

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Rare

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *Building a Global Constituency for Biodiversity Conservation*

Implementation Partners for this Project: Conservation International and ten in-country lead agency partners for Pride campaigns

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): December 1, 2002 – June 30, 2007

Date of Report (month/year): August 1, 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

“In an original manner, Rare attends to conservation where it has ultimately the most lasting effect, through education tuned to the culture and needs of local people.”

- E. O. Wilson

Rare’s purpose is to conserve imperiled species and ecosystems around the world by inspiring people to care for and protect nature. Rare fulfills this purpose by addressing some of the most pressing needs of the global conservation movement: we train and mentor local conservation leaders, we create and share tools that enhance conservation efforts, we build alliances that leverage many times over Rare’s financial and technical investments, and we evaluate and share what we learn from each project and partnership in order to continuously improve the practice of conservation.

This is an increasingly important niche. During the past two decades, the global conservation community has made great progress in mapping out the world’s centers of biological diversity and building international support for their protection. But not nearly enough has been done to engage the 1.1 billion people who inhabit the world’s 34 biodiversity hotspots. Many of the top threats to global biodiversity – including over-fishing, illegal hunting, deforestation, watershed pollution, and lack of protective law enforcement – need to be tackled at the local level, especially to complement the “upstream” efforts of larger conservation organizations. Conservation is not only a biological challenge; with the world’s site priorities well articulated, a key question is how to address the social, political, and economic sources of environmental degradation.

For the last 30 years, at over 90 sites, in more than 40 nations, Rare has helped generate local support for conservation among millions of people. The ***Building Local Constituencies for Biodiversity Conservation*** project was a pivotal project in the history of Rare, responsible for taking the program to 13 new priority conservation sites in the Hotspots, successfully scaling the program, and setting the future direction of the entire organization.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: Active involvement by civil society and the private sector in conservation activities in 28 targeted sites.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

The **Building Local Constituencies for Biodiversity Conservation** project launched a new phase of the growth of Rare Pride, with funding for thirteen campaigns in the Hotspots matched with at least 15 other Pride campaigns in the Hotspots.

As the project ends, we have matched the CEPF investment with 42 campaigns in the Hotspots (out of 62 campaigns non CEPF-funded campaigns) during the project time period.

The reporting below represents a snapshot of purpose-level highlights from CEPF-funded campaigns:

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	<i>Please see annex 1 for complete reporting per campaign; below we list one highlight from a CEPF funded campaign for each purpose-level indicator.</i>
1. Increased levels of local community support for conservation priorities in response to each campaign (Ex. community involvement in enforcement against activities such as illegal logging and hunting, and environmentally unsound land-management practices; community involvement in lobbying for new protected areas).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of follow up work for the campaign in northern Namaqualand, a new 1,220 hectares conservation area was established on the Roodebergskloof farm of the Kamiesberg municipality protecting at least 9 endemic plant species of the Succulent Karoo. A participatory management plan was developed for another 3,000 hectares of the farm.
2. Long-term funding to maintain the new educational programs established within each priority site (based on fundraising strategy and goals established within the project).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the follow up phase of the campaign, the Jane Goodall Institute opened an office in SW China and continues to work with Baishuihe National Nature Reserve on community outreach projects with funds they raise each year, in partnership with other NGOs working in the area.
3. Alternative resource use practices adopted by local communities (Ex. conservation-friendly agricultural and fishing practices, establishment of community and/or private reserves).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Indonesia, two plots of 10 hectare and 25 hectare land surrounding the protected area were donated for conservation activities by local village councils and private residents. One of these plots is an "agroforestry" demonstration plot where residents will share their experience in sustainable agriculture.
4. Appropriate policies and/or legislation passed in support of conservation priorities highlighted in each campaign (Ex. ban on bushmeat hunting, concession decisions, etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Philippines, a new system for citizen reporting of illegal logging activities was created in Peña Blanca: hotlines, help desks and text messaging of reports of illegal activities.
5. Improved local capacity for community education as seen by trained educators from the project remaining and working in the priority area for a minimum of 2 years beyond the life of the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ten out of 13 Pride educators remain working with their lead agencies as the project ends in August, 2007 (a bit more than four years after the project began). For the three no longer with their host institution, two of them now work for other environmental conservation organizations (Indonesia), and the third for a development organization (Sierra Leone) where his outreach

	skills continue to be used.
<p>6. Partnerships with local, national, and international stakeholders (as formed within project) continue beyond the life of the project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Nicaragua, campaign materials are utilized as reference texts in public libraries in the buffer zone, as well by other local organizations for training of their employees in environmental conservation; local artisans are working with campaign's flagship species image in their work; local corporations donated money for campaign materials; several community groups that focus on environmental protection remain active; the campaign is supporting other international conservation projects in the region (Aurocaria).
<p>7. Increased local awareness of targeted conservation issue(s) based on the individual campaigns implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Palawan campaign, 76% of local residents, up from 39%, believed that they could live together with wildlife; attitude change towards supporting the protection of wildlife also increased, from 56% to 85%.
<p>8. New sources of funding secured for the implementation of new conservation initiatives triggered by the targeted campaigns (levels to be defined based on assessments carried out during implementation). <i>An example of this is the increased levels of funding for bird habitat conservation projects generated by the Grenada Dove Pride campaign.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FFI was the only international organization working in Aceh conservation prior to the tsunami. The campaign was their only project when the disaster hit. In post-tsunami relief and conservation efforts, their partnerships on the ground were critical. FFI-Aceh's conservation program in Aceh is now very well funded, including a multi-donor trust fund with specific earmarks for conservation work.

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

The majority of the campaigns funded under this project have had a lasting impact on how community outreach is done in the Hotspots. In terms of building awareness, all campaigns met their knowledge-focused communications objectives (and some very impressively, especially in South Africa). Community support for conservation was also catalyzed at nearly every site—from engaging women's groups in Nicaragua to forming new environmental NGO coordinating groups in Sierra Leone. Ten of the educators selected for Pride still work for their agencies, in some cases after four years, while all of the thirteen continue to work in conservation outreach to some degree even if they have left their original employer. Each campaign fostered local partnerships that continue and in some cases thrive, as seen by the recent work of the Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative. One campaign run by the Jane Goodall Institute in the Baishuihe National Nature Reserve in Sichuan province of Southwest China had a hard time during the implementation of the campaign. However, in the follow up years they have made great progress and made lasting partnerships that continue implementing conservation projects on the ground.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

At the time the project was designed it would have been impossible to predict how the project would impact Rare. This project was Rare's first investment in "scaling" its Pride program, and supported the first replication of the Pride methodology at a training center in Mexico for Spanish-language instruction. Rather than seeking multiple donors for a single campaign, this project afforded Rare the opportunity to grow the program. This seed investment gave Rare the opportunity to both catalyze greater community participation in biodiversity conservation and build greater capacity for conservation outreach specialists in the Hotspots. Moreover, the investment

helped Rare understand the growth model for Pride and establish key new partnerships for delivering our methodology more broadly in the field.

Four years after this project was approved and as its implementation was winding down, the Board of Directors of Rare approved a new business plan that focuses on orientating the entire organization around Pride. All of Rare's programs are being retooled to be fully integrated with Pride, and we are regionalizing the organization to support our growth. More than half of the needed operational funding for this new strategy was raised in the first year.

As the first investor in Pride's growth model, the impact the *Building a Global Constituency for Biodiversity Conservation* project had on Rare cannot be overstated; indeed, that investment is now setting the future direction for the organization.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: University training program conducted for 28 educators from within the Hotspots. (The 12-week Diploma in Conservation Education Course is implemented in two phases: 10 weeks pre-campaign & 2 weeks post-campaign.)	Our university training program has trained 55 educators in the Hotspots as of August 1, 2007 (42 as match to the 13 CEPF funded educators. Twelve of the 13 of the CEPF-funded educators completed the program; due to the trauma of the 2005 tsunami in Aceh, Tisna Nando delayed her campaign but will return to the university to complete her diploma at a later date.
1.1 13 individuals across up to 13 priority sites selected to begin Diploma Course in Year One of the project (all CEPF funded). An additional 15 individuals to be selected for non-CEPF funded slots, who will begin the course in Years One and Two.	We selected 13 individuals for support under the CEPF program. Another 62 individuals were selected for training by the end of this project. 42 of them are in Hotspots.
1.2 Completion of 10 weeks of initial course of study at university by all local educators and satisfactory achievement on assignments from five assessed modules and supplementary workshops.	Twelve of 13 CEPF-funded campaign managers completed all coursework.
1.3 Educators' presentation and documentation of final campaign results. (Occurs after the campaign, during in the final two weeks at university).	Twelve of 13 CEPF-funded campaign presented final results. The thirteenth will return at a later date.
1.4 Completion of approved post-campaign educational plan, including activities, audiences, staff, monitoring and fundraising. (during final two weeks at university).	Nine out of 13 CEPF-funded campaign managers completed and implemented follow up plans.
Output 2: Targeted awareness campaigns implemented by local educators within the priority sites.	All CEPF-funded campaigns were implemented. As the project closes, one campaign is completing the follow up phase (Nicaragua) and another is completing the campaign and will return to the university at a later date (Aceh).
2.1 Site assessment phase completed with local stakeholder workshops and data collection activities	Complete.

(first 10 weeks in field).	
<p>2.2 Campaign designs completed with at least the following defined: target species, target population, objectives, educational messages, activities, and monitoring plans, by the end of each educator's first 10 weeks in the field.</p>	Complete.
<p>2.3 Implementation of work plan for 11-1/2 month campaign, which includes: - Outreach to ~90% of school age youth in target area using: puppet shows, school song with conservation theme, newsletter, art/essay competition, new children's club, school presentations, etc. - Outreach to all media operating within the target area through press releases, newspaper articles, radio/TV interviews, videos, etc. - Outreach to all government and law enforcement officials in target area through fact sheets, legislative booklets, meetings, and community events. - Outreach to resource user groups (e.g. fishermen, farmers, ranchers, etc.) through workshops, fact sheets, meetings, etc., totaling ~80% of individuals within the target area. - Outreach to ~80%-90% of general adult population in the target area through popular song on the radio, music video for local TV, community festivals, working with local clergy to integrate conservation messages into sermons, distributing posters, bumper stickers, and fact sheets, etc.</p>	Complete.
<p>2.4 Established community conservation education committees in each site that are composed of local business owners, teachers, clergy, leaders of cooperatives, government officials, and other community leaders (within first quarter of campaign).</p>	Complete.
<p>Output 3: Follow-up educational plans implemented in targeted sites. <i>(Note: All 28 sites in this portfolio will be encouraged to achieve this output. However, the 13 sites funded by CEPF will be part of a structured, multi-year program leading to this output; while the additional 15 sites will be part of Rare's standard 14-1/2 month training and technical assistance program that prepares them to achieve this output on their own, but does not provide technical assistance during this output.)</i></p>	<p>Nine of 13 CEPF funded campaigns completed follow up plans.</p> <p>As part of their follow-up plan to leverage the Succulent Karoo Pride Campaign nationally, CI-South Africa produced a video that will highlight the value of the Succulent Karoo in the context of climate change. The video is being distributed through national partnerships, including to WWF EcoSchools teachers throughout the country and via a TV series produced by National History Unit Africa.</p>
<p>3.1 Successful implementation of 14-month follow-up site educational plans (based on approved plan from university course), integrating and building upon first-year campaign results.</p>	Nine of 13 CEPF funded campaigns completed follow up plans.
<p>3.2 Educators' progress reports submitted to InterCom & Rare quarterly. Final project report submitted at end of 14-months.</p>	Twelve out of 13 CEPF funded campaigns completed their final reports, with the thirteenth campaign final report due later in 2007.
<p>3.3 Development of long-term strategy for an ongoing site educational program with plans for staff,</p>	Nine of 13 CEPF funded campaigns completed follow up strategies.

activities, monitoring, and funds. (Completed by end of the 14-month follow-up phase.)	
Output 4: A “Learning Portfolio” for analyzing results and sharing lessons learned established.	
4.1 Website launched by April 2003 to facilitate general information sharing among all local educators and project partners.	Campaign managers shared experiences via list-servs in English and in Spanish.
4.2 Monitoring of educators, their campaigns and follow-up education programs provided throughout project implementation: - Campaign: 2 site visits, review of monthly educators’ reports, weekly phone/email contact. Follow-up Phase: review of quarterly educators’ reports and final site project reports, 2 opportunities for project staff to meet with educator (either through a site visit or off-site meeting or training), and monthly phone/email contact.	All campaign monitoring trips were conducted, by either Rare or CI staff (2x for each campaign). Long distance support for campaigns was provided by Rare and CI staff.
4.3 Project team submits programmatic progress reports to CEPF at the end of each year of the project (except final year). Reports will cover: - Assessment of completed university courses - Assessment of campaigns conducted - Progress toward stated conservation objectives Initial lessons learned	Progress reports were completed.
4.4 Final evaluation conducted on the project by end of Year 4 by RARE’s Learning Director and CI Intercom, developed in consultation with external experts from academia.	The team did not conduct a formal external evaluation of the project. However, Rare did contract two external reviews (a 360 partner survey and a campaign retrospective in 2006) both of which included data from CEPF-funded campaigns.
4.5 Final programmatic report submitted at the end of the project in accordance with CEPF standard report format.	Complete.
4.6 Full portfolio of evaluation results compiled, analyzed and published as the Lessons Learned booklet, by end of Year 4.	We have included with our final report a compilation of lessons learned by Rare in how it implements Pride, as well as an update on our campaign learning portfolio. Rather than publishing this material, we opted to print our Pride activities’ manual in order to share the lessons learned from campaign implementation with other practitioners. This is the first time the Rare Pride manual will be printed and distributed publicly, thanks to this project.
4.7 Approximately 200 copies of Lessons Learned booklet produced and distributed to CEPF, other donors, participating sites and key local stakeholders (government, lead agencies, campaign oversight committee members), CI, RARE, universities, media, and external evaluators by end of year 4.	See above.
Output 5: Necessary funds raised and partnerships established in order to implement the additional 15 non-CEPF funded campaigns. Secure the foundation for RARE’s long-term implementation of	

<p>awareness-raising campaigns in the Hotspots through the establishment of two additional conservation education training centers (one that is currently in the development phase and one that will be identified and developed). The approximate total budget needed for this output is \$330,000. This proposal requests \$165,000 toward this amount.</p>	
<p>5.1 Fundraising complete for the additional 15 (non-CEPF funded) Hotspot campaigns for this project, generating \$1.06 million to \$1.51 million from foundations, corporations, governments, and other donors by the end of year 2.</p> <p><i>Explanation of fundraising projection:</i> The \$1.06 million minimum estimate is based on a minimum of \$71,000 needed to implement a basic campaign. This figure does not include the \$35,000 per-site support grants or the \$165,000 program development budget that are included in the proposed CEPF budget. However, the 15 sites will provide the resources to cover the local educator salary, vehicle/fuel/maintenance costs and any additional campaign resources needed. These contributions will total \$10,000 to \$30,000 per site depending on local economic conditions.</p>	<p>Beyond the 13 CEPF-funded campaigns, we have launched 62 more, an investment of over 6 million USD. 42 of those are in Hotspots, nearly triple the goal of the project.</p> <p>This was made possible by new partnerships formed with The Nature Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Society, the Environmental Services Program in Indonesia, and the National Audubon Society.</p> <p>We also secured major pledges of support from the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment, and from an anonymous donor.</p> <p>These partnerships would not have been possible without the CEPF investment in Rare Pride.</p>
<p>5.2 Development of the new Spanish-language training center at the University of Guadalajara complete by April 2003. This involves finalizing the curriculum (which will be an adaptation of the curriculum currently in use at the University of Kent course), receiving official validation for the course from the university, and completing all the necessary program set-up activities (setting up program office, securing student housing and facilities needed, hiring and preparing university lecturers, training course manager, etc.)</p>	<p>We raised funds for 62 additional campaigns, with 42 of those campaigns taking place in Hotspots.</p> <p>We completed the opening of Rare's second university training center in Mexico, and have now run a total of 5 cohorts through that program (32 campaigns).</p> <p>Our third training center in Indonesia was also set up and we are now training our second cohort (12 campaigns).</p> <p>Our fourth training center in China is in set up phase, with a university partner selected. A fifth French language program is now in a selection process to identify a university partner.</p>
<p>5.3 Development of partnerships with additional local and international institutions operating in the Hotspots to support the implementation of awareness-raising campaigns in areas where CI is not currently operating or does not have extensive field-based networks.</p> <p>By the end of year two, 15 partnerships will be established with institutions that will serve as the local lead agencies for the campaigns. By the end of year three, there will be at least 5 partner organizations serving on the campaign committees for each of the 15 campaigns, for a total of an additional 75 partnerships created.</p>	<p>Beyond the 13 CEPF-funded campaigns, we have launched 62 more, an investment of over 6 million USD.</p> <p>This was made possible by new partnerships formed with The Nature Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Society, the Environmental Services Program in Indonesia, and the National Audubon Society/Birdlife International.</p> <p>We also secured major pledges of support from the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment and from an anonymous donor.</p> <p>These partnerships would not have been possible without the CEPF investment in Rare Pride.</p>
<p>5.4</p>	

<p>Exploratory phase for next university partnership to provide training in another major language within the Hotspots (i.e. Bahasa, Portuguese, or French) complete by the end of year two. Establish this additional training center by the end of year three.</p>	<p>We completed the opening of Rare's second university training center in Mexico, and have now run a total of 5 cohorts through that program (32 campaigns to date).</p> <p>Our third training center in Indonesia was also set up and we are now training our second cohort (12 campaigns to date).</p> <p>Our fourth training center in China is in set up phase, with a university partner selected. A fifth French language program is now in a selection process to identify a university partner.</p>
--	--

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

The project met and in several cases surpassed its targeted outputs. For a project of this size and complexity, we think having met all of our outputs is quite laudable.

There are many ways to define “success” in a project. This project met or surpassed its targeted outputs; it also met most of its purpose-level indicators. Another way of looking at success is in the words of the people most affected by the project—the campaign managers that we trained in the Pride methodology.

One of those campaign managers is Morne Farmer, from northern Namaqualand, South Africa. Morne had very little training before being hired as an outreach officer for the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Program. Morne had several difficulties during his campaign, but he and his organization worked very hard to overcome their challenges and implemented a good campaign that achieved significant results in raising knowledge and changing attitudes. After the campaign’s completion, Farmer continued his conservation work in Namaqualand in partnership with Conservation International and the Namaqualand Wilderness Initiative.

In August 2006, Farmer began working with 14 communal farmers and other land users in Roodebergskloof to implement a conservation stewardship model. Recently, an agreement was signed to designate Roodebergskloof as an exclusive conservation zone. This conservation initiative will protect the highlands’ water resources that not only directly benefit 14 communal farmers, but also the roughly 11,000 people who rely on the watershed. Morne credits his Pride campaign as one of the reasons these local communities were supportive of the initiative.

“After almost 4 years since I’ve received the conservation education course at the University of Kent and actually implemented the Pride Campaign, I’ve realized that I couldn’t ask for a greater way of getting to know and do conservation,” Farmer says. “It’s a wonderful learning curve, as you work with different types of people, from scientists to a shepherd in the veldt, from a teacher to a small scale miner, from a municipal manager to primary school child. I’m also glad to announce that the Pride Campaign played a definite role in raising people’s awareness level, increasing knowledge and changing behavior of their area’s natural resources.”

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

Overall, the project’s outputs were realized and in some cases greatly surpassed. However, we were not able to benefit from greater incorporation of mass media tools and the Media Fund, as was in the original project design with CI.

Amendment by CI April 28, 2008:

Although the Media Fund was only able to finance one mass media tool rather than the three originally planned, we were able to demonstrate how this additional element can complement and leverage the local Rare Pride Campaign package at a National level through the production and distribution of a video in the Succulent Karoo, South Africa. Details on this project are included in Appendix 6

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

Not applicable.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

This project provided many lessons for Rare in how it implements the Pride program. A detailed accounting of these lessons is presented in annex 2.

The project contained a specific component regarding the Pride Learning Portfolio. A detailed update on the Learning Portfolio is included in Annex 3. The Learning Portfolio gathers data from each campaign so that we can develop a predictive model for future campaign success. One of the Learning Portfolio's research questions is: *Are there any statistically-significant differences between non-CEPF campaigns and the 13 CEPF university-based Pride campaigns?* While noting that our data set is not complete and that the total sample size is still very low, this meta-analysis of campaigns showed a few differences between CEPF-supported campaigns and non-CEPF campaigns, including:

- The average number of PCMs in a cohort for non-CEPF campaigns was 5.3 whereas the CEPF campaigns averaged 6.7 PCMs.
- The non-CEPF campaigns used more flagship species that were not endemic (73%), whereas the CEPF campaigns used more flagship species that were either endemic to the country (33%) or to the region (50%).
- The threat level to the target area was assessed to be high in 92% of the CEPF campaigns, whereas of the non-CEPF campaigns it was assessed to be moderate in 67% and high in only 22% of campaigns.
- The number of indirect threats identified in the CEPF campaigns was higher (3.9 threats) than in the non-CEPF campaigns (2.1 threats).
- The total number of threats that were addressed in the SMART objectives by the CEPF campaigns was higher (4.4 threats) than in the non-CEPF campaigns (2.9 threats).
- There were no statistically-significant differences between the non-CEPF and the CEPF campaigns in terms of their campaign managers.

- The non-CEPF campaigns worked with lead agencies that were smaller (averaged 9.2 staff and volunteers in the unit in which the PCM worked) than the lead agency partners of the CEPF campaigns (21.7 volunteers and staff).
- The lead agencies of the non-CEPF campaigns were more likely to pay 100% of the PCM salary (88%) than were the lead agencies of the CEPF university campaigns.
- Follow-up funding was available to 89% of the CEPF campaigns, vs. only 37% of the non-CEPF campaigns.
- Only two activities were done at different rates by the non-CEPF campaigns compared to the CEPF campaigns and included (a) school songs used during the school visit (100% vs. 85%), and (2) songs were written for the radio (88% vs. 73%).
- The average amount of change in attitude questions was much greater among CEPF campaigns (13.1 percentage points) than in non-CEPF campaigns (2.7 percentage points).

As your data set grows, we will be able to make more definitive conclusions from the meta-analysis.

Several of the lessons from this project are applicable to future CEPF supported projects. From a project implementation standpoint, estimating work load requirements and realistically weighing them against proposed indicators is an important lesson learned.

Many outreach and social marketing projects either skip or do not provide adequate funding for good formative research into the target audience's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. The project planning process that these campaigns went through was perhaps one of the most important aspects of the capacity building provided.

We feel like we were well supported from CEPF global grant managers during the implementation of the project. However, as a global project within an organization of regional portfolios, more focus on complementarities with regional portfolio managers even at the application phase would have made the project stronger. Making stronger links to funding for additional projects with the campaign lead agency partners to support the provision of specific alternatives also would have improved our results.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

Overall, we feel the project was well designed. In particular, the project components regarding building Pride and our learning program were very important in Pride's growth.

Knowing what we know now, we would change a few items if we were starting all over again. For example:

1) While the support funds provided to local partners were a great benefit to several campaigns, we feel asking partners to contribute funds for salary and administration helps build greater buy-in and commitment to the campaign. We have not provided salary funds to any campaign since our CEPF campaigns and now have a policy requiring partners to provide funds for local salary, transportation, and administration.

2) The project design called for the application process to be done via a request for proposals. At the time, we had two other projects which also used this mechanism to recruit Pride applications.

Since then, we have tried to avoid convening selection committees due to a tendency for criteria other than what makes the best campaign to be used in the selection process.

3) Related to campaign application and selection is building buy-in from partners. In hindsight, we would have liked to see the campaign application process used to build greater buy-in from CEPF regional grant makers for better integration into regional conservation strategies.

4) Supporting follow up is a component of Pride that we continue to improve. The follow up process that we created during the project, as well as the additional funding for follow up activities was very helpful for most campaigns. The project design did not allow for continued staff support, however, which would have benefited many of the campaigns.

5) Our purpose-level indicators reflect the key components of a successful Pride campaign. Two of them, specifically in providing alternatives to the behavior one seeks to change and engaging policy-level decision makers, are areas where the project design could have placed more emphasis. We have made changes to our program that improves our identification of targeted behaviors in the application process, but we recognize the need to strengthen the provision of alternatives/removing barriers in all of our campaigns.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

The most important aspect of the project’s execution that is a lesson for Rare is staffing. The growth that this project brought to Pride was understaffed and caused a great deal of work load stress on both partners (Rare and CI) and the partnership. We have learned from that lesson and now have nearly tripled the number of people supporting campaigns.

A second important lesson regarding execution that we learned is the true cost of a Pride campaign. In addition to problems derived from a change in exchange rates, the project under-budgeted direct and indirect costs by nearly 30% (costs which were ultimately borne by Rare).

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Rare unrestricted funds	A	\$156,643	To cover project direct costs not covered by CEPF
Grantham Fdn for the Protection of the Environment	C	\$5 million	Pledge to Rare for five years of campaign matching funds
The Wilson Challenge	C	\$1.3 million	One year of campaign matching funds; total pledge is at least \$4 million in matching funds over four years
Individual Donors	C	\$1.1 million	TNC partnership leveraged by CEPF investment
Individual Donor	C	\$250,000	National Audubon Society

			partnership leveraged by CEPF investment
CONANP (Mexican national park service)	C	\$284,000	Partnership and campaign support
InterAmerican Foundation	A	\$400,000	Co-funding for Guadalajara program
Prospect Hill Foundation	A	\$15,000	Other set up costs for Guadalajara program
Galapagos Conservation Fund	C	\$80,000	Hotspot campaign support
David and Lucille Packard Foundation	C	\$300,000	Hotspot campaign support
NOAA	C	\$45,000	Hotspot campaign support
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	C	\$175,000	Hotspot campaign support
US Fish and Wildlife Service	C	\$105,00	Hotspot campaign support + fifth university training center research
Omidyar Foundation	C	\$180,000	Revised Pride internet network
New Profit	C	\$1,000,000	Organization growth support
Development Alternatives/USAID	C	\$600,000	Third university training center + Indonesia campaigns
Individual donors	C	\$17,000,000	Pledges secured in the first year for Rare's new business plan; out of \$30 million needed.
Overhills Foundation	C	\$44,000	Fourth university training center in China

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

As noted above, Rare's Pride program will drive Rare's growth in our new business plan from 2006 – 2011. As noted in the table (above), we have made solid progress in fundraising for the business plan's priorities in its first year.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As this is a large project, we have included with this report several annexes, including:

- Annex 1: Campaign breakdown of purpose-level indicators
- Annex 2: Rare's lessons learned in Pride program implementation from the project
- Annex 3: An update from the Pride learning portfolio, supported by the project
- Annex 4: Final campaign facts sheets for each of the 13 CEPF supported campaigns
- Annex 5: CDs of campaign photos, materials, and campaign music
- Annex 6: Initial results of the Media Fund follow-up project in South Africa

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name:	Megan Hill
Organization name:	Rare
Mailing address:	1840 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA. 22201
Tel:	703-522-5070
Fax:	703-522-5027
E-mail:	mhill@rareconservation.org