

Supplementary Online Material

Reflections from interdisciplinary research on the social implications of implementing 30×30: five ways forward

Javier Fajardo, Dan Brockington, James Fitzsimons, Rose Pritchard,
Priya Shyamsundar and Chris Sandbrook

End-of-project questionnaire

To support the development of this short communication, the author group designed a reflective questionnaire for participants in the “Social Implications of 30×30” project, led by the Science for Nature and People Partnership (SNAPP). The questionnaire aimed to capture participants’ perspectives on the working group’s contributions to debates on the social considerations of Target 3 of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, including their reflections on the collaborative process.

The questionnaire included five open-ended questions. Specifically, respondents were asked:

1. What, in your view, were the most important insights, findings, or conceptual contributions from the project about the social dimensions of 30×30 or conservation more broadly?
2. Do you think the project influenced thinking, research, or policy on the social dimensions of 30×30 or conservation more broadly? Did its diverse, cross-disciplinary approach contribute to that influence? Please elaborate.
3. Did participating in the project influence your own thinking, views, or approach to 30×30 or conservation more broadly? If yes, what ideas, perspectives, or insights had the biggest impact on you, and in what way?
4. What did you find valuable or positive about working with a group that brought together diverse perspectives, backgrounds, or methods to reflect on the social implications of 30×30 or conservation more broadly? If something comes to mind, please describe what made it valuable or helpful to you.
5. Were there any challenges you experienced when working with a group that brought together diverse perspectives, backgrounds, or methods to reflect on the social implications of 30×30 or conservation more broadly? If so, what were they, and how did you or the group navigate them?

A separate section of the questionnaire focused on internal evaluation of the project and is not reported on here.

We distributed the questionnaire to all 29 active participants via an anonymous online form in July 2025. Completion was voluntary, and all questions were optional. Eleven working group members submitted responses. We collected explicit consent for the use and reproduction of submitted reflections, and all respondents provided their consent.

The responses informed both the content and framing of this short communication. We used them to complement the authors' reflections drawn from participation in the group's five workshops, collaborative research activities, and outputs. Where appropriate, we included selected anonymous quotes to illustrate key insights. While the responses provided valuable input to the writing process, we did not treat them as formal research data and did not undertake systematic analysis.

It is important to note that the views presented in this short communication primarily reflect those of the author group. While we aimed to incorporate as wide a range of perspectives as possible, drawing also on feedback and reflections shared throughout the course of the project, we recognise that the questionnaire may not capture the full diversity of perspectives within the working group, particularly those of participants who did not respond. For this reason, we do not claim the responses to be fully representative. The questionnaire served as a valuable tool to support collective reflection and enrich the development of this communication.