Measuring Socio-Economic Impacts of the AWF Conservation Program

AWF, FFI, BI Workshop

Cambridge, July 07

AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

AWF – An Introduction

Working in 8 large landscapes ('Heartlands') across 11 African countries

Implementing five main types of Priority Interventions (PIs) with partners:

- Land
- Enterprise
- Capacity building and leadership
- Species and research
- Policy

'Heartland Conservation Process' and 'PIMA' M&E system developed over past 10 years

Conservation-development links

- Conservation must integrate socio-economic parameters for three reasons:
  - Moral imperative when working in poor areas
  - Sustainable conservation requires poverty reduction
  - Livelihood decisions and natural resource conservation are inextricably linked – must understand and act on links for program impact
- 1997-99 DFID Livelihoods Framework/EC WELD project with ODI
  - Measuring socio-economic impact of enterprise PIs
  - input to AWF PIMA M&E system

AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

PIMA M&E system

- Three types of indicators:
  - capacity
  - activity
  - impact
- Three distinct levels:
  - AWF organization-wide level (for Board, general internal use and public/donor communications)
  - Program level (for technical monitoring and partners)
  - Project level (for main field projects, for internal, partner and donor use).

E.g. enterprise (program level)

1. Number of enterprises supported by AWF.
   - Number of new opportunities identified and adopted as cases this year.
   - Number of new contracts signed this year.
   - Total number of on going enterprises active this year.

2. Conservation impacts of enterprise PIs.
   - Number of targets whose conservation status is being directly addressed by enterprises.
   - Number of square kilometers being actively managed for conservation benefits.

E.g. enterprise (program level)

3. Socio-economic Impacts.

   – Total number direct beneficiaries

   – Total number of enterprises with existing equity or new equity gains for local communities or individuals originating in the community.

   – Total value of cash payments received by communities in AWF supported enterprises (rent, dividends or other) this year.

   – Total number of skilled employment posts filled by persons originating in the community this year. (by gender)

   – Total number of semi-skilled employment posts filled by persons originating in the community this year. (by gender)

4. Governance and Empowerment Impacts.

   – Number of community bodies (trusts, villages, group ranches, companies etc) legally constituted or strengthened

   – Total number of women from the communities serving as officers of these bodies, or as managers/principals of the enterprises.

   – Total number of community bodies managing revenues this year in excess of US$ 5,000.

Issues arising from experience to date

- Enterprise PIs only

- AWF's own perceptions/measures of impact

- Limited information generated for feedback into design process

PIMA now being updated

Socio-economic impact monitoring of all PIs with significant +ve/-ve impacts

- Internal team leading implementation
- Roll out to 20 PIs over next 2 years
- Baselines at PI or zonal level e.g. protected areas

Appropriate methodology for identifying and measuring indicators

- More 'bottom-up' identification and prioritisation of indicators
- Include measures of non-financial costs and benefits
- Household level impacts assessed and interpreted through surveys, focal groups
- Baseline, impact monitoring of key indicators every 2-5 years

AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

Questions remain

- Will we generate valid and reliable information?

- Can we make this cost-effective?

- Will better measurement improve program design?
  - How does AWF learn? Role of PIMA?

- What can we learn from other organisations?