

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): CEPF Scientific Advisor – EACF Hotspot

Implementation Partners for this Project: None

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): July 1, 2004 – September 30, 2005

Date of Report (month/year): 15 December 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

n/a

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: Ensure that "good science" and "best practices" are employed by those NGO/stakeholder projects funded by CEPF, especially those projects under Strategic Funding Directions related to enhanced "connectivity" and improved "biological knowledge", in order to prevent further species extinctions within the Hotspot.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
At least 15 LOIs reviewed and 10 proposals reviewed and "Proposal Evaluation Reports" written by end of 1 year.	At least 60 LOIs reviewed, and 16 proposals reviewed and "Proposal Evaluation Reports" written and submitted to CEPF and the Coordination Unit by the Scientific Advisor.
At least 4 projects visited and "Project Visit Evaluation Reports" written by end of 1 year.	Two CEPF-funded projects visited and technical inputs provided. Two "Project Visit Evaluations Reports written".
At least 300 pieces of correspondence related to this project are written by the Scientific Advisor by end of 1 year.	At least 900 pieces of correspondence related to this project were written by the Scientific Advisor.

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

Overall, this project attained the intended impact objective, providing substantial inputs, advice and guidance to CEPF, the Coordination Unit, and to many project leaders and stakeholders. Although two fewer projects were visited than planned for, the two

projects that were not visited will be visited under the CEPF Technical Advisor Project (which runs until July 2006). The number of LOIs reviewed was 4-fold more (60 vs. 15) than planned for, the number of full proposals reviewed was six more (16 vs. 10) than planned for, and the number of pieces of correspondence was 3-fold more (900 vs. 300) than planned for.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

I judge that this project was more successful and had more impact than expected. This was largely due to (1) the excellent staff of CEPF and membership of the Coordination Unit, the (2) higher than expected quality of the LOIs and proposals received, the (3) enthusiasm and support for this CEPF project from all corners, including government, stakeholders, and conservation NGOs, and the (4) greater amount of time that the Scientific Advisor spent on this project than budgeted for.

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: "CEPF Letter of Inquiry"(LOI), "CEPF Proposal", and "Project On Site" review systems have been developed and applied in ways that facilitate and promote those "good science/best practices" activities that contribute most to ensuring that CEPF-funded project achieve the "Strategic Funding Directions" and "Investment Priorities" as stated in the EACF CEPF Ecosystem Profile.	All of these systems were developed, put in place, and applied throughout this project by the CU and Scientific Advisor. One result is that this helped to facilitated and develop a CEPF portfolio of excellent, comprehensive, complementary projects.
1.1. Mechanism for review of CEPF LOIs and of CEPF proposal, and system for presentation of comments and recommendations proposals in place	This mechanism was developed, put in place, and applied throughout this project by the Coordination Unit and Scientific Advisor.
1.2. NGOs/stakeholders assisted in the revisions of their proposals and in the implementation of "good science/best practices".	The Scientific Advisor assisted at least 60 NGOs/stakeholders with feedback and evaluations of their LOIs/proposals so that "good science/best practices" would be facilitated during project implementation.
1.3. Proposals that have been reviewed, improved, and recommended to CEPF and CU for funding are approved.	At least 40 of the LOIs/proposals that were reviewed by the Scientific Advisor were approved for funding under SFD 2, SFD 3, and SFD 4.

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

All intended outputs were delivered.

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

No.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

n/a

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.

The time required to obtain research clearance, to organizing field visits to CEPF-funded projects, and to travel to and from project sites was considerably greater than anticipated. Part of the problem was that the projects that were the first to begin activities on the ground were in more remote sites than is the average CEPF-funded project.

Many more LOIs and proposals were received by CEPF for possible funding under SFDs 2, 3 and 4 than expected. Although this is a positive thing, it meant that the Scientific Advisor was required to spend more time than expected in the review of LOIs and proposals, and in attending Coordination Unit meetings.

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

The project design was as simple and straight-forward as possible. This was a very "feasible" project---but one that required considerable experience and many hours to successfully implement.

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

The Scientific Advisor spent about twice as much time working on this project than was budgeted for. This, and the considerable experience of the Scientific Advisor in this and other Hotspots, helped minimize wasted time and effort.

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
Zoo Atlanta	Secondment of two vehicles and most of the field and	\$10,000 value for 1 year	

	office equipment.		
National Museums of Kenya	Secondment of a free 3 room office, security, electricity, etc.	Value of \$5,000 for 1 year	

***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 funded 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 funded 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.

This project helped to give rise to another 1 year project, the “CEPF Technical Advisor Project”. This is a CEPF-funded project that will continue with many of the actions of the CEPF Scientific Advisor Project, but with far more emphasis on site visits to the larger CEPF-funded projects to provide technical inputs to help ensure that “good science” and “best practices” are adopted by those projects, as well as to help ensure the effective transfer of data to the Outcomes Database and proper Red List degree of threat assessments.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary “negative” that was revealed by this project (and which affects most other CEPF-funded SFD 2,3, and 4 projects more than the Scientific Advisor Project), is the need to obtain research clearance.

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes _____
 No _____

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Tom Butynski

Mailing address: Conservation International, c/o IUCN EARO, P.O. Box 68200, 00200 City Square, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 0733-333-601 & 0733-637-525
Fax:
E-mail: tbutynski@aol.com