

Field Project Prioritisation					
Principles					
Field Projects will be selected using the <i>criteria</i> listed below, but only after the following <i>principles</i> have been accepted; if any one of these principles cannot be satisfied, then the institution should consider very carefully whether the project should be undertaken at all					
1. Only projects that demonstrate measurable conservation outcomes in the field will be supported. Projects with an education component are strongly encouraged but measurable outcomes must relate to the species/habitat impact expected rather than community impact alone.					
2. Projects must consider the implications of climate change effects on the success of their project					
3. Project applications will specify a defined period of participation or support from TCSA zoos					
4. It is understood that in situ conservation projects do not need to have captive breeding/management components, nor that the focal/target species need to necessarily be held in zoos.					
5. Where in situ conservation projects involve reintroduction or relocation, such processes must be endorsed by relevant government bodies and adhere to all relevant policies and					
6. Humane treatment must be a priority for all animals impacted as part of this project and captive populations must be held in conditions considered acceptable by ARAZPA.					
7. TCSA recognises the importance of sensitive integration of wildlife conservation goals and human needs in successful in situ conservation programs					
8. No project should present an unreasonable level of risk to participant safety, project financial stability or reputation.					
9. Projects and their personnel must adhere to all laws of the country in which the project is undertaken.					
Criterion	Definition	Score (1-3)			
CONSERVATION BENEFIT					
			High (score = 3)	Medium (score = 2)	Low (score = 1)
Project Goals	What are the expected measurable outcomes of the project in terms of a) key threatening process and b) population and habitat viability - is this the best possible course of action to conserve this species or area?		The Project has stated clear measurable outcomes and time frames for meeting programme goals that address the greatest potential threats to this species/area	The Project has stated some measurable outcomes, but there is little detail, and does not address the primary threatening process	The Project has not stated clearly defined or measurable outcomes for meeting programme goals, or the measurable outcomes do not address biological processes
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, and some change in conservation status will occur if delayed	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 and what is the required continued input?		Likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future with little ongoing input.	Somewhat likely A clear strategy for developing the capacity of local stakeholders to continue into the future is in the process of being developed and will require future input	Unlikely Project has no strategy for long-term viability & sustainability of approach, particularly in developing the capacity of relevant stakeholders.
PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS					
		Score (0-1)	High (score 0.8-1)	Medium (0.4-0.7)	Low (0-0.2)
Project Design	Does the project design logically lead to the stated expected outcomes? Are the key threatening processes or persistent barriers to population or habitat viability addressed in the detailed design? If the target area or species is at the edge of a climate band, has the design taken this into consideration? Are there social cultural or political influences that are not under control of the team? Are potential pitfalls addressed? 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 bring about the desired outcome, taking into account origin or threat, geographic location & relationship to the threatening processes. • The effects of climate change have been considered, and if the target area and species are at the border of changing climate bands, this has been incorporated into the design • The methods proposed are likely to be successful, as they have considered the social, cultural or political context of the project. • Possible pitfalls have been considered and appropriate contingency actions considered. • The project is linked to previously identified regional or global conservation priorities. 	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 has been presented	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 TCSA zoos, is either not necessary or is secured.	Medium chance of success. Funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by TCSA, is partly secured. Some unfunded components are critical to overall project success.	Low chance of success. Additional funding for the project, aside from requested involvement by TCSA, is required and unsecured.

INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES		Score 0 or 0.1			
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 organisations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required, it is unlikely another organisation 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 organisations more suited to successfully deliver outcomes, given the types of skills required; and it is likely one of these organisation 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.
CONSERVATION BENEFIT SCORE:		0			
Institutional benefits score:		0			