


# WILDLIFE IMPACT



## Evaluation grading process

Wildlife Impact (WI) evaluates projects' conservation and welfare impacts using accepted or accredited standards and approaches. WI creates specific indicators for each applicant depending on their goals and activities and the potential ramifications of their work in its geographic, biodiversity and sociopolitical contexts. WI uses indicators that meet the [Biodiversity Indicator Partnership \(BIP\) guidance](#) (2010). Our evaluation processes, indicators and monitoring recommendations are based on the Conservation Measures Partnership's Open Standards for Conservation, Conservation Action Plans (The Nature Conservancy) Ferraro & Pattanayak (2006), Baylis et al. (2015), Conservation Excellence Model (Black et al., 2011), ENDCAP, European Union Animal Welfare Quality, International Companion Animal Management Coalition, Biodiversity Indicators Project, IUCN Action Plans for species or taxa (IUCN Species Survival Commission Specialist Groups), and Wildlife Impact. WI evaluations are conducted and reviewed by professionals with expertise in monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, conservation, wildlife ecology and welfare, and organizational management.

Prior to evaluation, projects or organizations must first demonstrate, via sharing organizational documentation or other evidence, that WI evaluation candidate criteria have been met. Follow up on these criteria may also be part of the on-site evaluation. For a passing grade (>50%), project evaluation provides evidence that all WI criteria have been met, and evidence of some positive outcomes for wildlife conservation and/or welfare.

### Grades

<b>A+</b>	100%	Significant positive impacts, no noted negative impacts; sustainable; regular evaluation and strategic planning covering; goals are being met
<b>A</b>	90 - 99%	Significant positive impacts; minor improvements possible but not needed No negative impacts or negative unintended consequences needing to be addressed High standards of work; Goals are being met Project or organization is able to sustain activities to continue meeting goals Regular strategic planning; Regular evaluation and adaptive management is undertaken or being implemented
<b>B</b>	80 - 89%	Significant positive impacts; few minor improvements needed No significant negative impacts
<b>C</b>	70 - 79%	Many positive impacts but room for improvement; Few to no negative impacts
<b>D</b>	60 - 69%	Some positive impacts but could be improved; Few negative impacts
<b>E</b>	51 - 59%	Few positive impacts but significant work needed to improve outcomes Some negative impacts from activities or unintended consequences
<b>F</b>	0 – 50%	No impact or outcomes on stated goals AND/OR Significant negative impacts or unintended consequences AND/OR Publicized goals are not relevant to actual activities AND/OR Activities have no discernible impact conservation or welfare AND/OR Evaluation criteria found not to have been met (e.g. illegal trades, human rights issues)