

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Tropical Biology Association LTD
<b>Project Title:</b>	Systematic Evaluation of CEPF and Capacity Development of CEPF Grantees
<b>Grant Number:</b>	65703
<b>CEPF Region:</b>	Eastern Afromontane
<b>Strategic Direction:</b>	3 Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.
<b>Grant Amount:</b>	\$425,000.52
<b>Project Dates:</b>	January 01, 2015 - October 31, 2019
<b>Date of Report:</b>	November 30, 2019

### Implementation Partners

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

**The project's partnership involved two separate work packages under different grants. Tropical Biology Association organised 7 courses including 4 master classes (Six were on project design, management and measuring impact, and one on communications skills); 12 themed-basedsite visits and learning exchanges (including 2 under a CEPF small grant to TBA); and a hotspot-wide experience sharing event, and set up the Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network (EACN); a new granteesnetwork for on-going support and collaboration. This report focuses on results on these activities, but excluding the 2 small grant exchanges. TBA wrote the project's (combined) final impact report.**

*See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file*

### Conservation Impacts

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

**We trained 108 individuals (34% women) - against a proposal target of c.73 – representing 68 grantee CSOs in 12 countries through 18 capacity development events.**

**We designed the master class. This new approach for training conservation managers helped significantly improve quality of grantees' projects, and the understanding of CEPF operations. Over 65% grantees reported success in grant applications; 20 CSOs won CEPF grants; and 6**

developed new project monitoring and evaluation plans after participating in 1 of our 4 master classes. The master class approach has been out-scaled to other hotspot including under the TBA's MADIO CEPF grant.

Our experience sharing event documented lessons of CEPF investments in the EAM hotspot (led by the RIT) for the period 2012-2019. The event was captured in the first hotspot-wide *infographic* profiling CEPF work, including ideas for sustainability. Our communication course in Ethiopia also interrogated and documented the CEPF investment in the country.

The grantees' new Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network registered 146 members (47 females and 99 males) from 82 CSOs and 14 hotspot countries. We published 39 Bulletin news that shared 94 targeted funding opportunities and 111 grantees' stories linking grantees to key conservation approaches and experiences. We set up 7 Whatsapp groups (3 still very active) crystallising networking around common events. We added members to the TBA alumni network meaning they continue to benefit beyond the project.

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
the significant boost to the CEPF grantees output of conservation proposals coupled with an increase in the regional and international profile of their organizations.	Results from our end of project impact survey (in May 2019) showed that on average, 80% of the responded reported that their work had improved as a result of applying skills gained from the master classes (see figure 1). Forty individuals responded to the survey See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file
Individuals with higher profiles tend to be more successful at attracting funding and collaborators, and this in turn will assist their organizations meet their priorities in managing and conserving biodiversity in the hotspot.	All the 20 CSOs that were on three out of the four master classes secured funding from CEPF. 11 won large grants (ranging from US\$50,000 to US\$100,000), while 9 CSOs got small grants (max. US\$50,000). The results from the May- June 2019 impact survey revealed that 70% of the grantees were successful in at least one their grant application since their TBA training. The grantees further confirmed at least 51 grant applications as successful, while another 9 proposals were reported to be under review. The exchange involving the MICAIA Foundation and BirdLife Zimbabwe resulted in the development of a joint proposal for Trans-boundary Cooperation in the Chimanimani Mountains of Zimbabwe and Mozambique. This project concept was approved by CEPF and the two organisations have each received US\$65,000 to implement the project. These successes allowed the grantees to implement their priority conservation projects. Here are some other examples of success stories "I have managed to develop and successfully implement five conservation projects in different areas which forms the core of my responsibilities at the organisation", James Okumu

	(Kenya). See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file
Further, increased networking among grantees will result in grantee-to-grantee learning and experience sharing and foster closer collaboration leading to more landscape-level strategic planning.	TBA set up the Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network (EACN); this was a grantees network that provided grantees on-going support and collaboration. The Network has 146 (47 females and 99 males) grantees enrolled. The network members received 39 monthly bulletins during the project period with information relevant to their work, including: Over 111 grantees stories showcasing key conservation approaches and experiences 94 funding calls 8 conference and short course announcements 16 toolkits especially from the Capacity for Conservation In their feedback, 85% of the grantees on the network report that they benefited from the EACN/TBA networks as shown in the figure he shared information See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file
This will positively enhance CEPF impact on both biodiversity and livelihoods across the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot.	The 108 project beneficiary came from 68 civil society organisations actively engaged in biodiversity conservation and livelihoods actions. By applying skills, knowledge, and tools gained during this projects, these beneficiaries will continue to amplify the impacts on CEPF investment across the 11 hotspots countries (Burundi, DR Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe) they operate in, and beyond. Evidence show this already taking root and happening. For examples, 1) Grantees are now more conscious about gender issues. Together with other CEPF investment, the project brought to fore the need to gender equality from project to organisation levels. Sarah Namelok reported that her organisation's (Nature Tanzania) project involving local communities is putting "emphasis on gender equality". This has direct implications on livelihoods dynamics at local levels. See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
A minimum of 128 CEPF grantees will have increased capacity to deliver greater impact for conservation through attending one of 7 regional learning exchange, training events, and an experience sharing meeting by October 2019	The TBA build the capacity of 108 individuals (37Female; 71 Male) representing c.84% of the 128 CEPF grantees proposed to the entire programme (ie including work packages delivered by Fauna & Flora International); and 40% more grantees than a target of c.73 for the TBA's component of the programme (see table below). The beneficiaries came from 68 CSOs and

	<p>11 hotspot countries; a Belgian at WeForest Zambia also participated in one of the 18 project's capacity development events. Figure below show that all beneficiaries from Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Burundi were male. Fewer females (below the project average of 34% women) participated in the project from Ethiopia, Tanzania and Rwanda. Two the 3 participants from Mozambique were women. See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file.</p>
<p>Enhanced profile of the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot leading to improved flow of donor support to at least 5 CEPF grantees projects by 2019</p>	<p>18 CSO confirmed having received one of the 51 grants reported in the project's impact survey. The range of funded proposals per CSOs ran from 1 to 6 (See table below for spread of funding by country and CSOs). Beyond CEPF, the CSOs listed the following sources of funding: • The European Union (EU) • Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) • World Resources Institute (WRI) • Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). • United States Agency for International Development (USAID) See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion report attached file</p>
<p>Established network for information sharing among CEPF grantees across the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot by 2018. The network will be used for mentoring CEPF grantees, for exchanging knowledge and experiences in conservation approaches and best practices so that lasting capacity for the grantees and their institutions is realized.</p>	<p>TBA set up the Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network (EACN); this was a grantees network that provided grantees on-going support and collaboration during the project period. The network has 146 (47 females and 99 males) grantees enrolled. These grantees are working in 82 civil society organizations in 14 hotspot countries: Burundi, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Jordan and Zimbabwe. The network members received 39 monthly bulletins during the project period with information relevant to their work, including: • Over 111 grantees stories showcasing key conservation approaches and experiences • 94 funding calls • 8 conference and short course announcements • 16 toolkits especially from the Capacity for Conservation The 7 Whatsapp groups set up to facilitate pre-event communication remained active several months afterwards; 3 have been very active a year later. These have further strengthened networking and sharing among grantees as they share their lessons and successes of their projects. At the end of the project all the network members have now been added into the TBA alumni Network, a lifetime membership.</p>
<p>A new cohort of 18 individuals have improved capacity and access to resources in project design and measuring impacts</p>	<p>37 grantees (14 female, 13 male) or double the project target, gained new skills and knowledge in project design and measuring impact. These individuals</p>

of their conservation work as a results of participation in one of the three master classes, and the on-going support and mentorship by end of April 2019

attended the 3 Master Class training developed in phase 2 (extended phase) of the project. A further 6 grantees (2Female; 4males) attended the first master class in Kenya, that was used to trial the approach during phase 1 of the project. It focused more on project design, monitoring and evaluation. All the Master Class followed an “active learning” approach based on interactive talks and practical exercises as well as peer-to-peer learning. The last 3 master classes (in Tanzania, Kenya and Rwanda) involved a mix of technical and the finance teams; they attended common classes as well as parallel classes that separately articulated specific issues relevant to either of the team. Impact First master class • All the grantees rated the training as “excellent” • 100% of those who had attended a previous TBA course said they had applied the skills learned. • 6 project monitoring and evaluation plans were developed Last 3 master class • 20 projects proposals were submitted, and all received funding from CEPF. See complete response to this question in the TBA completion report attached file

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

#### Successes

- 1. The master classes in project design worked well. Grantees had time to think through whole project and ensure logical flow. Guided by clear targets coupled with close interaction with the trainers, the RIT and CEPF (as a funder) resulted in a remarkable turnaround in grantees’ projects and/or proposals. It also helped trainees cements their new skills for the future.**
- 2. The mix of backgrounds, experiences and expertise among participants and trainers ensured cross sharing of ideas. It also helped build relationships, and though often overlooked, can hasten out scaling of conservation solutions.**
- 3. Involvement of CEPF/RIT staff significantly increased our/grantees’ understanding of CEPF, its investment requirements and priorities.**
- 4. Shared understanding for gender equality in conservations in the hotspot that led to new project activities on gender mainstreaming.**

#### Challenges

- 1. Achieving gender balance on training events partly due to constrain within CEPF contracted grantees, or biases within CSOs in nominating trainees. The Rwanda and Ethiopia courses for instance were heavily male-biased.**
- 2. Language barriers affected effective communication during projects events, and hindered fluid and significant dialogues between the members within the EACN. This affected mainly participants from non-Anglophone countries.**
- 3. Late submission of nominees to attend events, incomplete disclosure of key information e.g. on costs and availability, and arranging project events in remote location affected the smooth planning and delivery of, and increased costs for project activities.**



Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

**While the project did not directly impact gender mainstreaming, it helped bring out underlying gender inequality inherent in many CSOs in the hotspot. To address this, the project in some instances adopted targeted nominations of suitably qualified individuals of particular gender (guided by CEPF RIT knowledge of the CSOs) to attend project activities. This did not always results in the desired outcome, but increasingly more CSOs are now conscious of gender issues partly as a result of these interactions. This is captured in a comment by Laban Njoroge (Master Class trainee from Kenya) who wrote "*Gender mainstreaming. I never knew of it before but it is now a key component in all my projects and in the institution*".**

## Project Components and Products/Deliverables

Describe the results from each product/deliverable:

Component		Deliverable		
#	Description	#	Description	Results for Deliverable
1	Pragmatic training (representing CEPF work package B (organize at least 3 further training programmes);	1.1	1.1 A grantees' training programme designed and approved (by CEPF) by April 2019.	The training programme for the three courses and 4 master classes under this project were designed and approved by CEPF RIT. The programme were then adapted to the specific needs of each training event, in close consultation with the RIT.
1	Pragmatic training (representing CEPF work package B (organize at least 3 further training programmes);	1.2	1.2. At least 45 CEPF grantees trained through attending 3 of the 7 regional learning exchange and training events by July 2017	Done. A total of 108 CEPF Grantees attended the 18 trained regional exchanges and training events organized by the Tropical Biology Association between January 2015 and July 2019. This number covers master classes and the final experience sharing event delivered in the extended project phase.
2	Grantees site visits exchanges (or work package C (organize a range of at least 10 'grantee site visit' exchange), and	2.1	Ten CEPF grantees site visit exchanges organized across the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot for a minimum 10 grantees by end of 2016.	<p>We organised 10 site visits and learning exchanges that benefited 31 grantees (10 female; 21 Male). The exchanges focused 8 key themes: Community engagement in management of forest reserves/in biodiversity conservation in Ethiopia; Conservation and livelihood improvement through beekeeping; CRAGS for biodiversity conservation; Sustainable ecotourism enterprises; Effective EIA processes for biodiversity conservation; Management of Key Biodiversity Areas; PES for biodiversity conservation; and Transboundary management of Key Biodiversity Areas. The exchanges happened in Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda</p> <p>Participants included 21 visiting grantees (7 females and 14 males) representing 18 civil society organizations. Of these, 2 (both male) participated in two exchanges each. The visiting grantees came from Burundi, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. 9 grantees (4 females and 5 males) hosted the events; a host (female from KENVO) also participated as a</p>

				visiting grantee to the PES exchange in Uganda. The TBA also engaged consultants to co-deliver the 2 exchanges in Kenya. By matching visiting grantees with host organisations working on .....See complete response to this question in the TBA Completion Report attached.
3	Grantee mentoring and network (i.e. CEPF work package D (to facilitate individual and institutional capacity development for CEPF grantees,... and develop grantee networks)	3.1	All CEPF grantees linked to, and actively benefit from the existing TBA network support and mentoring by April 2019.	The 146 (47 females and 99 males) grantee subscribed to the Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network (EACN) have been enrolled to the existing TBA alumni network. (Burundi, DRC, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Jordan and Zimbabwe) will continue to receive information relevant to their work.
3	Grantee mentoring and network (i.e. CEPF work package D (to facilitate individual and institutional capacity development for CEPF grantees,... and develop grantee networks)	3.2	At least 10 CEPF grantees and 5 civic organizations have access to targeted information and opportunities to boost their CSTT scores by April 2019	82 civil society organizations have benefitted from regular targeted information including funding opportunities shared through the Eastern Afromontane Conservation Network (EACN), and linked to up to 16 toolkits especially available on the Capacity for Conservation website.  The TBA did not collate the CSTT scores for the grantees (at the start and end of the project) because participating CSOs were already providing these to CEPF at the time of contracting, and at the end of their projects. However, the TBA and CEPF RIT used filed CSTT scores to select grantees to participate in project activities. The training ultimately boosted the CSOs' CSTT scores.
1	Pragmatic training (representing CEPF work package B (organize at least 3 further training programmes);	1.3	Capacity development manual jointly produced with CEPF RIT by February 2019 as verified by a final publication	TBA developed with contribution from CEPF RIT a Capacity Development manual for all the training courses and master classes, and distributed hard copies to participants on each event. Manual version shared with participants on the Rwanda 2015 course were both in English and French
1	Pragmatic training (representing	1.4	Capacity development manual	The TBA developed a final version of the Capacity Development manual, and a soft copy of the distributed to all participants on the Experience sharing event in

	CEPF work package B (organize at least 3 further training programmes);		distributed by April 2019 as reflected in list of recipient and delivery reports	Entebbe, Uganda in July 2019. No final Capacity Development manual was published.
3	Grantee mentoring and network (i.e. CEPF work package D (to facilitate individual and institutional capacity development for CEPF grantees,... and develop grantee networks)	3.3	High quality proposals and projects delivered by the 18 master class trainees as a result of mentorship and support received by April 2019 as demonstrated by project reports, grant contracts and follow up assessments	20 high quality project proposals and projects were delivered. The projects were prepared and submitted by the 37 trainees on three master classes. Eleven CSOs represented on the Tanzania and Kenya master classes were awarded CEPF large grants, while nine on the Rwanda master class, small grants. CEPF is in possession of the projects reports, grant contracts and follow up assessments for these projects

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

### **The Master class approach**

**Designed trialled and refined during the funding period, this approach contributed immensely to the project success. This approach involved review of grantees' project proposals before contracting by CEPF (or submission for funding). The approach particularly is unique in combining proposal review sessions with value-addition training on project design and monitoring, and on CEPF's project management tools, procedures, and requirements. This allowed participants to apply what they learnt in real time as they continually revised their proposals. It also afforded the participants the rare opportunity to interact with potential future funder – the CEPF – and engage constructively to ensure their final proposals met the funder's standards. Another unique aspect in some of the master classes was the participation of both project's technical and financial staff and their mix from across the hotspot. Through learning by working together, the teams engaged more effectively, cross-sharing ideas from their different areas of expertise, and getting to understand better their contribution in the project. This help developed shared commitment to the success of the project.**

**Another key component in the master classes was the setting of very clear targets for thee grantees. In 3 master classes, the trainees were require to final and submit their proposal, and in one event develop a M&E plan for their project. This helped sustain focus throughout the event backed by essential support from teams back in their office. Further, the grantees shared their draft proposal with CEPF, and this helped inform the event training programme. And to maximise success, TBA used is experience in capacity development and understanding of how learning takes place to integrate**

appropriate breaks in what would have been a very intense event thus keeping the trainees appropriated energised.

#### Site-visit & learning exchanges approach

By matching visiting grantees with host organisations working on similar type projects, we ensured that the grantees learnt from each other's experiences. This helped strengthen mutual relations between the CSOs due to their overlapping needs, and diverse expertise. However, these exchanges would have resulted in great impact if grantees were allowed to visit and learn from non-CEPF grantees/projects. This was demonstrated during the sustainable ecotourism enterprises for biodiversity conservation exchange where the grantees visited a walking safari success venture in Loita Hills, Kenya, and the EIA processes exchange (also in Kenya) that involved an expert who provided external advice, guidance, and knowledge on EIAs for biodiversity conservation.

## 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

#### Lessons learnt: General

The integrated training designed and run by TBA clearly works as an effective approach to build capacity. The model can be adapted and applied to meet the need in other places where CEPF is supporting civil society organisations that are responsible for protecting biodiversity.

Training grantees before their projects are finalised and contracted helps in enhancing the quality of contracted projects, and this ultimately boosts CEPF investment.

Having good gender balance as well as a breadth of experience in a group works well, the latter sometimes leading to mentoring relationships being initiated.

Having the extra layer of "components" in the CEPF framework can be confusing for grantees. Most have an understanding of results chains or log frames which do not include "components". This may explain the challenges in complying with the system more than actual design of the projects.

We found the CEPF reporting templates – both on the heavily constrained in capturing capacity development impacts. It would be excellent if the current templates are expanded to integrate qualitative measures as these so often communicate better impact of capacity development actions. Issuing each participant with the USB memory stick that contains all the materials (e.g. PowerPoints and resources) from the training is the best way of ensuring they have access to materials after the training. Printing wastes paper and is difficult to transport and the some people have difficulty accessing online links due to poor internet connection.

The impact of site exchanges and learning visits would be improved if CEPF grantees were allowed to visit and learn from non-CEPF grantees/projects. This is particularly important where CEPF projects cannot fill the specific skills and capacity gaps identified as urgent by a potential visiting grantee. In

addition, opening exchange visit to open calls would further help identify grantees' gap areas and plug them better.

**Lessons learnt: Logistics**

It was very helpful having recommendations from the RIT when selecting participants and also from local CEPF grantees on transport, field trips and other logistics.

There is value in hosting capacity development events in well-experienced locations such as high end hotels. These cost a little more but we found them more efficient and provided better support leaving the training team to concentrate on the core activities.

It's usually quicker and easier to book flights (particularly international flights) on behalf of participants rather than have to approve quotes, have them book and pay for it themselves and then reimburse them later. It can also be difficult for them to book them online when they are in remote locations.

Some people can be very particular about the food served during training events. Mostly trainees preferred African style food and liked to have a variety of options – buffet worked better than a fixed menu a la carte.

Participants highly valued staying in separate rooms and not share accommodation. This was a key lesson especially during the Dar es Salaam master class.

Would be excellent to find a way ensure grantees commit to what they report in their CSTT/GTT self-assessments. This would make these tools a valuable way to measure investment impact.

Engaging grantees whose projects had long closed e.g. to share their impacts was challenging. A few CSOs could not release their staff to participate in the final event sharing in Uganda, or we found the project manager had since changed job and there was no one to take that role.

Actively engaging grantees prior to the exchanges helped identify capacity gaps and set specific learning objectives. This also allowed us to "match" the grantees with the most suitable projects to visit – even if in some cases this meant visiting a non-CEPF funded project.

Maintaining momentum during and after events. Incorporating an outing in each course helped the trainees relax and recharge. In the post event period, follow-up actions such as the publication of regular Bulletin News can be useful in ensuring that network dialogue is maintained.

A few grantees would have benefitted from extra support eg if offered childcare, or allowed to bring a helper where participation to training events require such. Though none reported this need, one participant could not attend a training event because they were on wheelchair while another was recovering from an accident.

## **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.

### **Successes**

Already the trained grantees as demonstrated in the impact section are using the skills they learned to write and apply for new funding. The Training manual we produced and shared with the grantees is very important for the trained grantees as they can use them for future reference and also for training their fellow colleagues in their organization

### **Challenges**

There has increasingly been less and less funding available for capacity building projects.

Some of the CSOs we trained have complained of staff turnover especially of those we trained, that on the other hand can be looked at as transfer of the skills to other organization

## 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

**Not applicable to our project**

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

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

**We thank the CEPF and its RIT for the excellent partnership and the opportunity to to contribution to developing the capacity of conservation managers in the hotspot. We look forward to our continued collaboration building on this relationship, mistakes and lessons we have learned together. CEPF Investment in biodiversity and livelihoods in the region, is probably the single most, best-coordinated programme today. Again, thank you.**

## 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\$)**

### **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)*



**Not Applicable**

## **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](http://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

**Ann Nyambura Githaiga, Tropical Biology Association, African office Nature Kenya PO Box 44486  
00100 Nairobi, Kenya +254 (0) 353 7568 [programmes@tropical-biology.org](mailto:programmes@tropical-biology.org)**