches in Priority Ecosystems (SCAPES) program was a partnership between USAID and four non-governmental organizations to conserve globally important biodiversity and provide leadership in developing, documenting and sharing state-of-the-art conservation practices. Nine transboundary landscape and policy initiatives implemented by African Wildlife Foundation, Wildlife Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund, and a consortium led by Pact, Inc. teamed with Fauna & Flora International, BirdLife International and ACDI-VOCA, apply innovative and tested methodologies to achieve conservation and development goals.

SCAPES applied a holistic and adaptive approach to addressing conservation challenges. Over the life of the program (2010-2014), all partner activities 1) took a threats-based approach to address conservation issues; 2) aimed to achieve financial, social and ecological sustainability; 3) applied adaptive management to be responsive to changing situations, information and enabling conditions; and 4) scaled-up knowledge and impact to increase conservation success at sites, across the partnership, and among the global conservation community.

SCAPES was USAID's largest global conservation initiative, managed centrally in Washington, DC to complement and inform the Agency's portfolio of national and regional biodiversity programs. The program was supported by a robust learning initiative that helps USAID and its partners to analyze, communicate and leverage results.

ANNEX II: SCAPES LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL

Question Set 1: Overall Impressions of SCAPES Learning (30 minutes)

- At the beginning of SCAPES, the learning objective was to “scale-up knowledge and impact to increase conservation success at sites, across the partnership, and among the global conservation community.”
 - How successful has SCAPES as a whole been in achieving this objective?
 - What contributed to success?
 - What hindered success?
 - *OPTIONAL*: Stepping back, was this goal valuable to your organization as part of your SCAPES work? Why or why not?
 - *OPTIONAL*: Did SCAPES learning effectively build on the lessons learned from the Global Conservation Program? Why or why not?

Question Set 2: Specific SCAPES Activities

Looking back at the activities you have been part of:

- Which content sessions did you find to be most valuable? Least valuable?
- What parts of the learning activity processes worked well? What could have been improved?
- Overall, did the learning activities and annual meeting sessions reflect the needs and interests of your organization? Why or why not?
 - Was there a topic/activity that was missed in the SCAPES learning agenda that would have been valuable to your organization?
- Overall, was the SCAPES learning process across partners valuable to your organization? Why or why not?

ANNEX III: SCAPES LEARNING ASSESSMENT PARTICIPANTS

Question Set 3: Continuing Cross-Institutional Learning

- What are one or two of the most important actions that USAID and/or partner organizations can take to support cross-institutional learning beyond SCAPES?

Partner Organization Focus Group

- Shari Bush, Pact
- Kimberly Marchant, World Wildlife Foundation
- Jimmiel Mandima, African Wildlife Foundation
- Rob Rose, Wildlife Conservation Society
- David Wilkie, Wildlife Conservation Society

USAID AOR Interviews

- Hannah Fairbank, USAID/E3/Forestry and Biodiversity Office, SCAPES AOR
- Mary Rowen, USAID/E3/Forestry and Biodiversity Office, SCAPES AOR
- Diane Russell, USAID/E3/Forestry and Biodiversity Office, SCAPES AOR
- Andrew Tobiason, USAID/E3/Forestry and Biodiversity Office, SCAPES AOR

Additional Interviews

- Shereen Abdelatty, Development Alternatives Inc., formerly with the CK2C Contract
- Paul Cowles, formerly with Pact, Inc.

2014 SCAPES Annual Meeting Participants

First Name	Last Name	Org.	Landscape/Office
Hussein	Sosovele	WWF	Ruvuma
Erica	Rieder	WWF	WWF Headquarters
Ananta	Bhandari	WWF	Sacred Himalaya
Priya	Shrestha	WWF	Sacred Himalaya
Luis	Naranjo	WWF	Eastern Cordillera Real
Sandra	Valenzela	WWF	Eastern Cordillera Real
Kimberley	Marchant	WWF	WWF Headquarters
Meg	Symington	WWF	WWF Headquarters
Andrew	Tobiason	USAID	E3/FAB
Marco	Santiago-Flores	USAID	E3/FAB
Olaf	Zerbock	USAID	E3/FAB
Nathan	Gregory	USAID	E3/FAB
Hannah	Fairbank	USAID	E3/FAB
Diane	Russell	USAID	E3/FAB
Sarah	Carlson	USAID	E3/FAB
Mary	Rowen	USAID	E3/FAB
Brooke	Whittenburg	USAID	E3/FAB (Intern)

First Name	Last Name	Org.	Landscape/Office
Nasson	Tembo	AWF	Kazungula
Jones	Masonde	AWF	Kazungula
Noah	Wasila	AWF	Kilimanjaro
Philip	Lenaiyasa	AWF	Kilimanjaro
Fiesta	Warinwa	AWF	AWF Headquarters
Jimmie	Mandima	AWF	AWF Headquarters
David	Williams	AWF	AWF Headquarters
Kirk	Olsen	Pact	Ustyurt
Berdiyev	Jolibekov	Pact	Ustyurt
Shari	Bush	Pact	Pact Headquarters
Paul	Hotham	Pact	FFI Headquarters
Enkee	Shiilegdamba	WCS	Daurian Steppe
Odo	Nyamtseren	WCS	Daurian Steppe
Shirley	Atkinson	WCS	KAZA Beyond Fences
Mariana	Varese	WCS	Madidi-Tambopata
Mariana	Montoya	WCS	Madidi-Tambopata
David	Wilkie	WCS	WCS Headquarters
Rob	Rose	WCS	WCS Headquarters

ANNEX IV: SCAPES ANNUAL MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

As part of the 2014 SCAPES Annual Meeting evaluation, participants were asked to respond to the question, “What is/are the one or two most important things that will need to be done (by organizations and/or USAID) to best support cross-institutional learning post-SCAPES?” Below are the individual comments shared by participants (**NOTE:** the comments below are directly from participant evaluations and have not been edited. Similar comments have been categorized.).

Provide Support for Communication, Knowledge Management and Learning Across SCAPES Organizations

- Allocate resources for one person to facilitate communication
- Incentives to communicate, share and network (e.g. need to see tools, approaches, lessons); Convenience and use-friendly targeted (field, region, theme)
- Accessible Community of Practice or network (“SCAPES book”)
- Put developed tools, reports online for easy access by partners
- Reserve budget & mechanisms to facilitate learning, ideally with a technical expert in staff, not only contracted for continuing and depth of knowledge
- Need a forum for learning: Some sort of structure with a facilitator, and could be regular meetings or an email listserve
- A community of practice, facilitated and curated
- Establish SCAPES Alumni Association (SAA) to keep the network among the partners
- Support SCAPES institutions communications
- Develop “knowledge management center” to document and disseminate the information and learning

- Establish regular interaction/communication mechanisms between partner organizations and USAID to strengthen future partnerships as well
- Keep the SCAPERS connected and establish a web-based platform to keep communications and exchange going on
- Maintain group communications

Gather, Distill and Disseminate Lessons Learned, Reports and Tools to USAID Missions, Government Agencies and Broader Development Community

- Mine and disseminate all the results, lessons impacts from SCAPES; need to take full advantage of what we have learned and achieved
- Figure out how to capture lessons/ideas that cross-boundaries. Right now everything is presented at SCAPE level, so results should be scaled up
- Get similar approaches to lessons learned
- Disseminate tools developed, learning on planning & monitoring, learning the importance of working at a landscape and transboundary level, and tools and lessons learned among USAID missions and government agencies
- Present government tool and adaptation tool at key partner institutions and USAID
- Video tape presentations/webcast for USAID missions
- Washington mission organization learning
- Sharing of evaluation reports as widely and with as many stakeholders as possible
- Series of learning events

Continue to Connect Through Meetings

- Have meeting or side meetings (i.e. at IUCN meetings) to reconnect individuals and organizations
- Ensure that future USAID meetings have similar safe environments for sharing

Develop and Share Strong Close-Out Reports

- Share close-out reports among SCAPES
- Strong close-out report to consolidate [cross]-site SCAPES learning

Support Learning in the Field

- Cross-site visits
- Taking the meetings to sites

Link to Other Initiatives for Continued Program Support

- Link to other USAID and State initiatives, meetings, workshops
- Continuous support through regional USAID missions
- Using other USAID programs that may take place in the SCAPES, efforts should be made to use the SCAPES experience to inform new programs

Other Comments

- Interested to understand how the various tools shape up and to learn more about their implementation in our own landscapes
- Brainstorming for follow-up!
- Plan for follow-on at outset (learning workplan adaptively managed)
- Joint group proposal for future work
- Identify gaps and develop support for USAID

ANNEX V: BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- SCAPES Learning Activities Proposal Master List, no date
- SCAPES Annual Meeting Documents:
 - SCAPES 2010 Annual Meeting Agenda, Presentations, Notes and Evaluation; Theme: Sustainability
 - SCAPES 2011 Annual Meeting Topics, Agenda, Presentations, Notes and Evaluation; Theme: Conservation and Development
 - SCAPES 2013 Annual Meeting Agenda, Presentations, Notes and Evaluation; Theme: Monitoring and Evaluation
 - SCAPES 2014 Annual Meeting Agenda, Presentations, Notes and Evaluation; Theme: Innovation and Reflection
- SCAPES Limiting Factors Baseline Survey Report, 2010
- Guidelines for Assessing the Strengths and Weaknesses of Natural Resource Governance in Landscapes and Seascapes, June 2013
- SCAPES Partners: A Review of Field Based Common Ground on Adaptation, October 2012
- USAID Learning Lab – Practices of Successful Learning Networks: Documenting Lessons from the GROOVE Network, August 2013

**U.S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel. 202 712 0000
Fax. 202 216 3524
www.usaid.gov/biodiversity**