

**Report from Breakout Group C6  
Blue Planet Symposium, 29<sup>th</sup> May 2015**

***Developing capacity and societal awareness: How can we measure the impacts of our initiatives?***

**Chair: Sophie Seeyave**

**Rapporteur: Vikki Cheung**

**Short introductory presentations**

*These are provided in the Annex at the end of the report.*

***Capacity building programmes***

Grinson George: The First Nippon Foundation-POGO Visiting Professorship, 10 years on  
What constitutes a successful capacity building programme from the recipient's perspective and what can we use as measures of success? (Lilian Krug)

Greg Reed: IOC Capacity Development Strategy: Baseline study for an assessment of national capacity

Gary Corlett: GHRSSST and SST-VC (title TBC)

***Societal awareness programmes***

Megan Davis: Can we evaluate how community awareness and involvement is improving the health of our local estuary?

Cass Hunter: The impact of a participatory tool for estimating future impacts on ecosystem services and livelihoods

**Session outcomes**

A number of different methods were presented by the participants for evaluating impacts of capacity building programmes, e.g.:

- Using a survey to create a new capacity development strategy
- Creating a network (to keep trainees engaged)
- Follow up with trainees to determine the impact of training in the medium & long-term through a questionnaire and/or case studies (e.g. newsletter articles)
- Metrics of success
- Net promotor score (index 1-10).

Different methods were presented for evaluating the impacts of societal awareness programmes, e.g.:

- Local community engagement
- Identify allocation/increase of funding
- Identify policy changes
- Social media impact
- Traditional media impact (sustained?)
- Evaluation of changes of behaviour (questionnaire)
- Story telling.

The group then discussed different metrics that could be used for evaluating impacts. For capacity building programmes these were:

- Career progression

- Outputs (e.g. publications)
- Scalability (e.g. number of students trained by the trainees)
- Involvement in international networks
- Number of projects funded

For societal awareness programmes they were:

- Number of people within the community engaged
- Amount of funding allocated
- How funds have been spent
- Number of articles published in media
- Number of interviews/media enquiries
- Number of tweets etc
- Changes to curricula/text books (ocean literacy)

Regarding the possible creation of a common framework for impact evaluation, it was agreed that it would be useful to work together as a community to exchange ideas and tools for evaluating impact. The framework would need to be adaptive (changing technology and transferable to different disciplines), and a more innovative approach than questionnaires would be desirable.

It was also agreed that the evaluation process and targets need to be set at the planning stage of the project/initiative, and this should be an iterative process for continued improvement.