# CCSL Social Learning – Building the Evidence Together

# Selection Criteria for participating projects

## Overview

The CGIAR CCAFS social learning theme has worked over the last two years to bring together materials on social learning as a methodological approach to foster change and get research in to action. This has consisted of a number of literature reviews, synthesis of materials, commissioning of papers, and supporting of discussion and action through an online interactive portal and a ‘sandbox’ for trialling social learning approaches.

The next phase, starting in 2014, will arrange and develop this material to be more accessible to academics and practitioners with a set of tools and guidelines, encouraging adoption of social learning as a methodology and sharing of findings. In addition there is an ambition to bring together a ‘core group’ of interested projects from within and external to the CGIAR family to work with a common methodology on monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of social learning in their projects. The purpose is to better refine the understanding of social learning and its impacts across a variety of different contexts.

The purpose of this document is firstly to outline:

* the range of possible **projects examples** that could be included in this ‘core group
* a number of **project ‘factors’** that will be useful when comparing different facets of projects so that there are a good spectrum included in the core group..
* the **selection methodology** for deciding which projects should be part of this core group for an initial meeting at a workshop in June 2014.

## Project examples

A starter list of potential projects that might be suitable and interested in being part core M&E group was defined by the CCSL core team in December 2013 and is listed below. Members of these projects were interviewed to find out more about each project (written up in Appendix 1).

Potential Social Learning projects as list in December 2013

* + ILRI – 3 from ILRI/KMIS, 1 from Lance Robinson
  + University of Reading/FAO Lesotho (Peter Dorward)
  + CARIAA – 2-3 case studies (from the consortium and perhaps IDRC/CARIAA as a programme example)
  + CARE – 2 studies
  + Prolinnova  - 2 studies
  + IIED – 2 studies
  + Makerere University 1 study
  + CCAFS FP4 trial  - 2-3 studies

It is hoped that these projects will join us in building an evidence base for social learning and help us to co-construct the relevant monitoring and evaluation methodology and examine what works and what does not work for successful social learning projects. There may be other projects who join us for this exploration.

## Project factors

The above project examples, given that they were listed by CCSL, all contain aspects of social learning. Having interviewed the project examples and compared some of the aspects of the different projects that are selected for the M&E workshop and process, seven ‘project factors’ were identified. The factors range from where social learning is expected to happen – for example at the programmatic versus project level - to more practical factors such as resources required from outside the project to support Social Learning M&E and timeline for project starting.

*It is important to note that the project factors are intended for internal use so that when we confirm our list of projects we can match similar projects together and to ensure there is a good balance of projects selected for the M&E workshop. They are intended to be just one component of the selection criteria (not the selection criteria as a whole – see below for selection methodology).*

The projects examples all contain social learning, so they have been used to illustrate the project factors in the descriptions below. Each project example will sit across all the factors - but within one particular state (labelled A, B) for each factor. The factors are also grouped under headings relating to things like their structure and extent, timescales and resourcing as below.

**Project Starting point and structure (intent)**

Factor 1

* 1A - Project ‘doing’ social learning but not explicitly measuring/articulating it - This project, such as some of the CARE work, FAS in Brazil, and SIFOR fit in to the category of strong evidence of social learning happening on the ground but either not being articulated as such or social learning not specifically being monitored/documented.
* 1B – Integrated social learning in to design – Projects/programmes like CARIAA have been designed from the outset to do social learning and to monitor the process of social learning fostering change.

Factor 2

* 2A - Large multi-country programmes, social learning at a programmatic level – projects like CARIAA are aiming to foster social learning at a programmatic level between consortia working on thematic work. Project level social learning (with communities and local stakeholders) may occur within the consortia and ideally will ‘trickle up’ in terms of flattening institutional hierarchies and changing program level behaviours. However the primary focus is on institutional social learning and change is at the programmatic level. programme level learning and bigger institutional changing versus project level change, direct impacts and important feed-up learning. Loose networks versus top-down programmes/projects
* 2B - Project (or multiple project) based, Social Learning at the project ‘on-ground’ level – social learning that is fostering on-ground change directly (usually through a project or scaling-up of a particular project idea). This may include efforts to foster local institutional change (particularly if double or triple loop learning) and ‘trickle-up’ in to programmatic thinking. However the primary focus is at the project level. Some loose networks such as Prolinnova sit primarily in this category and have some spill over to the programmatic level.

**Project Extent (Scaling)**

Factor 3

* 3A - Social Learning transfer across multiple stages or ongoing – there are opportunities to monitor Social Learning, reflect on this and apply this learning to other stages of the project.
* 3B – Social learning for one particular context – there is a particular project where social learning could be evaluated but no tangible option to reflect on learning/process and introduce new approaches for monitoring in further stages of the project or elsewhere.

Factor 4

* 4A – Social learning methodology use intends to scale geographically – there is a concrete aim to replicate/adapt the project for different geographical areas and audiences. Monitoring social learning could be done across the different geographies.
* 4B - Social learning within one particular area – monitoring of social learning will occur in one particular geographical area.

Factor 5

* 5A – Social learning based on physical interaction – social learning is more likely to occur when people physically meet up. Some projects may have aspects of virtual outreach but this is more communications focused. The core emphasis to foster social learning is through physical meeting.
* 5B – Social learning with a focus on virtual interaction for learning – some projects have at their core the idea that technologies are needed to get to social learning to scale. One strong example is Shamba Shape-Up, where a reality TV show is used to frame the setting for social learning. Despite the local level social learning happening through direct physical engagement of people at a farm to solve problems, the intended effect is a much wider engagement through interactive media to foster geographically disperse shared learning.

**Project Timescale**

Factor 6

* 6A – Social learning M&E within the next 18 months – some projects will be at a stage where learning has happened and there is an opportunity to reflect and implement shared M&E methodology on social learning in a follow-up stage within the next 18 months. Other projects such as CARIAA are new and will be building this in from the beginning – starting within the next 18 months. Note that CARIAA is an interesting example of social learning M&E being used at the programmatic level within the next 18 months, but less likely at the project level within that time frame.
* 6B – Social learning M&E likely 18 months plus

**Project Resources**

Factor 7

* 7A – Social learning M&E will require external support (capacity/finance) – some projects such as FAS in Brazil have a strong interest in building monitoring of social learning in to their projects but will require some external capacity building to do this. They may also require funding to attend the M&E group workshops, such as that happening in June.
* 7B – Social learning M&E can self-support – Programmes like CARIAA and CARE’s ALPS are relatively self-funding. If they need some external capacity support, they will have the resources to pay for it.

These factors can be displayed in a table by project:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project** | **1A** | **1B** | **2A** | **2B** | **3A** | **3B** | **4A** | **4B** | **5A** | **5B** | **6A** | **6B** | **7A** | **7B** |
| CARIAA |  | ✓ | ✓ | Partial – 18months+ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| Prolinnova | ✓ |  | limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | limited |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| Shamba Shape-Up | ✓ |  | limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | Possibly |
| Institutional transformation (ILRI) | ✓ |  | ✓end-2015 | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | depended on grant |
| CCAFS FP4 | ✓ | limited | ✓ |  | unclear |  | unclear |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| IITA learning alliance | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| Makerere | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | unclear |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Sandbox? |
| Africa Rising | ✓ |  | Unclear |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| SIFOR | ✓ |  | 2015 | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | some |
| ALP | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Limited |  | limited |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| BOLSA Floresta | ✓ |  | limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Future? | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |

# Selection Methodology

Each project/programme (referred to as initiative) will be asked to ‘self-assess’ how their initiative is engaged in social learning with the following three questions:

1. Is facilitated learning and reflection a central to the initiative’s approach / theory of change? In what ways is the facilitated learning and reflection built into the project structure?
2. If so, is that learning intended to go beyond the level of individual and effect broader community, systemic or social change (e.g. in terms of changes to systems, practices, or ways of knowing)?
3. Are the outcomes intended to empower stakeholders in a self-determined learning/change process or are they pre-defined and prescriptive? How does the objective of group learning reflect the objectives of other actors/stakeholders? Who conceptualised the process?

Convincing answers to these questions make the initiative viable for inclusion in social learning M&E. Finally selection for workshop inclusion can then be made by mapping the initiative across the project factors and ensuring a balanced portfolio. Members of the CCSL initiative who have identified projects and are encouraging buy-in should have this conversation and invite answers to the questions above.

# APPENDIX 1 – Project examples used for developing the factors

**Collaborative Adaptation Research Initiative in Africa and Asia (CARIAA)**

Summary

* Seven year IDRC and DFID funded program aimed at linking research policy and practice to improve resilience and livelihoods of the most venerable
* Focused on 3 categories of climate change hotspots in Africa & Asia – semi-arid, glacier river basins, and deltas
* Composed of 4 research consortia of up to 5 institutions each
* Strong ground presence with idea of research uptake from day 1

Social Learning potential

* Core ethos of being joined up between silos, with an incentive structure to cross-pollinate between programmes (largely knowledge sharing but encouraging activities)
* Ambitious programme which has strong potential for social learning at the programmatic level – fostering institutional change. M&E framework at this level being defined in Q2 2014 and potential to collaborate/integrate with external groups such as CCSL.
* Social learning should be happing at the project/field level too and filtering up to be part of the institutional change. This will take time (less likely year 1), and IDRC will have less direct control of social learning methodologies being used at the project level.

Scaling

* Large scale programme from the start with more potential initial for social learning at the programmatic level (one step removed from the field)

Timeframe and funding

* USD 70 million programme over 7 years will come self-funded for social learning activities
* Inception workshop March 2014
* M&E to happen in two stages (neither done yet): a broad view of what the programme wants M&E to achieve; more detailed design on how to collect data, guidelines on learning and reflection

Contact

* Blane Harvey (IDRC)

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| CARIAA |  | ✓ | ✓ | Partial – 18months+ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |

**PROLINNOVA network (Promoting Local innovation in ecologically oriented agriculture and resource management)**

Summary

* A loose network across a number of countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa promoting farmers playing decisive roles in agricultural research and development for sustainable livelihoods
* Run on a number of relatively small grants focused on innovation
* Country teams exist across the network who are de-facto volunteers
* Less easy to direct because it is a network but a lot of communication done on farmers as innovators

Social Learning Potential

* Social Learning is integral to the ethos of Prolinnova but has not necessarily been articulated as such
* Social Learning is happening but not systematically tracked as such at a project level. Tracking SL has potential for sharing and model replication across the network and elsewhere e.g. the farmers innovation fair model which integrates farmers in to the research process could be analysed through a SL lens when taken to West Africa later this year (see write-up of E Africa events which discusses SL here: <http://www.prolinnova.net/sites/default/files/documents/Kenya/2013/baobab68_15102013_05extract.pdf> ).

Scaling

* Lessons are being shared across the network and some initiatives have ambitions to be implemented/trialled elsewhere e.g. farmers innovation fair held in East Africa is being run in West Africa later this year.

Timeline and funding

* Patti K has provided a small amount of funds to Prolinnova to evaluate case studies. The criteria for evaluation and indicators for meaningful changes over time are part of the scope of this work. Prolinnova may be interested in introducing shared SL methodology in to the case study thinking.

Contact

Patti Kristjanson, Ann Waters-Bayer (Prolinnova)

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| Prolinnova | ✓ |  | limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | limited |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |

**Shamba Shape-Up (SSU)**

Summary

* Evidence-based, Innovative Climate Change and Agriculture Communication and Extension
* Focus on scaling out climate smart practices through entertainment
* TV show in East Africa where local partners turn up and work with a farmer to ‘reform the farm’. Use this to highlight climate issues and forward planning. Show is interactive with text-in and follow-up activities based on questions. A farmer mobile phone text-out network effect is also part of the interaction.
* Mostly urban and peri-urban but spreading out to the countryside (Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania).
* Working with the university of Reading to develop more in-depth M&E

Social Learning potential

* Reaching large numbers of people and fostering change through interactive ICTs backed with the physical interaction and learning happening at the farm level for each ‘case study’. If done right there is a huge potential for scale of behaviour change.
* Challenge on how to track Social Learning and its impacts at and between the interaction of the local case studies and wider viewers. How to ensure behaviour change propagates – e.g. are the interactive texts with farmers enough or do they need local support through organised social learning orientated groups?

Scaling

* Example of interaction of people doing social learning at a physical interaction level being magnified enormously with interactive ICTs.
* Programme is being extended in 2014 with ambition for wider coverage and including more partners (e.g. CG-centre KARI).

Timeline and funding

* In 2013 AECF commissioned a study of 300 farmers to estimate financial benefits from adopting practices recommended by SSU. In 2014 the study will be improved and scaled to 3,000 farmers in collaboration with Reading and Wageningen University. Potential to build in Social Learning methodology and use findings to help shape the format.

Contact

* Patti Kristianson, Peter Dorward (Reading)

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| Shamba Shape-Up | ✓ |  | Limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  |  | Possibly |

**Research and Institutional transformation for Climate Change adaptation (ILRI)**

Summary

* Participatory methodology to assess priority topics with focus on practical outcome insights in to the institutional environment which is relevant to local stakeholders
* ‘landscape level’ – smaller than district but bigger than community
* 3 sites – in Kenya, Senegal, Ethiopia. Kenya more traditional ‘extractive’ research). Other site more participatory and embedded in to local planning processes. Each site at a different stage, so potential for cross-learning (e.g. Kenya half-way through project, Senegal starting in March 2014)
* First phase – develop test and refine framework for institutional & governance dimensions of adaptation (picked up by district level government)
* Have developed decision support tools for institutional analysis at landscape level e.g. network analysis and scoring self-assessment on accountability, transparency and self-effectiveness
* Idea is to assist local stakeholders with insights and ideas before doing adaptation – building intuitional environment on the back of other activities such as climate scenarios work.

Social Learning potential

* Facilitated and more formalised Social Learning processes would be useful for querying the institutional change processes and self-reflection
* Realistically assessment of extent to which current work is engaged in social learning
* Desire to bring the three components together for shared learning (towards early 2015).

Scaling

* Because of phased nature of project, potential for social learning methodology to be introduced across sites, and lessons learned influencing design of other phases. Interplay on learning between countries is low but potential and interest is there.

Timelines and budget

* Aiming for a workshop on methodology and bringing groups together for shared learning early 2015.
* Can self-support workshop and possibly Social Learning M&E process
* Applying for CCAFS flagship 1 funding and hope to build in social learning to than the work now (will hear outcome of funding call late April).

Contact

* Lance Robinson (ILRI)

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| Institutional transformation for Climate Change adaptation | ✓ |  | ✓end-2015 | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | depended on pending grant |

**CCAFS Flagship 4 – Policies and institutions for climate smart agriculture**

Summary

* Flagship 4 is trialling results based management for CGIAR, looking at impact pathways
* Working at regional and international level
* Results-based trials have 6 projects that work in CCAFS target regions with CG-centres over 3-4 year period

Social Learning Potential

* Two of the trial projects have social learning potential:
  + IITA East Africa project on national learning alliances. These are ongoing and there is an opportunity to build in social learning M&E whilst documenting the learning processes
  + Flagship 4 itself – social learning at a programmatic level between the different projects that are part of the impact pathway ‘trial’

Scaling

* Learning from flagship 4 can feed to CCSL. Unclear on scaling potential within the ‘trial’ programme at the programmatic level but potential wider learning to steer future CCAFS strategic programmatic direction

Timelines and budget

* Taking place in 2014 onwards
* The trial programme is being funded through CCAFS, individual projects would need convincing to include social learning and to fund M&E for it. But being that the focus is impact pathways, there is a distinct possibility that projects like the IITA learning alliances would see value in doing this.

Contact

* CCAFS CCSL staff (Philip Thornton, Wiebke Foerch)

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| CCAFS FP4 | ✓ | limited | ✓ |  | unclear |  | unclear |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |
| IITA learning alliances | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |

**Makerere – Watershed management**

Summary

* Integrated and participatory watershed management
* Based in Uganda (at a CCAFS site)

Social Learning Potential

* Already established methodologies for participatory process (working with students and communities), and potential to integrate social learning as a way of working and reflection to improve impact

Scaling

* At the moment this is a one-off project. Potential for learning to be applied elsewhere in Uganda.

Timelines and Budget

* Ongoing in 2014, receiving some CCSL sandbox funding.

Contact

Mapping to project factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| Makerere | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | unclear |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Sandbox? |

**Africa Rising (ILRI)**

Summary

* Sustainable intensification project aiming to improve productivity and nutrition through engagement
* Cross CG project started in 2012 operating over 3 regions, 2 years in but still lots of aspects not in place – so potential for reflection
* Africa Rising programme is action research orientated and aims to build development partnerships.
* It is supported by ILRI’s separate work on innovation briefs. These are 12 separate briefs on innovation platforms which are ‘co-created’ through participatory write shops. e.g. see <http://clippings.ilri.org/2014/02/06/ipbrief2/>

Social Learning Potential

This is an ongoing programme where there is no explicit social learning lens has been used but the type of work is about bringing stakeholders on to a similar platform to solve problems. Hence there is potential here to introduce explicit social learning methodology.

Scaling

The programme works across a number of CG centres and has ambitions to increase geographic engagement.

Timelines and budget

* Ongoing programme, started in 2012. Unclear on funding, but potential that parts of the programme could fund their own social learning M&E work.

Contact

* Ewen Le Borgne (ILRI)

Project Factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| Africa Rising | ✓ |  | Unclear |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |

**Smallholder Innovation for Resilience (SIFOR) (IIED)**

* Participatory plant breeding using farmer field schools to strengthen learning at farmer level
* Emphasis on integrating indigenous knowledge – bringing together farmer food systems and scientist systems
* Operating across China Peru India Kenya

Social learning Potential

* Learning across sites in the programme possible as each country nis a different stages. This likely to happen more in 2015.
* Peru has a particularly interesting example of flattening hierarchies and changing farm systems - working with the international potato centre.

Timelines and Budget

* Programme ongoing (2012-2017) with a policy dialogue in india in mid-2015 which is an opportunity to bring the programmatic level closer together and foster collective learning.
* Programme has funding for its own M&E, participating in external M&E sessions may require additional funding

Contact

* Krystyna Swiderska (IIED)

Project Factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| SIFOR | ✓ |  | 2015 | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | some |

**BOLSA Floresta Brazil (FAS)**

**Adaptation Learning Program (ALP) CARE**

Summary

* Adaptation is a new concept. ALP idea is to put together to learn and get out more than the sum of the parts
* 4 country focus (Africa) at 3 levels: community (participatory processes and adaptive capacity), local government (engaging with community), and global/national practitioners

Social Learning Potential

* All CARE projects embed consideration of some of the core social learning factors: power, social differentiation, learning for change
* Aim of ALPS is to be more flexible than a regular project cycle – bringing in different timescales for planning processes and not being tied to logframe style indicators. Using flexible iterative frameworks like the ACCRA adaptive capacity framework. Promoting innovation, building trust etc.
* A challenge with this has been capturing lessons (‘documenting stuff’) and hence the ability to reflect. ALPS is coming to a close (unless further funded). One option this year that CARE are interested in is action research on what ALP has been doing to date, bringing in a social learning lens as part of this. Niger is one potential site for this (community level).
* Forthcoming programme (not ALPS called ACRES aims at connecting food security, agriculture and climate change. Ini9tial discussions have potential for SL to be included from the outset but is early days.

Scaling

* The aim of the program has been flexibility and iterative learning. The challenge has been capturing the lessons and linking them across the programme as a whole.

Timelines and budget

* ALP is moving in to the final year and has scope for reflecting on existing achievements and applying this to ongoing work. This also applies to feeding some of this work in to the upcoming ACRES programme. Potential to fund some social learning work to bring out evidence on the ALP programme.

Contact

Fiona Percy (CARE)

Project Factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| ALP | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Limited |  | limited |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |

**BOLSA Floresta Brazil (FAS)**

Summary

Large programme in the Brazilian Amazxon to provide support to communities in the form of financial payments and social programmes – forming a contract with those who receive benefits on environmental awareness and not destroying the forest.

Programme operates at various levels – individual for direct monetary payments; community for participatory self-selected social projects; ‘protected reserve’ level for larger projects and ‘Amazon basin’ level for communities to come together with FAS and government to discuss programmatic issues.

Potential Social Learning

* Social learning methodologies are not currently explicitely used, but there is a strong interest from the programme team to adopt them. Emphasis is placed on flattening hierarchies and the social programmes being driven by communities through collaborative discussion and group learning. Sharing of issues and learning at the reserve level also occurs. The inter-reserve or Amazon basin level is more difficult because of the logistics but meetings between community-level leaders, FAS, and government happen several times a year in Manaus. Again with the aim of flattening hierarchies and collectively learning. There is potential for the understanding and effectiveness of the processes happening at and between the different levels to be improved through more explicit use of social learning M&E.

Scaling

* The BOLSA Floresta programme is expanding in to new areas. Moreover there is big potential for scaling learning at the programmatic/Amazon basin level beyond what is being done with the leaders meetings. The total geographic scaling is limited to the Amazon for this particular programme. This type of approach is also novel compared to top-down government social programmes, so there is potential for innovative approaches to be replicated elsewhere in Brazil.

Timeline and Budget

This is an ongoing programme which has activities and meetings regularly in to which social learning approaches could be integrated. FAS would require some external capacity building to do this, but could continue the work themselves once they are up to speed on methodologies. They may also require supporting funding to attend any CCSL M&E workshops.

Contact

Ben Garside (IIED) Virgilio Viana (FAS)

Project Factors

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | 1A | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3B | 4A | 4B | 5A | 5B | 6A | 6B | 7A | 7B |
| BOLSA Floresta | ✓ |  | limited | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Future? | ✓ |  | ✓ |  |

# APPENDIX 2 – Additional supporting questions on Social Learning

Intent

1 What are the group learning aspects of your project and what change do they aim to foster? Please articulate the processes and stakeholders involved.

2. How does the objective of group learning reflect the objectives of other actors/stakeholders? Who conceptualised the process? What is the theory of change behind the outcome that is hoped for?

3. How are project learning processes integrated in to local knowledge and learning processes? For example making use of established ways of working, structures, and institutions

4. What are the risks inherent in the learning processes and fostering change? How do these impact vulnerable stakeholders?

**Social Differentiation**  
5. What measures (processes, criteria, incentives, interfaces, etc) have been put in place to ensure that an extended range of different social groups are engaged by the initiative?  
  
**Looped Learning**  
6. What measures are in place to enable the initiative to flexibly deviate from a given goal if the need is felt by the stakeholder group?  
7. Is the project aiming towards a pre-defined outcome with contingency measures should the pre-defined solution fail? What kind of adaptive learning processes are present?  
  
**Power**  
8. How are power dynamics in the field and within research being facilitated?  
9. Who initiates learning activities and with what objective? How informed are stakeholders who participate? Describe if/whether less powerful actors are involved in the problem definition  
  
**Monitoring Change**  
10. What measures are being used to engage beneficiaries in monitoring? How are beneficiaries defining their own indicators for successful change?

11. How will change be monitored and accounted for in an iterative manner?  
12. Are you using explicit methodology for monitoring social learning? If so describe, if not describe where you think it can be useful  
  
**Capacity and facilitation**  
13. How are beneficiaries’ capacities for social learning assessed to determine whether they can participate meaningfully or require capacity development as part of the initiative?  
14. How is an enabling environment for transdisciplinary approaches and recognition of multiple sources of knowledge being supported?

15. Describe facilitation of learning processes. Who facilitates and what is their relationship to the various stakeholders?