Appendix 1. Case study template

CONTEXT

Provide a narrative description of the context in which the MSP operates, addressing relevant factors variables. Write the narrative description to address the most salient factors identified among the list below:

Attributes of actors

- Power inequalities between resource use / resource-use change actors (technical, financial, resource control, etc.)
- Economic poverty and resource dependence (local communities)
- Gender inequalities in access to participation and/or resources
- Local/regional/national interest in conservation and preservation (by communities, government, private sector, etc.)
- Indigenous/local peoples distrust other groups and organizations (e.g. government, private sector, NGOs)
- History/experiences of development projects / initiatives

Governance attributes

- Existence of informal and/or traditional institutions related to resource management/use
- Government control of resource use / resource-use change decision-making
- Government recognition of right to and/or interest in the participation of local people
- Enforcement of resource use / resource-use change-related laws and regulations
- Government commitment to decentralization and devolution of decision-making to subnational governments
- Government commitment for multi-sector collaboration
- Tenure security and/or recognition of rights to land and resources for Indigenous Peoples / local communities
- Regional/national development agendas emphasize extraction of natural resources

ACTION ARENA

First part: Provide short answers to the following questions:

1. What is the primary justification for establishment of the MSP?
2. What is the primary goal or purpose established by the organizers? (Relate this to the one or more resources within a defined geography)
3. Actors
   a. Who are the actors participating? Group by state, NGO/CSO, private sector, and other.
   b. Who are key actors not participating, or excluded? Group by state, NGO/CSO, private sector, and other.
   c. What is the gender distribution of participants?
   d. Are there quotas in place for participation? If so, on what basis (e.g, by gender, locale, other)?

4. Who is the primary organizer? If more than one, group by state, NGO/CSO, private sector, funder, or other.
5. How was the MSP established (e.g., by law, donor project, voluntary initiative, etc.)? How is it funded?
6. What is the intended decision-making authority (e.g., binding mandate, advisory / recommendation, coordination, none specified)?
7. What is the duration planned for the MSP, and what year was it established? How often does it convene, and in what way?
8. What mechanisms are in place for conflict resolution, and how have these been used?
9. What connections exist to broader issue-based networks at national, regional or cross-regional scales that may help or hinder the effectiveness of these landscape-level platforms?

Part 2: provide a narrative description of the MSP, in about 2 pages, addressing these variables and others as appropriate to characterize the MSP and how it has functioned in practice. Where there are significant differences between design and practice, or significant points of change, these should be highlighted.

THEORY OF CHANGE

Provide a succinct description of the goals and approach of the MSP, which provides an understanding of how the MSP is expected to contribute to change in landscape governance. Identify and elaborate the primary *change mechanisms* that were intended by the organizers based on the goals and approach. Note which elements of this theory of change may be explicit (written or agreed) and which may be implicit. Provide a visual summary of the theory of change.

As theory of change is often not explicitly stated, it will often be necessary to probe for an understanding of how the organizers of the MSP believed that the platform would bring about change.

If there are differences in how other actors/ participants describe or perceive the theory of change, note these.

OUTCOMES

Guide questions for this section:
1. What are the most significant outcomes the MSP has contributed to so far?
2. What evidence is available to substantiate these outcomes? If there are differences in how different actors describe or perceive key outcomes, note these. If possible, provide direct quotes from actors involved in the MSP that illustrate key points.

Note, this study is not set up to collect and analyze new evidence on outcomes, beyond interviews and review of available data or reports. Therefore, we do not have an expectation of comparability in how outcomes are measured, but we do want to cite the most important and well-substantiated outcomes available for each case.

ADAPTIVE LEARNING

Guide questions for this section:
1. To what extent has there been organized reflection on the basis of early experience within the platform?
2. How does this occur?

3. What changes has this resulted in? If possible, provide direct quotes from actors involved in the MSP that illustrate key points. If possible, also characterize the learning processes observed in terms of three different levels (single, double, and triple loop learning).

LESSONS

What key lessons does this MSP experience yield? If possible, address both the *appropriateness* of the platform in its context (good design or "fit"), and the factors contributing to *effectiveness* (good implementation). A good lesson will build upon evidence already noted earlier in the case write-up. Identify each lesson with a declarative sentence, highlighted in bold, followed by supporting analysis or evidence. Where relevant, address:

- What factors have most contributed to success or failure of the MSP so far?
- What mechanisms have proven most effective to manage or mediate the power differences and the often-competing interests of diverse partners?
- In what ways do broader issue-based networks at national, regional or cross-regional scales help or hinder the effectiveness of these landscape-level platforms? And how do these landscape-level platforms in turn influence the broader networks?
- What are the implications for policy and investment? In particular, how can MSPs contribute to transformative change in resource governance at scale, under what conditions are they appropriate, and what sorts of support can make them more effective?

Distinguish which observations come directly from actors involved in the MSP, and which are interpretations of researchers. If possible, provide direct quotes from actors involved in the MSP that illustrate key points.