

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Organization Legal Name:	Fauna & Flora International
Project Title:	Building Capacity in Project Design and Proposal Writing in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot
Grant Number:	63400
CEPF Region:	Eastern Afromontane
Strategic Direction:	3 Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.
Grant Amount:	\$157,430.00
Project Dates:	January 01, 2014 - June 30, 2017
Date of Report:	September 24, 2017

Implementation Partners

List each partner and explain how they were involved in the project

Fauna & Flora International was the primary implementing organisation, delivering training, M&E and providing all logistics. Staff were also involved in workshop logistics and translation of materials from English to French and English to Portuguese. WCS is a partner of the Conservation Leadership Programme (CLP) and supported with administration, venue research and bringing trainees into the CLP alumni network. CI was a CLP partner and supported with some project implementation in 2014.

Ethiopian Wildlife & Natural History Society supported with planning and advertising the 2014 workshop in Ethiopia. Zewditu Tessema gave a presentation about CEPF grants.

Tropical Biology Association was consulted during design of the project, logistics and preparation for the 2016 workshop in Rwanda.

IUCN supported with the call for applications within the region, especially in Mozambique, and presented about CEPF's work.

The International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) helped in the 2016 workshop, presenting on sustainable financing and organising a field trip.

Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International hosted the training course in Rwanda.

WWF's Education for Nature Program was involved in the 2015 training course in Mozambique.

CEPF's RIT assisted with project implementation and trouble-shooting.

Conservation Impacts

Summarize the overall impact of your project, describing how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

Over three years, we directly trained 44 people - 15 in Ethiopia (2014), 13 in Mozambique (2015) and 16 in Rwanda (2016). A number of different nationalities participated ensuring that resources were spread across the hotspot, taking into account guidance and advice from the RIT regarding where there were greatest needs which was combined with CLP assessments of focal countries and research indicating where there was already heavy investment and reliable training on project planning and fundraising e.g. Uganda and Kenya. The nationalities trained were: Ethiopia (15), Mozambique (3), Malawi (2), Zambia (2), Zimbabwe (6), Rwanda (8), Burundi (2), DR Congo (3) and Tanzania (3). The most significant result of this project is the total amount of funding that has been raised by trainees of the workshops. Following two years of reporting since the end of the first workshop, 103 applications were submitted worth \$3,668,632 of which 30 grants were funded worth \$1,082,321.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
The conservation status of species, sites and corridors within the CEPF Eastern Afromontane Hotspot (EAH) are improved and well-managed by highly skilled local conservation practitioners working on self-sustaining projects	Within this three year project, given the fact that projects funded as a result of the training commenced only in 2015, it is too short a timescale to measure an increased number of species or sites with management plans. However, of the projects funded, work being undertaken by trainees will continue to have an impact, predominantly on sites, but also with regard to certain species. These include tree planting within the Greater Mahale Ecosystem, Tanzania; conservation of the Malagarasi River, Tanzania; surveying and developing a conservation action strategy for the Chimanimani cycad, Zimbabwe; black-crowned crane conservation, Ethiopia; involving illiterate women and youth in supporting management of biodiversity around Lake Tanganyika, DR Congo; integrating biodiversity conservation and community development in Nyungwe National Park, Rwanda; conserving Hamlyn's monkey and its bamboo habitat in Nyungwe National Park; creating "Friends of Elephants" in local communities within Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania; conservation assessment and action planning for an endemic and endangered orchid, Zimbabwe.
Conservation practitioners trained through the CEPF project are in positions of influence at local, national and international scales.	Any promotions or change of position that have been reported by trainees, of which there have only been three (mentioned whilst reporting on other outcomes of the training) cannot firmly be stated as resulting from the training. Training aside, such professional development arises through a combination of factors (including availability of employment opportunities)

	and would also be attributed to gaining experience in project implementation and management as well as project design and fundraising. For those trainees who have accepted the invitation to register to the CLP alumni network, there will be an opportunity to track future career development. In the most request for information from workshop participants, 26 of the trainees confirmed that they are still involved in the sector and that they are contributing to local conservation activities. However, none of those reported that they are in senior positions (e.g.Heading up CSOs, Director of local/ national NGO, working in local or national government) or participating in decision-making at national and international fora.
Local stakeholders within priority KBAs and corridors in the EAH are engaged in and contributing to conservation efforts.	
Conservation practitioners living and working in the CEPF EAH work within a well-funded conservation sector.	Reporting on the success of funding applications made by trainees indicates a short-term increasing trend in the proportion of successful proposals developed by the workshop participants over three years: Jul-Dec 2014 = 0%; Jan-Jun 2015=14%; July-Dec 2015 = 0%; Jan-Jun 2016 = 36%; July-Dec 2016 = 24%; Jan-Jun 2017 = 36%. Although we cannot continue to track this trend, it is likely that as trainees progress with their careers and fundraising activities then they will be making applications for larger grants. It would be too presumptuous to suggest that the conservation sector becomes better funded during the coming years and without on-going monitoring this will be difficult to track. Two suggestions for measuring this long-term impact are: 1) At a global scale, CEPF tracks its own grant amounts across the Hotspots; 2) future monitoring of the impact of CEPF's investment should include all trainees who participated in the project planning and fundraising workshop, even if they are not direct CEPF grantees.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Increased ability among a total of 45 early and mid-career conservation practitioners across the CEPF EAH to design, fund and implement effective conservation projects.	Over the three years of the project, 44 individuals were trained during the workshop. The training was reported to be effective - both in terms of project delivery and post-survey questionnaires submitted by the trainees. Beyond those directly trained, the workshops have had a broad impact through the request that participants pass on the skills and knowledge attained from the workshops to peers and colleagues, an activity that was

	<p>supported by the provision of information and advice on training of trainers delivered as part of the workshops. During the three years of project implementation, an additional 711 individuals have been trained. These include students (undergraduate and Masters), work colleagues and supervisors, and applicants to the National Geographical Society grants programme.</p>
<p>Increased donor interest and investment in conservation projects in the CEPF EAH over the life of the project.</p>	<p>Over three year, trainees made a total of 103 application to 51 donors, of which just under 30.6% were successful (n=30). Donors ranged from members of the public (through a crowd-funding campaign), small family trusts, large international foundations and multi-lateral donors. A full list of donors is available as a separate attachment. Donor interest was also demonstrated through face-to-face meetings with donors at the training course. These donors included CEPF, CLP, WWF-Education for Nature, IUCN and National Geographic Society.</p>
<p>Funding secured for at least five project proposals developed by training participants from the Conservation Leadership Programme over the life of the project, leveraging a minimum of \$75,000 in additional funding for conservation work in the EAH.</p>	<p>As mentioned elsewhere in this report, and reported back to CEPF during project implementation, due to a change in strategy from CLP's major donor (BP plc), there was a reduction in the number of countries eligible for CLP support – focusing on 22 countries of which Mozambique became the only country with the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot. Only one trainee from the Mozambique workshop submitted a proposal to CLP. Despite the change in CLP priorities, the programme will remain connected with trainees - through the CLP alumni network - and should the trainees still be eligible to apply to CLP at a later date, then we would welcome their funding applications. As reported under the other objectives, trainees were successful in leveraging funding from other donors, which is being invested within the hotspot.</p>
<p>Regional network established to maintain and support 45+ conservation practitioners working across the CEPF EAH in project planning, management and fundraising using social media tools.</p>	<p>During the three workshops, 100% or trainees initiated their own networks using a variety of tools. The grantees in Ethiopia selected a Facebook group with one coordinator selected from the group. However, responses from this group suggest that the network is not very active. Seven of the Ethiopian trainees recently responded with very mixed feelings about the group and reported regularity of contact ranging from monthly to never. Trainees in Mozambique also opted for a Facebook group but they also regularly email each other which is more difficult to track externally. Of the Mozambique trainees, seven have mixed feelings about the value of the network in its current format, making</p>

	contact with individuals on specific subjects rather than making more general posts or sharing fundraising opportunities. There was a general feelings in both cases that incentives (e.g. joint funding application or networking event) would stimulate greater contact and support. By far the most active group are the 2016 trainees from Rwanda, DRC, Burundi and Tanzania with a whatsapp group that is constantly buzzing with updates, opportunities, notifications and greetings.
--	---


Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives

Despite motivation, insistence and reassurance during and after the training there have been some competing priorities that have affected trainees ability and availability to conduct fundraising post-workshop. This has happened even though the application process tried to identify those most likely to require the skills and be able to put them into practice soon after the workshop. Reasons for not submitting proposals ranged from a) undertaking priority conservation work; b) completing academic studies and/or looking to pursue further academic work; c) unable to request/identify referees. Similarly, the motivation for maintaining a network has varied depending on the training cohort and the trainees' other engagements. On the one hand, the networks were established and the days together at each workshop enable professional and personal relationships to be formed at each training course and to be coordinated by a volunteer (ie a trainee) from each cohort. Yet, on the other hand, there was varying degrees of success in maintaining the networks for each training course and minimal interest in joining the group into one big network. Given the sheer size of the region and differences in types of projects, we now appreciate that coordination of this diverse and dispersed group requires more intensive coordination, incentivisation and opportunities to meet face-to-face. One of the main challenges of the Mozambique workshop was participants' travel over the border (mainly Malawi) to reach the training. The safety of two participants was compromised at the Malawi-Mozambique border. In preparation for the Rwanda workshop the project personnel closely reviewed travel plans, sought recommendations on border crossings, advised trainees to fly over international borders and avoid travel at night. Not only was travel closely monitored, but a Whatsapp group was created prior to arrival in Kigali to connect people and update planners (and trainers) of any potential issues in transit.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Three trainees at the Rwanda workshop have done short-term consultancies with National Geographic Society (NGS) to run training courses on project planning and fundraising, demonstrating the value of the training and training of trainers module. Workshops have been run in Bukavu and Goma (DRC), Bujumbura (Burundi) and Kigali with more to happen in the future. Trainees who have been funded by NGS will develop additional communications capacity through a "Sciencetelling bootcamp".

Although we focused on fundraising for conservation projects, some trainees were able to help raise funds for non-conservation projects e.g. \$16,000 raised for a programme aimed at developing alternative incomes for those those at risk of HIV/AIDS in Zimbabwe. Trainees have also applied for



individual accolades e.g. Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI). Although not directly funding conservation work, the YALI awards will enable a trainee to develop their entrepreneurial skills during a month-long fellowship in Nairobi.

In our initial proposal, we had not planned to support the design and printing of an Arabic language version of Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects, so that is a highly unexpected yet rewarding output, which will have a long-term impact in Arab-speaking countries!

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Describe the results from each product/deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Training – to build capacity in project planning and proposal writing skills through the delivery of high-quality, experiential training.	1.1	Training curriculum and materials specific to the EAH produced that build capacity around project planning and proposal writing.	The final workshop in this project required training materials to be translated into French. A consultant was contracted to translate all training materials including Word documentation and powerpoint presentations (see attachments). We sourced interpreters to work during the workshop who were recommended by CEPF RIT but were also subject to interview and reference checks before being accepted for work. For both roles (document translator and interpreter) it was deemed important that the consultants had experience of working in the conservation sector. Both roles involved pre-course reading and cross-referencing of the English and French language versions of Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects.
1	Training – to build capacity in project planning and proposal writing skills through the delivery of high-quality, experiential training.	1.2	In 2014, 15 individuals working in the EAH in Ethiopia, Kenya, South Sudan and Uganda trained to develop effective conservation projects and to secure funding to carry out those projects.	In 2014, 15 individuals who were all Ethiopian nationals were trained. As agreed with CEPF, we focused on nationals from Ethiopia and South Sudan, the latter of which was very difficult to source due to security issues at the time of the call for applications. Having carefully selected one South Sudanese trainee, just two days before the workshop start date, we had several conversations with the trainee who stated reasons why he was unable to attend. This workshop was the least balanced in terms of gender with just two female trainees attending and 13 male trainees.
1	Training – to build capacity in project planning and proposal writing skills through the delivery of high-quality,	1.3	In 2015, 15 individuals working in the EAH in Rwanda, Burundi, DRC and Tanzania trained to	In 2015 (location and geographic scope was change in agreement with CEPF), 13 individuals were trained at a workshop delivered in Maputo, Mozambique. These included trainees from Mozambique (3), Malawi (2), Zambia (2) and Zimbabwe (6). There were five female trainees and eight male trainees. During the workshop, 13 proposals were developed and discussed in various scenarios one-to-one with facilitators, in groups, and with

	experiential training.		develop effective conservation projects and to secure funding to carry out those projects.	buddies. The facilitators paired participants into buddy pairings (and one trio) depending on levels of experience, taxa and theme of their projects. A couple of modules were altered this year compared to the 2014 workshop in Ethiopia: 1) rather than the facilitators playing the donor in all of 'elevator' speech exercises, we did this once as a demonstration and then requested that participants play the role of the donor and a fellow trainee "act" as a keen fundraiser. We believe this proved beneficial as it added a new dynamic to the classroom, created a different set of challenges, and also allowed participants to view their own and each other's projects in a more critical light. 2) Quiz style activities were incorporated into the modules (in addition to the start of each day) to help remind participants about what has been learnt during modules.
1	Training – to build capacity in project planning and proposal writing skills through the delivery of high-quality, experiential training.	1.4	In 2016, 15 individuals working in the EAH in Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe trained to develop effective conservation projects and to secure funding to carry out those projects.	In 2016, we trained 16 participants (3 from Tanzania, 3 from DRC, 2 from Burundi, 8 from Rwanda) Of these, only four were female and 12 were male. This was the first time that we had run the course with simultaneous French translation, contracting two interpreters to provide one-to-one translation to two trainees (although other trainees also benefitted). This worked well, although it did require extra time for all activities. Similar to courses in 2014 and 2015, we had a number of trainees pull out at the last minute and these were replaced with recommendations from CEPF RIT and staff members from Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International in Musanze, which was hosting the training.
2	Training Application – to ensure that training participants apply newly gained skills and knowledge to their existing conservation work.	2.1	Fundraising plans applied by 45 conservation practitioners (15/yr x 3 yrs) for their projects/ programmes in which they will have identified country-specific	As reported throughout the project, many of the trainees who were either working on small projects or were looking to approach small grant donors primarily focused primarily on short-term requirements. At this stage in their careers, these trainees were more interested in a targeted approach to donors whereas those working within larger programmes found a broader approach (involving multiple donors with different giving levels) more relevant. During each of the workshops, we discussed the need for varied donor approaches to multiple donors and there were reflections on a) submitting proposals to different donors for the same project, b) internal communication and prioritisation for funding opportunities, and c) reliance on small grant

			prospect donors and sustainable financing mechanisms.	donors. Follow-up with grantees involved email bulletins recommending country-specific donors for grants and scholarships. Judging from six-monthly trainee reporting, there is still a reliance on traditional donor approaches without there being much evidence for sustainable financing mechanisms being implemented to support conservation projects.
2	Training Application – to ensure that training participants apply newly gained skills and knowledge to their existing conservation work.	2.2	A total of 45 funding proposals (15/yr x 3 yrs) submitted to appropriate donors by training participants with a combined value of more than \$675,000 for priority projects in EAH KBAs and corridors.	During this reporting period, we contacted all 44 trainees to record their fundraising efforts in 2017. Due to the concerted efforts to solicit replies from as many trainees as possible, we also recorded some proposal submissions and fundraising successes in the last 6 months of 2016, which had not previously been recorded. Responding trainees (26) submitted 42 proposals worth a total of \$2,526,746. Of these, 15 proposal were accepted for funding worth \$858,545. Funding values ranged from \$1,500 (the financial value of a laptop, binoculars, camera, rain gauge and thermometer granted by IdeaWild) to \$440,000 from AGRA (Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa) for a three-year project to address food security and increase production of small-hold farmers in Kigoma, Tanzania. The granting donors included Civil Society Support Program in Ethiopia, IdeaWild, Rufford Small Grants, Embassy of the Netherlands (Zimbabwe), The Van Tienhoven Foundation, UN DRC Humanitarian Fund, Fond Francais por L'Environnement Mondial, Fonds Pour Les Femmes Congolaises, The Foundation for Civil Society, AGRA and the South African National Biodiversity Institute.
3	Networking – to provide a platform for conservationists working in the EAH to continue to develop professionally, share learning and collaborate with other conservation practitioners in the CEPF EAH and worldwide.	3.1	45 individuals from across the EAH form a regional network of conservation practitioners and provided with opportunities and a platform to share experience and learn from peers post workshop.	Throughout the delivery of the three training courses, we promoted two networks that would be established: 1) the regional network (between cohorts at each training course and 2) a larger network of all 44 trainees. Two invitations have been presented to the trainees to establish a large network but there has not been a significant interest with trainees preferring to keep in contact with their fellow trainees from each year. This is understandable given the time spent together, the relationships forged, the understanding of each others' projects and vastly differing geographies. The three opportunities were: 1) CLP online alumni network (see above); 2) Introduction to the TBA-led Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network with invitation to sign up to the newsletter; 3) emails from Stuart to a) promote funding, b) make introductions, c) report feedback. Effort has mainly focused on maintaining each

				individual cohort network, with mixed levels of interaction. Given the success of the Rwanda network, which is thriving, we have attempted to liven-up the Ethiopia and Mozambique networks through Whatsapp. However, either phone numbers and have changed or trainees do not use Whatsapp, so the most likely success for ongoing contact and networking will be through the CLP alumni network.
3	Networking – to provide a platform for conservationists working in the EAH to continue to develop professionally, share learning and collaborate with other conservation practitioners in the CEPF EAH and worldwide.	3.2	Successful CLP applicants integrated into the global CLP alumni network, where they can access resources to further their professional development.	Due to changes in CLP's country eligibility (enforced by restrictions imposed by our main donor), CLP only received one funding application from a CEPF workshop trainee, which was unsuccessful. As reported under a different deliverable, all trainees have been invited to join the CLP alumni network whereby they can access a full range of resources including opportunities for grants, training, events, degree courses, short courses. To date 13 of the 44 trainees have accepted the invitation to join the online CLP alumni network.
3	Networking – to provide a platform for conservationists working in the EAH to continue to develop professionally, share learning and collaborate with other conservation practitioners in the CEPF EAH and worldwide.	3.3	Within one month of each training course, 15 (x3) additional individuals trained by CEPF training participants, who will multiply their impact by passing on skills and knowledge gained from the workshop to their colleagues.	During the final 6 months of the project, 21 trainees reported that they had continued to train 229 others in project planning and fundraising, thanks to the skills and knowledge that they had gained during the CEPF workshops. This included one training course delivered by four trainees from the 2016 Rwanda workshop at the University of Rwanda Biology Department. There is evidence that training will continue to be offered, especially in university settings across the Hotspot. As well as as helping to improve project planning and fundraising capabilities, this will also help to develop future conservation leaders and support both long-term and short-term impacts from this project. In particular long-term impacts 2 & 4, and short-term impacts 1 & 2. Additionally, three of the trainees have been contracted by National Geographic Society to co-deliver project planning and fundraising workshops in Bukavu and Goma (DR Congo) and Bujumbura (Burundi).
3	Networking – to provide a platform for	3.4	45 individuals connected to the CLP global	All trainees have been invited to join the online CLP alumni network (RootsUp) and become part of a specific sub-group focused on the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot.

	conservationists working in the EAH to continue to develop professionally, share learning and collaborate with other conservation practitioners in the CEPF EAH and worldwide.		network, giving them access to expertise and knowledge of partner staff and peers.	Registration is voluntary and so far 13 people have registered. Membership to RootsUp offers many benefits including lists of grants, fellowships, training, scholarships, university degree courses and other events. Members can connect with other alumni currently registered and also link with CLP and partner staff, and publicise any published research which can be accessed by all public. The invitation for trainees is open-ended so we will encourage more to join.
4	Portuguese language version of “Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects”	4.1	“Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects” available to Portuguese-speaking community through printed booklets and online version.	This could almost be considered a separate project in itself and required considerable use of personnel (internal and external) and project management time which in hindsight could have been budgeted for differently. Several potential translators were contacted and the selection was based on cost, availability, experience of translating conservation materials and ability to translate into Portuguese that would be easily understood in Africa as opposed to Brazilian Portuguese. To proof-read the documentation we sourced a Portuguese FFI staff member. The documents were put into the design format and then proofed again by the Portuguese staff member and CLP alumni before being approved. At the request of the RIT, we also managed a sub-project to develop an Arabic language version which had been translated under a previous CEPF project (completely unrelated to FFI projects). However, we sourced a proof-reader and engaged with the same design company to design the Arabic-language book, which was also proof-read. The books are provided as attachments and will be uploaded to the CLP website once their file-size has been reduced to less than 10MB. Copies in French, Portuguese and Arabic have also been received by the CEPF RIT in Kigali.

Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

Attached are the French language PowerPoint presentations that were translated for use in the workshop. Also attached are the Portuguese and Arabic language versions of Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.

Consider lessons that would inform:

- Project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)
- Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

PARTICIPANT SELECTION

During the project we re-evaluated the selection criteria for participants. An important audience amongst the early-career conservationists targeted by this project are students. We learnt that students who are primarily committed to completing their academic studies (even though they are also working with other organisations) may decide to complete their degree course before actively pursuing donors; or, the donors that they are targeting mainly offer scholarships. In years two and three of the project, we concentrated on selecting participants who were, according to evidence, going to make applications to fund conservation projects outside of their academic work. Each of the workshops experienced participant dropped outs, often at short notice. We made participants aware of how much effort, time and resources were being spent on their selection and participation at the workshop but most cases were due to changes in participant work priorities. We learnt to accept participants based on merit of application, rather than 'nomination' from senior staff members.

Taking into account the merit of applications, effort was made to ensure that the gender balance was more even than the 2014 workshop in which only two of the 15 participants were women. We worked with CEPF RIT, especially in 2016, to identify and select female participants who fulfilled all the eligibility criteria and would benefit from the training.


TRAVEL & LOGISTICS

In 2015, two participants experienced major issues when travelling to Mozambique overland from Malawi, which resulted in one participant not being able to reach Maputo to attend the training. The other had a difficult and long journey, but finally made it. For the 2016 workshop, we spent time researching potential travel options and risks, and in ensuring that participants were aware of potential issues. We recommended that participants travelled by plane across borders. This caused some extra logistical complications (e.g. FFI staff time sourcing flights and accommodation) but at least everyone travelled safely.

We clearly indicated that accommodation would be shared (single-sex) and that no per-diems would be provided at the workshop. This was stated in the application form, the guidelines and in email correspondence with participants.

COURSE DESIGN

Recognising that this is an intensive course, we tried out a few new methods and activities to break the classroom routine. This included the introduction of a "museum" instead of a Powerpoint lecture whereby participants were asked to walk around the room in small group and visit "displays" posted upon the walls. The groups discussed the displays and then answered a series of questions to explore what they had learned. The response to this interactive session was very positive. In followup workshops we took the idea a step further by introducing a competitive quiz to add extra energy to the activity.



We learnt during year 1 the benefit of having members of the RIT at the workshop to speak directly with workshop participants about the CEPF grants. In subsequent years we added to the number of donor contacts presenting at the workshops which allowed for a) participant to appreciate that donors, who they normally consider to be distant and impersonal institutions (rather than people too!) actually have a human face and are approachable. This helped build confidence in applicants and give them the opportunity to ask questions directly to donors. It also enabled donors to get to know who might be potentially good applicants and follow up with them directly regarding proposal submissions. Several comments were submitted after each workshop about the length of the workshop and the busy and intensive daily schedule. Although there were no major changes to content, we tweaked the scheduling and added time for conversations and discussions, ensured we had guest speakers and adapted some of the exercises to allow for more active participation.

Having now delivered a bi-lingual workshop, in the future we would look at reducing some of the content as it is challenging to squeeze so much in when the majority of taught lessons have to be simultaneously translated. For example, we would ask trainees to do pre-course reading on fundraising plans and consider replacing alternative forms of fundraising with a facilitated discussion.

PARTICIPANT REPORTING

Participants were requested to report back on their fundraising progress every six months during the project. Preparation for this final report in particular required a concerted effort to chase participants through group emails, reminders, individual emails and requests via Whatsapp (on the condition that responses were provided by email!). Some participants commented on the conflicting priorities (work or academic) which prevented them from submitting fundraising applications e.g. I'm currently aiming to complete studies therefore have not submitted proposals; I'm currently focusing on implementing a project which does not allow time for either development of new proposals or submitting proposals.

NETWORKING

Following skype calls with the project team running a separate CEPF grant (ID 65701) and a separate internal discussion within FFI, we took the opportunity to ask trainees several questions to find out what sort of network had been formed between the grantees and how the network was functioning. This was done to support recommendations for future network development. Questions asked included:


1. What has been the main purpose of the CEPF trainees' network?
2. How often do you connect with this network? 1=monthly or more; 2=about six times a year; 3=about once a year; 4=less than once a year; 5=never
3. How are members of the network adding value to one another's work?
4. Are you, as a member of this network, achieving more together than you could alone?

Of the 44 trainees asked, 25 responded to questions about the network with responses analysed as follows:

1. What has been the main purpose of the CEPF trainees' network?

Reviewing the responses and breaking them down into 12 response types, revealed that the regional networks were mainly used to share project ideas, look for collaborations and identify fundraising, training and scholarship opportunities (eight responses each). Six respondents said the main purpose of the network was for fundraising support. The network was also a source of inspiration, with respondents stating that it kept them motivated and was used to share success stories (three responses each). Three responses referred to the importance of the network for social reasons. There were individual responses related to sharing other sorts of information (non-defined), discussing studies, sharing conservation news, adding credibility to projects, and identifying opportunities to strengthen organisations.

2. How often do you connect with this network? 1=monthly or more; 2=about six times a year; 3=about once a year; 4=less than once a year; 5=never



There was a marked contrast between the regularity of contact between groups from different training courses. Clearly, trainees will lose contact over time unless there is an opportunity to meet up, work together on projects, or have some other form of incentive to communicate. This was discussed with the RIT during project implementation and we considered utilising some funds to coordinate learning exchanges amongst trainees from different years and between trainees and CLP alumni funded in previous years. We decided against this idea for two reasons: 1) it was already an activity being conducted (with different individuals) by TBA under Grant ID 65701 and 2) a higher priority was developing training manuals in Portuguese (and Arabic).

Surprisingly, trainees from the Ethiopian workshop (all Ethiopian nationals) were seldom in contact with each other according to responses, or indeed lack of responses, from trainees. As one trainee notes “since some of us were friends we exchange lots of ideas and information” which perhaps reveals that a trainee network mechanism was not actually needed. Two of the seven Ethiopian respondents said they were in contact with individuals from the network monthly or more. One respondent used the network annually, whilst three used the network less than once a year and one never used the network. There was a recommendation that “there has to be some mechanisms of further strengthening the network e.g. through arranging experience sharing on best conservation models, and also sharing experiences of successful members of the network on fundraising for conservation...”

Of the seven multi-national trainees from Mozambique (nationals from Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe), the network was more frequently used. Two respondents use the network monthly or more, another two use it six times a year and one person uses it annually. Two trainees did not respond to this question. During the workshop, this group discussed a number of transboundary collaborations, partly because there was the incentive to apply for grants offered by WWF-Education for Nature.


The most recent training course delivered in Rwanda, involving trainees from Rwanda, DR Congo, Burundi and Tanzania has been a very active network. Of the ten respondents, eight use the network at least monthly and the remaining two are in contact at least six times per year. The frequency of contact is driven by several factors: 1) this is the only group using whatsapp. It is simple to use, widely used, spontaneous and allows photo-sharing; 2) the group was set up prior to the training course (to coordinate travel logistics) and was used during the training course; 3) regular messaging stimulate ongoing communications within network.

3. How are members of the network adding value to one another's work?

Similarly to question 1 above, there are multiple reasons why members are adding value to one another's work. Most commonly this is to generate funds (5 responses), develop better proposals (5), share ideas (3), collaborate on projects (3), research donors (3) and share successes (2). Other responses included motivating others, sharing results and successes, improving project planning, preparing to train others, finding solutions to fundraising challenges, preparing to train others and creating responsible citizens.

4. Are you, as a member of this network, achieving more together than you could alone?

Despite the fact that some respondents are not frequent users of their networks, 17 of the 26 respondents state (some very emphatically!) that they are achieving more together as part of a network than they could alone. Five respondents did not answer this question and two stated that they are not achieving more through the network. The remaining two respondents suggested that there is more that could be done to achieve a greater impact. One lamented that his impact as an individual was minimal and is seeking “collaboration with other trainees so that we come up with solid proposals.” The other stated that “there is more we can do together as a network. I realise the busy schedules also take up most of the time but if we can demonstrate commitment, definitely we can achieve more as a team or network.”



Becoming part of a network (or maintaining a network) is a voluntary activity and some participants are more willing and likely to a) communicate within the network; b) offer opportunities and support when requested; c) take up opportunities (e.g. funding or project collaborations) that are presented to them via the network. The most successful networking tool seems to be Whatsapp, which worked very well in Rwanda where the group was set up prior to the workshop. Creating networks via Whatsapp prior to start of the training (in fact, prior to travel from home) is definitely recommended for future workshops, although speed of internet connection (in Ethiopia this is apparently an issue) should be checked and participants will be required to download the Whatsapp app.

Sustainability / Replication

Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.

SUCSESSES

The newly translated manuals "Institutional Fundraising for Conservation Projects", which are now available in Portuguese and Arabic, will be a valuable tool that will continue to be used within the Hotspot. Copies of the manual in French, Portuguese and Arabic have now been received by the RIT office in Kigali. Future training courses, if delivered in French, will be able to use and adapt the French language materials that were also produced thanks to this project. For example, FFI will be able to use materials in French-speaking central and west Africa. The Portuguese manual will be used by FFI in Sao Tomé & Principe and with partner projects in Brazil (e.g. the Global Trees Campaign). Expertise has been built with in the Hotspot to deliver further training on fundraising and project planning. This resulted from the Training of Trainers module coupled with the availability of all training materials to each of the participants. To date trainees have reported that over 700 people have received training from the 44 participants directly trained during the three workshops. Although it was not part of planned activities, it is worth noting that several of the trainees from the 2016 workshop have acted as co-trainers for National Geographic Society, helping to deliver training in DR Congo, Burundi and Rwanda.

CHALLENGES

The strong network developed during the Rwanda workshop will provide stimulus and support for sustained impact across the central part of the hotspot. This may not be the case, or will be at least more challenging to measure, in the northern part of the Hotspot (Ethiopia) and southern region (Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe).

Safeguards

If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

n/a

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

Further to the experience in developing and delivering the three successful workshops across a diverse region, FFI and CLP would be keen to conduct future capacity-building workshops across CEPF's global programmes. This includes organisational capacity building and management training, mentioned within the lessons learned section. We recommend that all training participants are contacted at the end of the CEPF investment period to conduct a final review of the success of the training courses.

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment

Total additional funding (US\$)

\$1,216,738.00


Type of funding

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source, categorizing each contribution into one of the following categories:

- A Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

Funding type A: Counterpart funding was contributed by the CLP partner organisations (note that Conservation International withdrew for CLP partnership at the end of the first year of the project). Total of \$5,834 from the following groups: Wildlife Conservation Society (\$2,940: Staff salaries/benefits for integration of participants into the CLP online network, network maintenance and proposal preparation; \$441: WCS indirect costs), Conservation International (\$1,552: Staff salaries/benefits for proposal preparation \$301: CI indirect costs), CLP Alumni (\$600: Time for assistance with coordinating workshops)

Funding type B: Although this was neither expected nor intended to be the case when the original project proposal was submitted to CEPF in 2013, funding received for grant ID 63400 was invaluable match-funding against the primary CLP donor, BP plc in 2015 and 2016. As a result of CEPF funding, CLP was able to leverage match-funding worth a total of \$128,583 - \$63,392 in 2015 and \$59,191 in 2016. This I would categorise as Funding Type B because, regrettably, the funding was not leveraged to conduct activities within the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot because BP stipulates that funding be only directed towards 22 countries where they conduct exploration and extraction operations.



Funding type C: The purpose of this project was to increase capacity in project planning and fundraising. Trainees of the three workshops raised a funds from a variety of donors, who are investing a total of \$1,082,321 in the region over the next three years.

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

1. Please include your full contact details (Name, Organization, Mailing address, Telephone number, E-mail address) below

Stuart Paterson, Fauna & Flora International, David Attenborough Building, Pembroke St, Cambridge CB2 3QY. Tel: +44 (0)1223 749 005. Email: stuart.paterson@fauna-flora.org