



Combined Evaluation and Prioritization: Thinking and Application and Field Project Prioritization Workshop Working Group Report

2008 CBSG Annual Meeting, Adelaide, Australia

Participants

Nicole Anderson, Anne Baker, Chris Banks, Amy Camacho, Frands Carlsen, Peter Clark, Gerald Dick, Lesley Dickie, Jo Gipps, Wendy Foster, Tomohiko Iwata, Bjarne Klausen, Lena Maria Linden, William Meikle, Graeme Phipps, Claire Pipe, Hugh Possingham, Martin Smrcek, Rebecca Spindler, Miranda Stevenson, David Taggart, Yasumasa Tomita, Olivia Walter, Chris West, Sherman Wong

Background

There have been several workshops (CBSG, WAZA, Catalyst for Conservation) looking at why we get involved in conservation projects and how we evaluate how well we are doing with those projects. From these a tool has been developed for Field Project Prioritization and a first test of the tool has occurred at Taronga in April 2008 as a means of prioritizing which projects to fund during a granting round.

The EAZA conservation database has been established, and gone through several iterations, to develop a tool to collect information on how many, and what type of projects zoos are involved with in one way or another. It is primarily a promotional tool, that is looking to go global, but there is interest in tying the prioritization process with the database and also including some evaluation measures with it so we can get an indication of the success of activities, not just of the inputs into conservation. Also as a means of finding out information on species projects, what worked, what didn't and what impact the projects have had on the species as a whole. There is also a WAZA database that collects data in a different way, as well as the AZA conservation and research database.

With the declaration in WZACS (which has been downloaded more than 200 000 times, and is now available in 9 languages) that zoos are conservation organizations providing support to species in the wild, we need to be able to provide evidence that we are truly conservation organizations. With many zoos and aquariums doing the same thing we could achieve a great amount, with 10% of the North American zoos revenue alone greater than that of Conservation International or WWF.

There has been a massive investment in conservation, but we don't know what we have got for that money, and this is applicable to other conservation organizations, not just zoos. Two audit reports of conservation activities in Australia have struggled to show effectiveness e.g. species saved, or that animals are now living in revegetated areas. This is partly associated with timeframes, with short term reports wanted for long-term projects, and also with granting bodies being uninterested in evaluating the work they sponsor.

Hugh Possingham's Presentation

Prioritization ranks actions relative to each other – and is about actions, not species and places. The aim is to maximize the number of species saved but can also be used to prioritize actions directed towards a particular species. May market it as a species project, but actually action based.


The cost efficiency of actions i.e. maximum net benefit for available money is reflected by:

$$\text{Value} = \frac{\text{Benefit} \times \text{Probability of Success}}{\text{Cost}}$$

Some projects may look at how long we continue to protect areas when species haven't been seen and how long we continue to look for species without finding them – Save, Survey, Surrender
Ideally want a summary of projects that have been undertaken given information on project success/failure so we can learn from them.

Taronga's Field Project Prioritization Trial

Taronga trailed the FPP process (Appendix 1) in April 2008 on 17 projects and involved 11 assessors from the zoo, representing most departments in the organization. No correlation was found between the final score and perception of value (measured in 2 ways), but there was a correlation between the conservation impact and amount of money assessors willing to give that project. The first application asked for general description of process bearing in mind the criteria, while the



second application round has given the list of questions, in order of weighting, to be more explicit about what information is required. Second round will be assessed at the end of October 2008.

Want a system that allows projects to be assessed in a transparent manner that broadens the reach of zoos beyond just BINGO's, and that allows for more staff involvement and improves the measurability of impact by defining specific goals at the start that allow measurement at the end. Also simple system that can allow for prioritization of projects that smaller organizations with less resources could then just select from. Although currently there are a lot of management costs associated with spending a small amount of money, want to validate the process and show that it is worth doing, and then be able to use it on much larger scale.

Factors found to be important

- Very transparent application process – know exactly what areas project is being assessed on
- Multiple assessors
- Selection criteria representative of committee priorities
- Example of responses expected and staff companion that walks applicant through the process

Feedback on Taronga's Trial

The process has isolated criteria which is a great way forward, but there are some mixed purposes e.g. conservation plus engagement, partnership, education. Don't try to combine these as different currencies and instead of weighting them, use these other criteria as a decision tree. Some may be 'drop dead' criteria ie if doesn't do this, won't get involved. Some may be intangibles, so separate these from conservation value and use in multi criteria decision analysis. Can plot cost efficiency of projects with other values and then choose projects on far right – and when money is limited, do the same thing but only within the range of available money.

Some are also probability of success criteria – an area for applying expert opinion – and for these need to multiply (if fail on one, should see project fail altogether rather than just reducing the score). Benefits may be additive, but must multiply probabilities of success. Maybe create a range as difficult to determine probably, and then do calculations with both upper and lower bounds.

Other things can be used to rank projects such as genetic uniqueness ($1/\text{number of spp in genus or genus in family}$), or the number of existing populations ($1/N$) e.g. saving 10th population has lower value than saving a 3rd population.

Cost can range over several orders of magnitude, hence cheap projects may be pushed up the priority list. If preferred cost can be left out of the divisor and just includes in a matrix. Need to consider what costs you include – purely financial, in kind, only the contribution of your organisation, total project cost, infrastructure, etc. If others are involved, should be considering what your contribution brings to the table above everyone else, not taking credit for entire benefit.

The idea of biodiversity trading was briefly discussed, as through making these decisions we are not protecting everything equally, therefore placing values on things. Carbon is becoming a currency for many things but an international currency for biodiversity is difficult to define. Too big an issue to address in this workshop but noted as future area of exploration/ growth so discussions with corporate can look at biodiversity returns on investment. In our reporting though we should be exploring things beyond just expenditure e.g. triple bottom line. Expenditure isn't necessarily related to outputs as may be grossly inefficient.

Need to define the parameters going into Benefit, Probability of Success and Cost, and also tie these to the 'drop dead' principles that are to be addressed before progressing into the assessment. The FPP should ask questions that provide the information needed to give estimates of B, Ps and C. Where a project has benefits to several species these are likely to score more highly. To prevent inflation of scores, only nationally listed species should be included, and any projects saying they will have benefits to multiple species, need to show these beneficial outcomes during evaluation, otherwise they will have a low likelihood of getting repeat funding.

An example of the FPP process was workshopped using Zoos SA's Mainland Tammar project and the details can be seen in Appendix 2.

Revised FPP

In light of the feedback from the first two sessions, revisions were made to the FPP overnight (Appendix 3), and the last session started with a review of the aims of the FPP; to make the selection process transparent, and improve reporting (and honestly in reporting) and measurability of impact.

The questions were reassessed and separated into four groups:

Benefits - Anticipated scenario if action delayed or not taken

- Measurable outcomes in terms of key threatening process and population and habitat viability
- Conservation scope – impact at population, spp, habitat, ecosystem, global
- How long expect benefits to be delivered (conditions needed for this to be sustained)

Probability of success - Project design to derive outcomes and address barriers and pitfalls

- Project team skilled with good track record with similar projects
- Sufficient local support for long term results
- Funding other than requested either not needed or secured

Conservation Value = Benefit (sum of 4 benefits) x Ps_1 x Ps_2 x Ps_3 x Ps_4

Additional opportunities

- Educational benefits – above and beyond what is required for the project to occur
- Research, marketing, etc benefits
- Linkages with species in own or regional zoos
- Partnership building – our participation greater than just handing over money, staff participation

These are for institutional decision, not part of the conservation value calculation. Use to tip decisions when there are closely ranked projects or unable to fund/participate in all available projects. These are weighted by individual institutions according to their specific circumstances.

Cost

Show this separately as both total project cost and contribution by own organization. In kind?

Evaluation

Benefits accrued by intervention need to be compared to what would happen if we did nothing, but as we don't have a control for the experiment it is often speculative. Modeling can help with predictions, but that requires data to determine likely outcomes. Need to have a long-term commitment in order to be able to evaluate, and especially to take it beyond basic auditing to adaptive management experiment from which you can learn. Also requires that resources are allocated to project evaluation – corporates allocate 10-20% of project budget to evaluation, auditing and research. Want to be able to find out how little can be spent to have a reasonable chance of success – if always succeed, don't know how much less could be done to still achieve the same result.

Questions for evaluation of projects

- Did you do what you said? Base reporting
- Did you achieve your conservation outcome?
- Did you achieve any other positive outcomes? If not, why not?
- Were there any negative results?
- What did you learn and what would you do differently?

It would be beneficial to have a web based tool so there is a searchable database which provides a 2-page summary of projects that allows for lessons to be learnt and provides information for meta-analysis. EAZA database provides some foundation for this but needs some alterations. As they stand at the moment, FPP and EAZA database have different purposes and questions and can't be combined in existing format. In future would be good for FPP and EAZA database to feed information into each other. Issues with needing to nurse people through the process to get everyone to provide the data, and there are issues like misspelling that affect the usefulness of database searching.

Project Information and Evaluation Links

www.cambridgeconservationforum.org.uk
conservationevidence.com
www.eco-index.org
conserveonline.org



Appendix 1 Taronga's Draft Field Project Prioritization Protocol

Criterion	Definition	Weighting (DRAFT values)	Score (1,2,3)	Weighted score			
		A	B	C = (A*B)			
CONSERVATION CRITERIA					High (score = 3)	Medium (score = 2)	Low (score = 1)
Conservation urgency	How urgent is it that the Project be done?	5		0	High Urgency The Project is necessary and clearly urgent – there is an opportunity that is time sensitive, or the situation will worsen significantly if not put into action now	Medium Urgency The Project is necessary, but not very urgent	Low Urgency The Project is necessary, but not at all urgent.
Project Partners	What evidence has been provided on the past success of the partners involved?	5		0	Good evidence Well documented evidence of success in similar previous projects, taking into account sector expertise and history within the region.	Some evidence Mixed evidence of successful delivery of similar projects in the past, taking into account sector expertise and history within the region.	Little evidence Little or no evidence of successful delivery of similar projects in the past.
Project Design	Is the Project design likely to derive the desired outcome?	5		0	High likelihood of success Influence of proposed actions on mitigating threatening processes is high because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌘ The proposed actions are directly related, and/or has the capacity to influence the desired outcome, taking into account origin or threat, geographic location & relationship to the threatening processes. ⌘ The methods proposed are likely to be successful, as they have considered the social, cultural or political context of the project. ⌘ Methods proposed are likely to deliver successful ecological outcomes, e.g. population recovery, habitat rehabilitation and threat mitigation. ⌘ Possible pitfalls have been considered and appropriate contingency actions considered. 	Medium likelihood of success	Low likelihood of success Influence of proposed actions on mitigating threatening processes is low because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌘ The proposed actions have limited capacity to engage in or influence the desired outcome, taking into account origin of threat, geographic location and relationship to the threatening processes. ⌘ Mechanism proposed to deliver action is unlikely to be effective, as it does not take account of the social, cultural or political context in which the project is operating. ⌘ Methods proposed are unlikely to deliver successful ecological outcomes, e.g. population recovery, habitat rehabilitation and threat mitigation. ⌘ No pitfalls considered, no contingency in place.
Measurable outcomes	Does the Project have a defined set of measurable outcomes?	5		0	The Project has clear measurable outcomes and time frames for meeting programme goals.	The Project has not yet derived measurable outcomes, but there is a high probability those outcomes will emerge.	The Project does not have clearly defined or measurable outcomes for meeting program goals.
Local support	Is the project embedded into the local community, incorporate capacity building into the plan, and have buy in from governing bodies?	5		0	Embedded Working teams on the ground include a high proportion of local staff, with a clear goal of building capacity. Has well-developed working relationships at all levels within the region, from local villages through to government agencies.	Somewhat embedded Working teams on the ground predominantly comprise ex-patriots. However, there are clear goals and aims of engaging local staff to build capacity. Project newly established and therefore does not have strong relationship. However, past record suggests a commitment to engaging relevant stakeholders.	Not embedded Working teams on the ground predominantly comprise ex-patriots, with little view to building local capacity. Despite being in operation for a while, there is little evidence of engagement with relevant stakeholders, from local communities through to government agencies.



Anticipated Conservation Impact - ecosystem	What is the expected conservation impact of the Project, in terms of species persistence, species diversity, habitat restoration, ecosystem integrity, etc?	5		0	Great Impact If successful, a large number of other species will benefit within the ecosystem; i.e. through relationship of species to others or removal of significant threatening process.	Medium Impact If successful, other species will benefit, though there are more significant species within the ecosystem, which, if successfully conserved, would deliver greater biodiversity benefits.	Low Impact If successful, benefits will have little impact on other wildlife in the area; i.e. survival of species has little impact on ecosystem as a whole, or threatening processes apply only to the target species.
Key threatening processes	Does the project consider primary issues threatening the population?	3		0	Well considered Success likely because project fully addresses the issues that threaten the survival or viability of the population e.g. hunting, human conflict, habitat destruction, predator risk etc.	Somewhat considered Success possible because: Although project only partly addresses threatening process, those that aren't targeted in this project are being addressed by other parties.	Not considered Success unlikely because: Project does not address the larger context of the issue, particularly the key threatening process(es).
Ongoing benefits	Is the Project likely to continue to deliver benefit in the future?	3		0	Likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future.	Somewhat likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future is in the process of being developed	Unlikely Project has no strategy for long-term viability & sustainability of approach, particularly in developing the capacity of relevant stakeholders.
External funding	Is ARAZPA funding sufficient for the overall success of the project?	3		0	High chance of success. Funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is either not necessary or is secured.	Medium chance of success. Funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is partly secured. The unfunded components are not critical to overall project success.	Low chance of success. Additional funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is required and unsecured.
Risk analysis	What risks does the Project bring to project participant safety, the projects financial stability and reputation, etc?	3		0	There is little risk to participants or project/program reputation.	There is some risk, either to participant safety, or program finances or reputation.	There is significant risk to participant safety and/or program finances or reputation.
Educational Benefit	Are there educational and awareness raising opportunities with species managed in ARAZPA zoos?	3		0	Focal/target species held in ARAZPA zoos allowing ARAZPA facilities to deliver educational opportunities to raise awareness through zoo interpretive themes and capital project interpretation through real examples and is a high profile species, likely to provide platform for broader communication opportunities	Analogue held in ARAZPA zoos, some educational, awareness raising opportunities	Not managed, few educational opportunities
Recognised conservation relevance	Does the project link or align with a previously identified regional or global conservation priority?	2		0	High relevance. Project has strong relevance (links with, or delivers objectives) to both regional or global conservation priorities, as identified by the IUCN or its constituent groups.	Medium relevance. Project has relevance (links with, or delivers objectives) to either a regional or global conservation priority, as identified by the IUCN or its constituent groups.	Low relevance . Project has limited relevance (links with, or delivers objectives) to a regional or global conservation priority, as identified by the IUCN or its constituent groups.
Positive history with ARAZPA	What is this project's track record with ARAZPA zoos?	2		0	Good track record ARAZPA zoos have worked successfully with this partner before. Involvement in this project would continue to build this relationship	Medium track record ARAZPA zoos have not worked with this partner; however, they have a reputation as a good partner, communicator, etc.	No track record ARAZPA zoos have not worked with this partner before and little is known about its communication or reliability; or ARAZPA zoos have not worked successfully with this partner before.



Partnership building I	Does participation/support from ARAZPA or their its member zoos add value to the project	2		0	Adds great value Skills & resources required entirely available in ARAZPA zoos and are necessary for completion of the project	Adds some value Some of the skills & resources required are available in ARAZPA zoos. Although there are other organizations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required, it is unlikely another organization would pick it up.	Does not add value Skills & resources required not available in ARAZPA zoos, or there are other organizations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required; and it is likely one of these organization would pick it up.
Partnership Building II	Are there ARAZPA staff development opportunities	1		0	Significant opportunities for staff development	Some level of staff development.	No relevant staff development opportunities.
		TOTAL SCORE:		0			



Appendix 2

Information on project for applying prioritization to: Mainland Tammar

Peter Clark and David Taggart (Zoos SA)

Australian wallaby (14 spp in genus)

Urgency - Extinct in the wild in Australia. Were 4 sub spp, 2 now extinct in the wild, with this subspp extinct in Australia but had been put on an island in NZ, which was about to be eradicated (eradication actually took 3 yrs). Decision to bring them back to Aust as they would otherwise be extinct. 80 brought to Australia – all founders known. Use cross fostering to increase reproductive rate – up to 3 fold over natural breeding

Project partners – Zoos SA have completed several conservation projects with DEH (stick nest rats, yellow-footed rock wallaby, bilby).

Project design – Zoos SA staff have had membership on recovery teams and designing the project, so were able to influence the design to increase likelihood of success.

PC - 75% chance of success, HP – 50% chance of success. PC – wouldn't have got involved if didn't think a high likelihood of success.

Outcomes – To create a sustainable population of tammar wallabies on Mainland Australia.
Have been 3 releases, 4th next week.

Local support – local schools and communities involved, used as model for explaining conservation concepts, on flow to farming (lamb loss). Was disagreement from locals at inception, explained in detail at community meetings, lot of publicity, especially local. Had contingency plan if tammars did move onto farming land and impact farming community.

Anticipated conservation impact – Impact on tammar persistence and also ecosystem recovery. Limited annual monitoring in Innes, but appears to be increase in other species present in Innes

Key threatening processes – Consideration of primary threats – habitat destruction (protected at Innes), predators (foxes and cats) – baiting on going rather than fencing, hunting – stopped. Area could have been fenced off as end of peninsula, but was decided not too – therefore committed to long term predator control.

Ongoing benefits – Ongoing baiting in the region benefit tammars and other local species. Also likely benefits to local farmers – reduced lamb loss.

External funding – 5 year project, \$100 000 per year (Zoos SA's contribution), and total project costs estimated to cost \$1.5 million over 5 years. Funding sufficient to make project happen.

Risk analysis – No formal risk assessment done at the start but required participation at all levels so can shape program.

Educational benefit – Consider education as two separate parts – farmer education an essential part of the program, and other education may be a side benefit.

Recognized conservation relevance – State government (DEH) has no species loss policy so fit with regional conservation priority.

Positive history with zoos – Yearly contract with DEH for this project (trying to set up MOU), and worked together on previous projects.

Partnership building - Zoos have contributed more than just animals including expertise in cross fostering; a method to accelerate reproductive rate.

Zoos maintaining an insurance population – currently Zoos SA, Perth zoo getting involved, one other site looking to get involved.

Additive project as building on good will and reputation of previous projects

All projects have research students associated with them – building relationships with local universities.

Other benefits - Accelerated breeding techniques got media attention – surrogacy program results in young being euthanased, but this hasn't led to a lot negative publicity.



Hugh's Comments on Tammar Program

Need to put some numbers with benefits and probability of success, that even though they are not exact, they have a thought through process that provides a best guess and is internally consistent.

Benefit is 1 population as would be no populations if no action.

Probability of success = 0.6

Cost = \$2.5 million for 20 years + \$500 000 Zoos SA contribution = \$3 million

Value = $1 * 0.6 = 0.0000002$ (Multiply by 1000000 to get easy to work with number) = 0.2
3000000

With there being benefits to other species e.g. malleefowl, western whipbird, hooded plover, can add the B x Ps of each species into the top value.

Can put other benefits (eg cost efficiency, engagement, education, relationship building) into a matrix which could be used as a decision tree, although this can mean a borderline project on one point is ruled out even though it may score highly on all other areas.



Appendix 3 Refined output fro CBSG workshop

Criterion	Definition	Score (1,2,3)			
CONSERVATION BENEFIT			High (score = 3)	Medium (score = 2)	Low (score = 1)
Project Goals	What do you expect to be the measurable outcomes of the project in terms of a) key threatening process and b) population and habitat viability		The Project has clear measurable outcomes and time frames for meeting program goals.	The Project has not yet derived measurable outcomes, but there is a high probability those outcomes will emerge.	The Project does not have clearly defined or measurable outcomes for meeting program goals.
Scope of Conservation Impact	What is the expected conservation scope of the Project. i.e. does it impact at a population, species, habitat, ecosystem or global level?		Great Impact If successful, a large number of other species will benefit within the ecosystem; i.e. through relationship of species to others or removal of significant threatening process. Amelioration of global disruption	Medium Impact If successful, other species will benefit, though there are more significant species within the ecosystem, which, if successfully conserved, would deliver greater biodiversity benefits.	Low Impact If successful, benefits will have little impact on other wildlife in the area; i.e. survival of species has little impact on ecosystem as a whole, or threatening processes apply only to the target species.
Conservation urgency	Describe the anticipated scenario if action is delayed or no action is taken		High Urgency The Project is necessary and clearly urgent – there is an opportunity that is time sensitive, or the situation will worsen significantly if not put into action now	Medium Urgency The Project is necessary, but can be delayed if necessary	Low Urgency The Project is necessary, but can be done at any time with equivalent effect
Ongoing benefits	How long will the project continue to deliver benefits?		Likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future.	Somewhat likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future is in the process of being developed	Unlikely Project has no strategy for long-term viability & sustainability of approach, particularly in developing the capacity of relevant stakeholders.
PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS					
Project Design	Does the project design logically leads to the stated expected outcomes? Are there any key threatening processes or persistent barriers to population or habitat viability in place? Are there social cultural or political influences on the that are not under control of the team? Are there any other potential pitfalls? Does the project link or align with a previously identified regional or global conservation priority?		High likelihood of success Influence of proposed actions on mitigating threatening processes is high because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∅ The proposed actions are directly related, and/or has the capacity to influence the desired outcome, taking into account origin or threat, geographic location & relationship to the threatening processes. ∅ The methods proposed are likely to be successful, as they have considered the social, cultural or political context of the project. ∅ Methods proposed are likely to deliver successful ecological outcomes, e.g. population recovery, habitat rehabilitation and threat mitigation. ∅ Possible pitfalls have been considered and appropriate contingency actions considered. 	Medium likelihood of success	Low likelihood of success Influence of proposed actions on mitigating threatening processes is low because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∅ The proposed actions have limited capacity to engage in or influence the desired outcome, taking into account origin of threat, geographic location and relationship to the threatening processes. ∅ Mechanism proposed to deliver action is unlikely to be effective, as it does not take account of the social, cultural or political context in which the project is operating. ∅ Methods proposed are unlikely to deliver successful ecological outcomes, e.g. population recovery, habitat rehabilitation and threat mitigation. ∅ No pitfalls considered, no contingency in place.



Project Team	What is the expertise and track record of partners in effecting conservation outcomes?		Good evidence Well suited expertise and documented evidence of success in similar previous projects, taking into account sector expertise and history within the region.	Some evidence Most likely capable but little relevant experience in team Mixed evidence of successful delivery of similar projects in the past, taking into account sector expertise and history within the region.	Little evidence Little or no evidence of relevant skills or successful delivery of similar projects in the past.
Local support	Is the project embedded into the local community and governments, incorporate capacity building into the plan, and have buy in from governing bodies?		Embedded Working teams on the ground include a high proportion of local staff, with a clear goal of building capacity. Has well-developed working relationships at all levels within the region, from local villages through to government agencies.	Somewhat embedded Working teams on the ground predominantly comprise ex-patriots. However, there are clear goals and aims of engaging local staff to build capacity. Project newly established and therefore does not have strong relationship. However, past record suggests a commitment to engaging relevant stakeholders.	Not embedded Working teams on the ground predominantly comprise ex-patriots, with little view to building local capacity. Despite being in operation for a while, there is little evidence of engagement with relevant stakeholders, from local communities through to government agencies.
External funding	Is TCSA funding sufficient for the overall success of the project?		High chance of success. Funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is either not necessary or is secured.	Medium chance of success. Funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is partly secured. The unfunded components are not critical to overall project success.	Low chance of success. Additional funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by ARAZPA zoos, is required and unsecured.
INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES					
Educational and Public Relations Benefit	Are there educational, awareness or fundraising opportunities with species managed in ARAZPA zoos?		Focal/target species held in ARAZPA zoos allowing ARAZPA facilities to deliver educational opportunities to raise awareness through zoo interpretive themes and capital project interpretation through real examples and is a high profile species, likely to provide platform for broader communication opportunities	Analogue held in ARAZPA zoos, some educational, awareness raising opportunities	Not managed, few educational opportunities
Partnership building I	Does participation/support from TCSA or other ARAZPA zoos add value to the project, and/or will ARAZPA zoos have an improved conservation reputation if the project succeeds.		Adds great value Skills & resources required entirely available in ARAZPA zoos and are necessary for completion of the project. ARAZPA institutions will have greatly improved conservation reputation if project succeeds.	Adds some value Some of the skills & resources required are available in ARAZPA zoos. Although there are other organizations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required, it is unlikely another organization would pick it up. ARAZPA institutions will have mildly improved conservation reputation if project succeeds.	Does not add value Skills & resources required not available in ARAZPA zoos, or there are other organizations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required; and it is likely one of these organization would pick it up. Project success will have no impact on ARAZPA conservation reputation.
Partnership Building II	Are there TCSA staff development opportunities		Significant opportunities for staff development	Some level of staff development.	No relevant staff development opportunities.
	TOTAL SCORE:	0			

$$= (\text{sum of benefits}) \times P_{S_1} \times P_{S_2} \times P_{S_3} \times P_{S_4}$$