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DESIGNING AAI M&E: WHAT QUESTIONS DID WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO ANSWER?

Two time-scales for assessment
• Regular, ‘real-time’ feedback (POs constantly; Initiative semi-annually?)
• Periodic evaluation (External evaluation)

But questions are the same...
• Are we doing the right things? (Relevance)
• Are we doing things right/well? (Efficiency)
• Are we moving things in the right direction? (Effectiveness)
• Are we ultimately driving meaningful change? (Impact)
• Will our results last? (Sustainability)
• And of course, based on answers to the above: What can we do better??
A FEW DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

• Right info to answer the key questions
• Do-able/Usable
• Toyota versus Tesla
• Responsive to several users/audiences:
  – Broad applicability to grantee partners
  – AAI program director and officers (regular oversight)
  – Roll up for senior management & board
To assess EFFECTIVENESS, must know status of key factors targeted by each strategy.

Example—Strategy: System Sustainable Finance Mechanism for PA System

What AAI tracks annually:

- **Stage of setup of each finance mechanism** (1: Discussion/ Design, 2: Develop/ Set-up, 3: Funding/ Fundraising, 4: Implementation)

- **Extent to which funds in mechanism can meet recurring costs of targeted ha of PAs** (measured in %)
To assess EFFICIENCY, must track inputs and outputs

For each strategy, AAI tracks annually:

- **Grantmaking** in support of each strategy (USD)
- **Delivery of milestones** (Dropdown status menu--Abandoned: Not strategic; Abandoned: Not feasible; Advanced to next year; Achieved)

### PA SYSTEM SUSTAINABLE FINANCE: MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Target Year</th>
<th>2013 Status</th>
<th>2014 Status</th>
<th>2015 Status</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA$ 1.1</td>
<td>Finance mechanism</td>
<td>Deal to secure donor funds and leverage federal budget agreed by stakeholders.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA$ 1.1</td>
<td>Finance mechanism</td>
<td>Legislation and policy created to secure permanent funding to protected areas.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAI M&E SYSTEM: IMPACT

To assess IMPACT, must know biodiversity status:

Example of Unconstrained Initiative Outcome:
Biodiverse forest conserved and appropriately distributed across the basin.

What AAI tracks: Forest cover of the Amazon Basin

Example of Constrained Initiative Outcome: By 2016, forest cover loss and vulnerability to future deforestation & degradation is reduced in the PAs captured by the 12 priority AAI mosaics, as evidenced by reductions in mosaic 5-year (2018).

What AAI tracks for each mosaic: Forest cover change, 5-yr threat projections, 20-yr threat projections
To assess SUSTAINABILITY (of results), must know status of “Durability Factors.”

For each mosaic, every couple of years, AAI assesses status of:

1. Knowledge (for mgmt., Including baseline conditions, regular monitoring)
2. Law & policy: policy, legislation, enforcement
3. Constituency: stakeholder mass, makeup, engagement & support
4. Capacity: stakeholder ability to affect change
5. Capital: conservation funding

Using qualitative scale of:

1. Factor is in a **POOR** state such that it significantly impedes conservation
2. Factor is in a **FAIR** state (i.e., somewhat impedes conservation)
3. Factor is in a **GOOD** state (i.e., not limiting but could be improved)
4. Factor is in a **VERY GOOD** state (i.e., ideal state for conservation)

Note: These complement individual PA consolidation factors that are also tracked
**AAI M&E SYSTEM: PROS/CONS**

**Strengths:**
- Limited number of indicators to track—can compare across mosaics
- Most factors tracked relevant to partners/grantees—working with them to collect/validate data
- Uses rating scales wherever possible/practical to enable analysis, promote consistency, and increase ease of updating (dropdowns)
- Rolls up to a dashboard
- Links $ to results

**Limitations:**
- Supports correlation and contribution versus causality and attribution
- Although basic, still difficult to get data and find time to fill in
- Very pared down, but senior management still says too complicated
- Excel-based versus user-friendly relational database
• Feedback?

• Examples of other approaches at similar scales (particularly in funder setting)

• How do you get the data you need and ensure quality? How do you ensure compatibility with grantee/partner information needs so you don’t add transaction costs?

• How sophisticated do M&E systems need to be? Do we absolutely need to know attribution/direct causality? Does seeking that ideal impede M&E system effectiveness/use?