

Summary of Key Issues and Management Response

Summative Evaluation of Conservation Measures Partnership (CMP) and Conservation Coaches Network (CCNet) to Strengthen Results-Based Management in Conservation - January 9, 2015

This summary and management response is collated to better inform the two networks, their communities, and supporters of the follow up to the evaluation. Some specific areas of improvement guided by the current strategic plans are identified below. It is also clear that both networks - in collaboration - aim to continue to specifically embrace learning, and use the Open Standards and Conservation Coaches Network as a framework and vehicle for learning and improving the effectiveness of conservation practice.

To do this, both organizations will consider what (if any) substantive changes will be required to strategic plans. To formalize the joint actions to be undertaken in response to the evaluation they will be incorporated in the formal Memorandum of Understanding between CMP and CCNet that since 2012 has define and guided the implementation of our work together.

Sustainability	
<p>Issue 1: Lack of success in influencing senior management of organizations. Rewards for engagement with CMP and CCNet accrue mainly to practitioners and not managers responsible for annual financial contributions</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish to Build More Buy-in: Producing more peer-reviewed articles by CMP and CCNet practitioners would help make the case for the efficacy of the Open Standards (OS), build knowledge amongst the conservation community, and provide evidence to be used in convincing organizations to adopt the OS. • Incorporate the Science of Changing Minds: Reach out to practitioners of behavioral economics and related disciplines.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a calendar of specific outreach to partner leaders including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Semi-Annual calls with partner leadership to review CCNet/CMP work plan to identify areas of support. o Work with partner leadership to identify opportunities to incorporate OS into core business practices and workflows. o Publish CCNet/CMP “Annual Report” and Newsletters and distribute directly to influencers with cover note. • At Rally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Invite as speaker/presenter practitioners of Behavioral Economics to present at the Rally. o Hold workshop on increasing publishing output. • Document a list of existing peer-reviewed literature related to OS and identify areas where more literature should be encouraged. Keep list accessible through the CCNet website. • Include in CMP/CCNet MOU development of a formal communications strategy. • CCNet will join the CMP Initiative on “Institutional Adoption of OS with a focus on the use of OS in Institutional decision-making”, launched Feb 2015. • In addition to a CMP Symposium at ICCB meeting in August 2015 on 10 years of the OS, pursue similar externally oriented events to help engage leaders and the conservation community more widely. 	
<p>Issue 2: Limited foundation and major donor fundraising success and erosion of partner support.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand engagement with government sector to fund needs.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCNet management is establishing a “Fundraising Working Group” with CMP participation. We will focus on CCNet since sustainability is more of an issue given the larger budget and scope of work, but will look for opportunities to provide outcomes valuable to each. Plans call for developing a set of recommendations to be brought to the Conservation Coaches Rally in October 2015. • CMP moving to develop new forward looking and annual budget to better consider fundraising needs and opportunities. 	
<p>Issue 3: CMP/CCNet both operate with very</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p>

<p>small budgets, relying significantly on contributions of time from people who are not paid. The volunteerism of members is admirable but creates challenges garnering resources to sustain ongoing strategic goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “full-cost” accounting for financial and in-kind contributions of all units CMP and CCNet would better define the level of support provided and help frame a solution.
<p>Management Response:</p> <p>CMP and CCNet will produce a “full-cost accounting” and establish a regular approach and report that recognizes the financial and in-kind contributions of board, organizational, and franchises members. We will share this information with key audiences to demonstrate the efficiency and leverage of our business model.</p>	
<p>Structure & Governance</p>	
<p>Issue 4: CMP & CCNet should merge. Clear complementarities between the two organizations make it advisable to seek ways of integrating.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such a process would need to be done with care and attention to the differing constituencies, cultures and histories and consider a range of alternative structures.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMP and CCNet have agreed to establish a working group to explore possible alternatives for governance and structure for CMP and CCNet including merger. Recommendation will be presented at the October 2015 CCNet Rally. This project is now a formal action incorporated in our CMP/CCNet Memorandum of Understanding. • CCNet’s leadership has set in motion a process to review and revise the existing CCNet 2009 Charter and in the process we will focus on the issues raised in this section and coordinate with CMP. 	
<p>Strategic Direction</p>	
<p>Issue 6. CCNet at Crossroads: Need more “top-down” strategic growth.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing demand suggests a need for CCNet to differentiate and prioritize among potential dimensions of future growth including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Geographies of need (where conservation capacity need is greatest); ○ Institutions of importance (identifying key institutions to spread good practices through coaching); ○ Developing a hierarchical coaching model (e.g., training for individuals and organizations who have no prior experience), or develop specialty coaches.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCNet covers most regions of the world with its current franchises (only exceptions are North Africa/Middle East and West/Central Asia). We need to improve our assessment of both conservation and institutional capacity in establishing and maintaining franchises. As a first step we are reviewing CCNet’s current 2009 Charter to update the roles, responsibilities and franchises and franchise leaders. • Continue to pursue the need for an improved hierarchical coaching model to build strategic coaching capacity through specialty coaches and coach advancement and accreditation programs. Hold workshop on this issue at the October 2015 Coaches Rally. • Continue to explore and collaborate with universities as institutions of importance in providing courses in coach advancement that can grow capacities at a scale not possible by CCNet alone. 	
<p>Open Standard’s Implementation</p>	
<p>Issue 7. Not all steps in the OS cycle are fully used. There is sharp attenuation in use after the planning stages.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The full power of the OS to transform the conservation community through improved practices such as cross-project learning will be fully realized when the OS are used broadly and through the full cycle.
<p>Management Response:</p> <p>Develop an initiative to look at past experience, successful examples, current status of training provided for the back-end of cycle and use the CCNet Rallies and CMP Technical Meetings and other learning sessions to develop actions to address this.</p>	

<p>Issue 8. Some important RBM tools not supported.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now may a good time for CMP/CCNet to consider formally the role of the OS relative to a small but critical set of conservation frameworks that are viewed by many as alternative RBM approaches, e.g. Structured Decision Making.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include this issue in the current CMP/CCNet joint initiative around curating guidance and tools. • CCNet will consider a session at the Rally covering questions about how familiar a “conservation coach” should be with other planning frameworks or simply present on these other frameworks as a learning opportunity. 	
<p>Issue 9. Although succeeding in achieving its major initial objectives - very few of the organizations have fully adopted (and enforce the use of) the OS.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider a more proactive promotion of the OS in different organizations and sectors. Use the OS to help establish a strong, shared learning system for the biodiversity conservation sector.
<p>Management Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursue action on this issue through the “Initiative on promotion of the OS” established by the CMP Board during the October 2014 technical meeting with CCNet members participating. • Use the symposium held at ICCB meeting on 10 years of the OS to contribute to advancing this initiative. • Develop, promote and mainstream OS through a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) on OS to grow capacities in all geographies, at scale and cost-effectively. The course can then be easily repeated on a regular basis. It can enhance permeability and prevalence of OS, and establish OS as the de facto “standard” for the biodiversity conservation sector. 	
<p>Measuring impact</p>	
<p>Issue 10. No quantifiable data, documented baseline or counterfactual studies that provide evidence that use of the OS, or any other specific adaptive management framework, has led to improved conservation status.</p>	<p>Evaluator’s Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend that CMP/CCNet develop a set of “test beds” – areas where decision-making bodies are willing to consider results of OS work in determining how and where to deliver conservation results.
<p>Management Response:</p> <p>CCNet and CMP will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring together practitioners at the 2015 Rally to look to how we do this and invite “stories” about linking (as closely as possible) to results and impact. • Set measurable goals for impact and develop methods to measure the impact of conservation planning on delivering conservation results. Formally engage academic partners on this issue. 	