

Appendix

Appendix A: Budget

Appendix B: Performance Indicators

Appendix C: Peer Landscape

Appendix A: Budget

The following budget estimates were produced through conversations between Big Duck and CEPF, and are reflective of initial research on estimated costs.

Communications Channels/Activities	What we are doing currently	What would change under strategic plan	Estimated cost implications
Brand identity and messaging	Applying brand set 15 years ago	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop/revise vision and mission statements, key messages, boilerplate, elevator pitch Produce logo variations and consider a secondary color Provide brand strategy and messaging trainings for Secretariat and RITs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$25,000–\$30,000 \$8,000–\$10,000 \$5,000–\$7,500
Website	Managing cepf.net site, including French and Japanese translations of select content. Site last redesigned in 2008.	Redesign website to reflect an updated brand; to be audience-centric in content, structure, and ease of use; and to bring the site in line with current technology and expectations	<p>\$100,000–\$200,000; expect to stretch cost over two fiscal years.</p> <p>GEF (bridge grant) project plan designates some funding for the website for lessons sharing aspects.</p>
Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bimonthly e-news Event invitations Occasional dedicated e-blasts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly e-news Event invitations Increased use of of dedicated e-blasts Introduction of emails segmented to specific audiences 	Minor increase in email service subscription rates.
Media relations	Managing a basic media relations program at the Secretariat level that is primarily reactive, with the exception of promotion of special events or projects. Some assistance is provided by CI.	<p>With current resources, the Secretariat would seek to initiate targeted, proactive media outreach to develop a small number of key relationships.</p> <p>Upon hiring of PR firm, to explore media partnerships and focus on increasing placements in prominent, international media sources</p>	PR firm: \$5,000–\$15,000 per month; cost to include management of media partnerships

Print and digital publications (collateral and templates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report • Quarterly reports • Ecosystem profile summaries • Thematic brochures • Fact sheets • Donor Council documents 	Decrease to one general brochure and shorten profile summaries and some fact sheets. Move toward digital-only publications as possible. Produce flexible templates and infographics.	<p>Transitioning to digital annual report: additional \$8,000 initially, with significantly reduced cost annually after template established</p> <p>Annual savings from decreased print runs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In transition, \$1,000 • At completed transition to entirely digital annual report, savings of \$6,500 • Print savings per digital brochure: \$1,000 <p>Per infographic design: \$800–\$5,000, depending on complexity.</p>
---	---	--	---

Translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fact sheets in French, Japanese, Spanish • Ecosystem profile summaries in primary hotspot language(s) • Select video subtitling in French and Japanese • Select website content in French and Japanese 	<p>Additional translations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PowerPoint presentations in French and Japanese • Increased translations of website content in French, Japanese, and Spanish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100 per French and Spanish translations; • \$150 per Japanese • Website: \$6,000 a year
-------------	---	---	---

Video	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Producing one professional video a year • Funding/editing video interviews with grantees at assessments • Providing editing support for RIT-produced videos 	Produce one to two high-quality CEPF videos	<p>\$7,000–\$10,000 per video</p> <p>Savings in funding for assessment grantee interviews: \$1,600/assessment</p>
-------	---	---	---

Photography	Primarily use CI/CEPF photo library, including grantee photos; some Creative Commons photos. Purchase a few specific shots for annual report.	Organize photo shoots to build collection of high-quality shots of CEPF-funded grantees in action in the hotspots (use hotspot-based photographers when possible)	Additional \$3,000–\$8,000/year
Event planning	Use Secretariat staff and occasionally contract with outside event manager for major events (such as reception at 2010 CBD)	Hire freelance event planners for high-end events or expand internal resources to allow a staff member to focus more on this area of expertise	\$5,000–\$15,000/month for freelance
Staff	Three full-time staff	Hire communications associate to help with communications monitoring/eval plan, website management, content development, etc.	\$55,000–\$75,000+benefits
Total		One-time costs	\$146,000–255,500
		Annual costs	\$31,350–208,250

Appendix B: Performance Indicators

The following table provides data on top-level indicators that will help you track performance of communications as this plan is implemented. The goals presented here should be viewed as targets that you may want to adjust as the degree to which CEPF is able to implement this plan is clarified. Benchmarks noted below come from the M+R Benchmarks 2015 report.

Channel	Benchmarks	Current performance	Goal	Notes
Email	11% open rate 5.4% click through rate	26% OR 5.4% CTR	27% OR 6% CTR	Increases in email volume may exert negative pressure on response rates, while increasing overall engagement
Website	11% increase in website visitors per month, 2013–2014	55% increase, 2014–2015	15% increase, 2015–2016	Publication of hotspot pages is largely responsible for significant growth, 2014–2015; Increase in email volume will drive further increases
Blog/Our Stories	N/A	23% year-over-year increase in unique pageviews, July–December	20% increase in unique pageviews	Our Stories section of website was launched July 2014. While increased email volume will drive traffic increases, the rate of increase may slow as the majority of your audience may already be aware of the content.
Media	N/A	3 placements in large, international media sources	4 placements in large, international media sources	2015 placements were not primarily driven by CEPF
Events	N/A	N/A	250 event attendees	150 to attend anniversary event at World Conservation Congress
Printed materials and publications	N/A	Assisted in the recruitment of 2 donors (1 global and 1 regional donor)	Assist in the recruitment of 2 donors (1 global and 1 regional); Increase in	Audience satisfaction benchmarks will be established and analyzed through donor and grantee

			audience satisfaction	surveys
Video	N/A	Videos produced in 2015 have received 100–200 views	300 views in first year for new videos	Dedicated emails and use of video at events will help drive increase in views
Social Media	42% increase in Facebook fans, 2013 vs. 2014 37% increase in Twitter fans, 2013 vs. 2014	70% increase in Facebook fans, 2014 vs 2015 172% increase in Twitter fans, 2014 vs. 2015	40% increase in Facebook fans, 2015 vs. 2016 30% increase in Twitter fans, 2015 vs. 2016	2015's rapid growth on Facebook and Twitter reflects the transition from fledgling efforts to a more mature social media practice. A slower pace of growth is anticipated moving forward.

Appendix C: Peer Landscape

As part of the research conducted for this communications plan, a review of CEPF's peer landscape was conducted. The below organizations were selected based on similarities to CEPF's mission and structure. The organization's websites, publications, videos, and social media channels were reviewed in order to assess their branding and communications. Recommendations included in the plan were then considered within the context of this peer landscape. Organizations included were:

- BirdLife
- Conservation International
- Save Our Species
- The GEF Small Grants Program
- Le Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM).
- IUCN

Findings include:

- The somewhat scattered and detail-heavy presentation of the majority of CEPF's peers presents an opportunity for CEPF to stand out through a well-maintained brand and clear and concise communication.
- CEPF's peers in terms of donor audience include Save Our Species (SOS), IUCN, BirdLife, and the GEF Small Grants Program.
 - CEPF's closest peer in relation to donor audience is likely SOS, which is supported by three large entities that work together to power SOS's grant giving model.
 - IUCN appeals to donors based on membership benefits and inclusion in a large group of organizations and government entities. However, the size of the community likely provides less of a voice to donors than is found in CEPF.
 - BirdLife's primary focus on birds is an obvious and key differentiator in comparison to CEPF. However, their efforts to have a broader impact on conservation, while maintaining their primary focus, likely leads to some competition for donor investment.
 - The GEF Small Grants Program focuses on sustainable development and "thinking globally acting locally," which has definite commonalities with CEPF's mission. In comparison to this program, CEPF's value lies in part in its focus on biodiversity conservation and the hotspots, the expansion of the GEF's reach and the connections provided among the donor community.
- CEPF's peer landscape provides distinct competition in terms of niche within the conservation community. For instance, IUCN, SOS, and BirdLife combine the forces of influential organizations and government entities; IUCN, SOS, and the GEF Small Grants Programme have a broad global reach and work with civil society.
- Within its peer landscape, CEPF stands out in terms of the strength of its relationships with donors and civil society, a truly collaborative approach, and a focused attention on biodiversity in global hotspots.
- Other than Conservation International, which truly stands out in terms of branding and communication practices, IUCN seems to do the most to imbue specific positioning and personality in their communications.
- The lower frequency of social media posting found within this landscape indicates that CEPF may be able to reduce frequency of communication on these channels while maintaining positive engagement and growth.
- Frequency of email communication varies greatly among this peer landscape, with Conservation International and BirdLife producing a significantly higher frequency of content than the other organizations. However, it should be noted that while Big Duck subscribed to IUCN email, it is possible that members receive a higher frequency of emails.