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**Introduction**

This document provides an overview of grant-making for all of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation’s (“Packard’s”) ocean and coastal grant-making in its California Coast, Gulf of California, Marine Birds, Marine Fisheries, Science, and Western Pacific subprograms. This look back on a decade of grant-making reports on the subprograms’ accomplishments, challenges, and operations, distills lessons learned, and identifies Packard’s singular contributions as a grant-maker to ocean and coastal conservation.

Blue Earth Consultants prepared this analysis based on a review of subprogram documents, external evaluations performed by independent parties, and interviews with past and present Packard Conservation and Science Directors, Program Officers and Associate Program Officers. The results are presented in seven sections:

- Background: Origins and Evolution of the Ocean and Coastal Subprograms
- Accomplishments: Results of a Decade of Packard Investment
- Challenges: Internal and External Impediments to Progress
- Organization: Putting Packard’s Conservation and Science Mission Into Action
- Lessons learned: Prerequisites and Key Elements for Sustaining Ocean Conservation
- A Distinctive Legacy: What Sets Packard Apart from Other Funders
- Profiles: Summaries of the Conservation and Science Subprograms

**Background: Origins and Evolution of the Ocean and Coastal Subprograms**

For more than a decade, the Packard Foundation has been an innovator and leader in ocean and coastal grant-making. The Foundation’s six ocean and coastal subprograms comprise two-thirds of all of the Conservation and Science subprograms, and roughly 40 percent of the Program’s total funding as of 2009. This emphasis on the marine environment arose more than a decade ago from Trustees’ interest in addressing threats to the global oceans, and at a time of growing understanding of the magnitude of those threats and readiness by some leaders around the world to elevate the oceans on public policy agendas. With the support of a highly regarded and competent staff, these investments have evolved to make the Packard Foundation one of the most widely recognized ocean and coastal philanthropic donors in the world.

At their inception, the Conservation Program and Science Program were separate programs and resulting portfolios. Historically, Packard had a long track record of supporting conservation efforts, though in previous decades, conservation investments focused primarily on terrestrial systems. Likewise, the Science Program had a large budget and made substantial investments in the advancement of robust scientific knowledge, similar in strategy to the National Science Foundation. In the early 2000s, Packard was considering the benefits of creating a unified Conservation and Science Program. These considerations, coupled with the economic downturn during this time and subsequent budget cuts provided sufficient reason to join the two programs. January 2003, the Programs formally
merged with the recognition that good science is a fundamental component of successful conservation. The combined Conservation and Science Program that emerged now focuses on conserving biodiversity, promoting sustainable use of the environment, and developing sustainable management solutions with the underlining theme of improving and increasing science-based decision-making. Through its ocean and coastal subprograms, the Foundation funds direct conservation projects as well as science integration and strategic communication efforts. Examples of direct conservation programs and system reform interventions include the purchase of Isla Espiritu Santo off the coast of Baja California and the invasive species eradication efforts of the Marine Birds subprogram. Examples of science integration and communication include support for the, Communication Partnership for Science and Sea (COMPASS), SeaWeb, and the Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO).

Of the eight subprograms in the Conservation and Science Program, six focus on ocean- and coastal-related investments; including Western Pacific, California Coast, Gulf of California, Marine Fisheries, Marine Birds, and Science. The first ocean-related subprograms were formed in 1998 and 1999, with the approval of Western Pacific and Marine Fisheries, respectively. As global visibility of the importance ocean conservation grew, the Foundation identified and developed additional subprograms. Other investments made to special institutions through the David and Lucile Packard Foundation include the Monterey Bay Aquarium (MBA), the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI) and Stanford University’s Center for Ocean Solutions (COS). Although important programs and valuable parts of Packard’s ocean and coastal conservation portfolio (MBARI, for example has received roughly $215 million from Packard through the years and COS received an initial $25 million grant in 2005), they are not specifically included as part of this review.

Although diverse in their specific goals, each subprogram has an approved strategy and a clearly delineated set of goals, objectives, and intended outcomes, which collectively contribute to the overall priorities of the Conservation and Science Program. The Foundation provides tremendous support for conservation, science integration, capacity building, and policy and market reforms in some of the most important marine ecosystems around the world. Over the past 12 years, ocean and coastal subprograms have issued more than $335 million in ocean and coastal conservation grants, and almost $4.4 million (since 2005) for Organizational Effectiveness (OE) grants. Figure 1 provides an overview of funding amounts for the subprograms highlighted in this report.

---

2 The Science subprogram is not entirely devoted to ocean- and coastal-related issues, though is it a large proportion of its investments.
3 Liaison to the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute was transferred to Science in 2009.
4 A total of 630 ocean and coastal subprogram grants have been approved from 2004-Q1 2010, and 93 OE grants from 2005-present. The number of ocean and coastal and OE grants issued by each subprogram are provided in the subprogram Profiles section (page 23).
Beginning with its first ocean and coastal subprograms in the late 1990s, the Foundation has steadily added subprograms as new strategic opportunities have arisen. Regardless of their length, all subprograms have completed internal and external evaluations and subsequent strategy updates within five to seven years of subprogram inception. As would be expected, older subprograms, such as Western Pacific and Marine Fisheries, have a longer history of activity, with more strategies approved, and a greater number of initiative entries and exits, as conditions have shifted or as lessons are learned. Over the past decade, the Conservation and Science Program has been under the leadership of three individuals. During this time, it also weathered two stock market crashes that compelled the Foundation to respond to a loss of investment income with two rounds of significant budget cuts to its grant-making programs. The timeline below provides an overview of ocean- and coastal-related subprogram milestones.

**Figure 2: Ocean and Coastal Subprogram Milestones**
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**Figure 1: Ocean and Coastal Conservation Funding Amounts (subprogram inception to present) and Organizational Effectiveness Grants (2005-present) by Subprogram**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subprogram</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Coast</td>
<td>$45.6m</td>
<td>$178,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>$43.2m</td>
<td>$895,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Birds</td>
<td>$15.7m</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Fisheries</td>
<td>$151.9m</td>
<td>$920,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>$31m</td>
<td>$1.27m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Pacific</td>
<td>$57.2m</td>
<td>$1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although much of Packard’s propensity for supporting ocean and coastal initiatives has been driven by internal interest, a number of external factors have also influenced the development of subprograms and momentum for ocean conservation through the years. Increased political support has played a crucial role in this. For example, in 2004, the Pew Oceans Commission, whose members included Foundation Trustees, launched a high profile evaluation of key U.S. ocean policies that was reinforced and expanded by the U.S. Congress’ establishment of the comprehensive U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy. This led to the formation of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative (JOCI), whose aim is to help accelerate the pace of change in which meaningful ocean policy reform is introduced and implemented.

Such elevated interest in the field of ocean conservation and management brought an increased number of new donors to the table, and the resulting influx of funding helped to create new non-government organizations (NGOs) and build capacity within existing NGOs. Corporate social responsibility and interest in sustainability have become more mainstream with large multinationals, such as Walmart, pledging sustainable seafood supply chains in the not so distant future. Cultural shifts in awareness brought forward by movies focusing on anthropogenic interactions with the environment and promoting human connectedness to the species with which we share the Earth, such as An Inconvenient Truth, Finding Nemo, and Disney’s Oceans, and other media sources have heightened public support for ocean education and conservation. A changing political landscape has facilitated recent advances in ocean and coastal conservation and management policy reforms. The National Ocean Policy and President Barack Obama’s recently signed Stewardship of the Ocean Executive Order have created cross-scale openings for increased collaboration between the local, state and national levels. While international frameworks with increasing emphasis on oceans (e.g., formation of International Coral Reef Initiative, Convention of Biological Diversity Programme of Work of Protected Areas included marine protected area targets, Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation 2005 Bali Plan of Action etc.) and changes in national priorities, such as Mexico’s government, have created new opportunities for international engagement and impact. The stock market crash in 2000 and the 2008/2009 recession amplified the need to maximize the effective use of shrinking budgets, focusing greater attention on the importance of streamlining programs and leveraging partnerships.

**Accomplishments: Results of a Decade of Packard Investment**

Information from internal and external program evaluations and staff interviews confirm that Packard’s ocean subprograms have made progress towards their stated goals and outcomes over the past 10 years. Blue Earth Consultants determined that there is significant overlap in subprogram goals and strategies and, consequently, overlap in the achievements realized by the subprograms (see the Organization section for more information, page 11). While each subprogram has many individual noteworthy accomplishments, this section focuses on the primary areas of achievement across all subprograms. A timeline of highlighted accomplishments by area and subprogram is presented below in Figure 4. Specific subprogram achievements can also be found in the Profiles section, page 23.
Subprogram achievements fall into four primary themes:

- area-based outcomes;
- market outcomes;
- policy outcomes (includes science-based decision-making);
- organizational and institutional capacity-building (includes constituency building and community of practice).

Among these main themes, achievements regularly fall under more than one category, for example, there are several instances where policy changes have helped achieve area-based accomplishments, such as establishment of the Marismas Nacionales-Nayarit Biosphere in the Gulf of California. Similarly, significant policy wins were often succeeded by substantial constituency building efforts. For the purposes of this report, we have categorized achievements into the theme with which the outcome is most aligned. Finally, among these four primary themes, subprogram strategy documents, evaluations, and staff noted the importance of good science as an underlying aspect influencing the subprograms’ successes and major accomplishments. Science outcomes have primarily been framed around informing and improving decision-making for sustainable use, conservation, and protection of ocean and coastal ecosystems.

**Area-Based Outcomes**

The ocean subprograms have been highly successful in funding efforts to establish and implement effective MPAs, no-take zones, sanctuaries and biosphere reserves. With support from Packard, 10 MPA networks have either been started or have had their management improved within Oregon, California, Gulf of California, and the Western Pacific (Fiji, Indonesia, Philippines, Palau, Solomon Islands, and Federated States of Micronesia), totaling approximately 544 small and large MPAs.

Packard’s ocean subprograms have been influential in achieving restrictions on destructive fishing methods. As a result of Packard grantees’ efforts, 178,000 square miles have been closed to bottom trawling in the Bering Sea, and 196,000 square miles have been closed to commercial fishing in U.S. Arctic waters. Key closures have occurred in the Upper Gulf of California, California’s Central Coast, essential fish habitat off the coast of Washington and California, and Alaska’s Bering Sea. Ocean subprogram funding has also prevented the expansion of fisheries into critical cowcod habitat and into previously unfished U.S. waters in the Arctic. Additionally, invasive species eradications have been completed on more than 20 islands due to the subprograms’ combined efforts.

---

CCMI – 2 new California networks including 51 MPAs covering 357 square miles; Marine Fisheries -2 in Oregon; Western Pacific – establishment or improved management of 485 MPAs; Gulf of California – 6 MPAs
Market Outcomes
Packard’s work over the past decade has helped catalyze the market shift toward more sustainable seafood purchasing and overall buyer and consumer awareness. The enormous momentum that has been gained for the sustainable seafood movement is a keystone achievement. For example, an external evaluation conducted in 2005 found that Marine Fisheries’ Seafood Choices has directly contributed to dramatic increases the salience of the issue and shifts in purchasing behavior.

Additionally, as of 2010, the MSC certification scheme has substantially increased in visibility, with 8 percent of the global fisheries now certified. Sustainable production standards for aquaculture are also now being developed, and market transformations are taking hold with 14-16 major buyers in the U.S. and Canada committing to source certified or environmentally responsible seafood. The Gulf of California subprogram has also helped make valuable strides toward changing markets. In addition to establishment of fishing concessions, one of the Baja Peninsula lobster fisheries was certified in 2004. The Foundation has been instrumental in catalyzing the marketplace to foster sustainable fisheries markets by providing support for initiatives, such as the Sustainable Fisheries Fund, which promotes sustainable fisheries by providing seed funding to commercial fisherman who wish to adopt sustainable practices and may otherwise be limited due to associated financial hurdles. Packard has also been innovative in developing new incentives for ocean conservation such as developing the Sea Change investment Fund to support sustainable industry practices through program related investments.

Policy Outcomes
Ocean subprogram grantees have been instrumental in some of the most critical policy decisions in the last decade. For example, considerable progress has been made in the Marine Fisheries subprogram’s work towards reforming policies governing U.S. waters. The subprogram supports the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative (JOCI), aimed at working with all sectors of the marine stewardship ocean community to move toward meaningful policy reform through “ecosystem-based management, balancing the long-term health and sustainability of the ecosystem while also supporting economic prosperity” (JOCI website). In July 2010, the Obama Administration’s National Ocean Policy was formalized by Executive Order. The National Ocean Policy will establish a “collaborative framework for the stewardship of the ocean, our coasts, and the great lakes that facilitates cohesive actions across the Federal Government, as well as the participation of State, tribal, and local authorities, regional governance structures, non-governmental organizations, the public, and the private sector” (National Ocean Policy Executive Order 2010). It is important to note that a former Packard Trustees (Dr. Jane Lubchenco, Mr. Mike Sutton) and grantees (e.g. Dr. Marcia McNutt and Ms. Margaret Spring) now hold high-level positions within federal natural resource agencies.

Science integration has also played a significant role in the achievement of important conservation policies. Packard has consistently recognized the importance of science in effective and sustainable
decision-making. Gulf of California supported work that led to a Federal Fisheries Law outlining the need for science-based management in the conservation of key ecosystems, territorial use rights, and regional fisheries management plans. The Science subprogram, through its support of the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, is helping to provide science-based expert advice to the State Water Resources Control Board on the monitoring of emerging contaminants being released into coastal waters. CCMI’s current strategic plan has some goals and strategies focused on building mechanism for science-based decision-making. This has been realized with the establishment of the Ocean Protection Council’s Science Advisory Team as well as the Marine Protected Area Monitoring Enterprise for the California network of MPAs.

Significant federal policy outcomes have also been made within the ocean subprograms focal geographies. Although not yet fully implemented, the Gulf of California subprogram grantees were key players in supporting work that led to the development of a new federal law promoting science-based fisheries management and conservation and regionally-focused fisheries management plans.

Organizational and Institutional Capacity Building
Capacity building is one of the achievement areas that is less quantifiable, though never the less important. Across the ocean subprograms, Packard funding has been responsible for developing new organizations, programs, and learning platforms (e.g., SeaWeb, COMPASS, and PISCO LMMA Network, Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions) and increasing organizational and knowledge capacity of hundreds of NGOs. As one of the most consistent funders for marine conservation, Packard has been critical in building NGO capacity in all the regions that they have worked. In addition, informant and evaluations regularly noted that support from Packard has enabled grantees to leverage resources from other funders, the overall result being a dramatic increase in public funding for coastal and marine conservation and institution building in recent years.

Many of Packard’s ocean and coastal conservation grantees have worked to engage community stakeholders to build capacity for sustainable use of marine resources. For example, Gulf of California has supported efforts to build sustainable fishing capacity within Mexico’s fisheries cooperatives. Through several grantee programs, fishermen are trained and compensated to monitor the recovery of no-take zones. In the Western Pacific, Packard has been a catalyst for the development of a network of locally-managed marine areas (LMMAs). LMMAs are a means of promoting and practicing sustainable management systems for nearshore water by the local governments and communities that have recognized control over the resources. The program promotes the use of traditional systems for on-site designation and management of locally-identified MPAs, coupled with environmental education and awareness programs for children and adults, and a focus on balancing local livelihoods with conservation goals. Today these communities are involved in the management of nearly 450 LMMA sites in eight countries. Under the EBM Initiative, significant progress has been made in establishing an EBM community of practice to help the wider EBM community communicate with each other more effectively, and has supported the development of many technical tools for EBM, such as the EBM Tools Network, to empower experts and decision-makers. For example, the Fisheries Leadership and Sustainability Forum is a partnership between Stanford University’s Woods Institute and COS, Duke University’s Nicholas Institute and School, and the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF). Its aim is to
provide professional development, continuing education, and networking opportunities for regional fishery management council members through semiannual forums, regional workshops, and an ongoing support program.

Packard ocean subprograms have also been responsible for raising awareness of ocean and coastal conservation. Through key grantees, CCMI was able to build a constituency to support the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) process. As a result, NGOs and other environmental organizations have presented organized testimony at all MLPA hearings. It has helped organizations such as NRDC, Surfrider, Waterkeepers, Ocean Conservancy, and World Wildlife Fund engage individuals at the local level to act as leaders within their communities to promote the goals of the MLPA, and enabled strong NGO representation of their stakeholder groups in the regional process. Through the actions of just one grantee, for example, in Monterey alone, 900 local participants actively engaged thousands of individuals to write letters to government officials to support MLPA implementation. Marine Fisheries supports a number of organizations that work to increase the sustainable seafood constituency. These efforts are also helping to promote market shifts; as awareness grows, so is the demand for sustainable products, creating a positive feedback loop. An external evaluation of Marine Fisheries stated, “Grantee convenings are building trust and setting the stage for alliances among NGOs and a potential collaborative major buyer campaign” (The Headwaters Group, 2008). FishWise, for example, is an organization that seeks to educate consumers, restaurants, distributors, and retailers on sustainable fishery issues. They utilize a comprehensive seafood labeling system for grocery stores and direct marketers that assists consumers with selecting healthy and sustainable seafood choices, and, staff are trained to answer customer questions about sustainable seafood. As of the end of 2009, more than 650 storefronts were carrying FishWise certified products.

Figure 4 provides a timeline of selected ocean and coastal subprogram achievements by theme for 1998 to 2010.
Challenges: External Impediments to Progress

Donors operating in the ocean conservation sector experience different challenges to terrestrial conservation efforts because there are fewer funders and money is subsequently spread more thinly. In addition, there is considerable opposition towards conservation and sustainable management from industry operating in ocean and coastal zones, including oil and gas, fisheries, coastal development, transportation, etc. In many cases, these sectors are able to contribute sizable funds to resist governance reforms that would impact their businesses. Packard’s ocean subprograms were not immune to setbacks while implementing their programs. This section provides a brief overview of the external challenges experienced by the ocean subprograms.

Grantee Capacity

In many cases, achieving significant conservation impacts take time. Subprogram grantees implementing ocean conservation and sustainable management continuously face barriers from many internal and external factors. Staff turnover, limited talent pool to draw on, lack of business and/or technical skills, inadequate funding, and limited NGO cooperation have all impacted progress towards conservation. For example, some Marine Fisheries’ grantees were typically scientists or campaigners and they did not have the business and management skills to initiate and maintain effective...
relationships with businesses in the sustainable seafood sector. As such, they have run into difficulties implementing successful major buyer programs.

Subprogram staff also shared that they faced challenges distributing grant-making across multiple geographic scales because grantees capacity and strategies were not considering issues and opportunities related to scale. A common concern voiced in evaluations and interviews was the grantee challenge of designing a program at the community scale, that once proven successful, could be scaled up effectively to have broader reaching impacts. For example, Marine Fisheries’ support of community-based management pilot projects in Oregon revealed concerns that while appropriate on the small scale, larger projects using the same model may not be successful.

**Strategy Design and Effectiveness**

Challenges have also arisen from ineffective strategy design and/or implementation. Although subprogram goals have been regularly achieved, those that fell short can often be attributed to a lack of connection between subprogram strategy design, grantee or Foundation strategy and plan. The Science subprogram encountered this issue in the development of strategic alignments at the EBM pilot sites between scientific research and users; knowledge grants identified important components of EBM, though this information failed to translate to EBM practices. Similarly, the Gulf of California encountered challenges in its attempt to reduce the impacts of shrimp trawling in Mexico, when its market opportunities strategy did not adequately engage and incentivize fishers, buyers and distributors as expected. Finally, many grantees do not have robust monitoring and evaluation frameworks and metrics for showing progress to adapt their programs and ensure alignment with subprogram goals.

**Opposition from Stakeholders**

Ocean conservation has experienced challenges and barriers to overcoming the strong opposition from stakeholder groups. As well-funded opponents can lobby key decision makers and maintain a long-term effort. Issues with push-back from the commercial and recreational fishing industry have made a considerable impact on the progress that CCMI has made with moving implementation of the MLPA forward. As the fishing community has become more organized CCMI approved some risky grants to recreational fishers in an effort to create better understanding and buy-in, though these efforts did not alleviate issues. Nevertheless, the MLPA continues to make progress, regardless of these challenges, due to its design and strong commitment from CCMI.

**Political Will**

In several cases, grantee progress was impaired by government action. For example, in Papua New Guinea, efforts by Western Pacific grantees to protect Madang Lagoon experienced a substantial setback when the government approved the construction of a large-scale marine industrial complex in the coastal zone. Similarly, Marine Birds program grantees have been working to protect key migratory shorebird habitat in Panama Bay, but that was affected by the election of a new president, who promptly suspended an earlier decision to expand the Panama Bay protected area. Government decisions, such as these, often occur beyond the persuasion of grantees and funders and are difficult to influence. Fortunately, despite these challenges, Packard subprograms continue to seek progress and, in some cases, reverse these decisions.
Financial Constraints
Budget and financial cuts were probably the most significant challenge facing both Packard’s ocean and coastal subprograms and grantees. Market crashes in 2000 and 2008/2009 lead to considerable tightening and cutbacks within subprograms. This factor, coupled with overall reductions in philanthropic and government funding, had a drastic impact on grantees. Both Foundation subprograms and grantees saw budgets reduced and a need for prioritizing their efforts. This resulted in some strategy shifts such as the Western Pacific subprogram discontinuing funding in Malaysia and the Philippines and the Marine Fisheries shift from a consumer to retail focus, and strategy exits such as Marine Fisheries Arctic strategy exit or the EBM initiative exit within the Science subprogram. However, in spite of economic transitions Packard has remained supportive of many of its grantees and has maintained their progress towards overall strategy goals.

Organization: Putting Packard’s Mission into Action
This section of the report provides an overview of the process undertaken by subprograms to help ensure that grants are effective in achieving the Foundation’s goals and objectives. These include stated goals and outcomes, strategic planning and evaluation processes, and strategies employed.

Goals and Outcomes
Each of the ocean subprograms examined for this review possess a key goal to help guide grant-making within their specific region or theme. These goals have been drafted in a way to increase opportunities for flexibility within the strategy and creativity by subprogram staff and grantees. In addition to the key goal, subprogram staff and documents discussed related outcomes associated with the overall goal.

Several subprograms have modified their goals at some point in the duration of the program. Changes to goals were informed by findings in mid-point evaluations and insights from subprogram staff; proof of Packard’s ability to adaptively manage programs (see Strategic Planning, Evaluation and Adaptive Management, page 12). The Gulf of California subprogram 2003 strategy outlined the goal of promoting a network of effective MPAs, making up 10 percent of the total Gulf. By the time the subprogram went through an evaluation in 2006, this goal had been nearly achieved. Thus, the 2006 strategy update identified the opportunity to revise the subprogram strategy to focus on the goal of reducing the impact of shrimp trawling and improving the effectiveness of conservation in MPAs and other priority sites. Our review shows that there are commonalities between the goals that the subprograms are working to achieve. Many of the strategy documents outlined outcomes and goals for:

- area-based outcomes:
  - restore habitats and populations;
  - reduce certain threats;
- market outcomes:
  - create sustainable seafood supply chains and transform global markets;
  - create viable alternatives for coastal economies;
- policy outcomes (includes science-based decision-making):
  - facilitate governance reform;
Furthermore, many of the subprograms outlined more than one of the goals described above. This mixing of goals increases opportunities for success by engaging multiple sectors and scales.

In general, the subprogram staff agreed that the goals and outcomes outlined in the strategies are realistic. However, they also mentioned that some outcomes were hard to measure and that some benefits are not defined by specific outcomes.

**Strategic Planning, Evaluation and Adaptive Management**

Strategic planning and evaluation has become an integral factor in the success of the ocean and coastal subprograms. Leadership and program officers all stated that strategic planning and evaluation are critical activities for effective implementation of subprograms. These processes allowed subprogram staff to prioritize and streamline strategies, in addition to providing clarity of purpose and design. In the past 10 years, strategic planning and evaluation have allowed subprograms to be adaptive; shift away from ineffective strategies and to incorporate alternative approaches.

As the ocean conservation programs evolved within the Foundation, so did the strategic planning and evaluation processes. Starting in the early 2000s, strategic planning developed to become more formalized and robust, ultimately incorporating input from external sources, logic models, evaluation, and revision informed by evaluations. This evolution is evident when comparing initial subprogram strategies with post-evaluation, revised versions. For example, the Western Pacific subprogram strategy, approved in 1998, was outlined in a simple manner, minimally laying out goals, geographic priorities, habitat priorities, and strategic portfolios. That strategy was refined in 2000 by new Western Pacific staff, but the 2007 version of the Western Pacific strategic plan, informed by a program evaluation in 2005, was more detailed and clearly outlined with a Theory of Change, outcomes and approach, a time frame and exit strategy, evaluation protocol, and a budget. All of these components were absent or not fully formed in the original 1998 strategy. This example demonstrates that strategic planning has matured throughout the duration of the ocean and coastal subprograms’ evolution.

This evolution is also clear when reviewing the initial strategies of subprograms added later. The Marine Birds initial strategy, approved in 2007, was far more sophisticated than initial strategy documents for some of the earlier subprograms, containing a Theory of Change, early actions, conservation priorities, requirements for drafting a monitoring and evaluation plan, an estimated timeline, and exit plan. In addition, this strategy was informed by an analysis conducted by Redstone Strategy Group, which outlined recommendations for metrics for success, outputs, outcomes, sub-outcomes, a return on investment (ROI) calculation, a 10-year plan, and cost modeling.

Ocean and coastal subprogram staff have been thoughtful in producing robust and adaptive strategic plans. As part of developing strategic plans, subprogram staff solicited input from experts, stakeholders,
and funding partners on proposed strategies to ensure viability of a strategy given the context of the region or issue. This process allowed subprogram staff to gain insights to incorporate into a Theory of Change and strategy and to achieve buy-in from these groups. Although advice from external sources informed each subprogram strategy and helped to set the agenda, subprogram staff ultimately prioritized issues based on the Foundation’s values and staff analysis.

Subprograms utilize a Theory of Change and logic models to outline goals, short-term and long-term outcomes, and strategies to achieve those goals. Drafting a Theory of Change and logic model allowed subprogram staff to frame the issues and develop specific metrics and indicators by which to measure progress and success. Ocean and coastal subprograms utilized both quantitative and qualitative indicators within strategic planning documents. For example, a quantitative indicator of the Gulf of California is “reduce the total area of priority habitats trawled (MPAs, shallow bays, and seasonal habitats such as spawning areas for commercially or ecologically significant species) by 75 percent,” while an example of a qualitative indicator is “experiments in area-and rights-based fisheries management in priority areas lead to Gulf-wide sustainability innovations in fisheries regulation.” Further examples of quantitative indicators include:

- Number of MPAs created;
- Percent increase in support for conservation measures;
- Number of schools involved in outreach and education programs;
- Area of MPAs established;
- Percentage of seafood purchases are certified; and
- Number of invasive species eradicated.

Many of the qualitative indicators for success detailed in subprogram strategic planning documents covered themes including:

- Increased capacity of government and civil society;
- Increased monitoring and evaluation;
- Sustainable implementation of conservation tools (e.g. MPAs, certification, eradication);
- Established effective policy and governance;
- Increased science integration;
- Increased awareness;
- Increased support and buy-in for conservation efforts; and
- Increased opportunities for sustainable financing.

Having this mix of quantitative and qualitative indicators is important to ensure lasting impacts. One staff member stated, “the focus needs to not be on numbers but on how effective and sustainable solutions are.” Although difficult to measure, qualitative metrics ensure that thoughtful and effective conservation is being funded as well as elements aimed at institutional capacity building.

Ocean-related subprogram staff were also able to measure success outside of indicators defined in the strategies. Although some achievements did not directly address indicators or were not easily
measured, Packard staff still recognized these as successes. Increasing organizational capacity of grantees and other organizations in the regions that the subprograms are funding was considered an achievement although it did not directly meet strategy indicators. As was, maintaining high quality relationships and interactions between donor and grant recipients. It is important that the value of these undefined impacts is not underestimated. While they may not specifically contribute to progress that can be gauged against outcomes or indicators, many program staff and third party evaluators identified these as some of the most important in generating profound and long-lasting success. They also contribute to other, perhaps less tangible impacts, such as relationship strengthening, trust, and enhanced quality of life. It would be worthwhile to make efforts to capture this impact to show the full return on investment.

Strategic planning coupled with evaluation allows for learning and adaptation. Several subprogram strategies were revised mid-duration based on key findings and recommendations revealed by evaluation. Evaluation occurs on multiple levels within the ocean and coastal subprograms, both internally and externally. Internal evaluation occurs informally on a regular basis by staff who perform due diligence and scoping of grants. This process allows subprogram staff to evaluate grantees and determine their progress. In addition, program officers and associate program officers are regularly in contact with current grantees to stay abreast of project progress and challenges, and to offer input and advice, when needed.

The Dashboard is another relatively new internal tool that aids in evaluating subprograms. Dashboards are drafted on a quarterly basis for each board meeting, outlining intermediate outcomes and indicators and describing progress towards meeting those goals. The due diligence performed to inform these reports ensures that staff and trustees are up-to-date on the advancement of subprograms goals. Internal evaluation is also supported by the evaluation officer who is working to institutionalize the evaluation process across all programs.

A critical component of adaptive management for ocean and coastal subprograms is external, third party evaluation. External evaluations are usually conducted at the mid-point of a subprogram’s strategy and are intended to be a review of progress to date and document to inform revision of the strategy. Evaluations conducted on Packard’s ocean and coastal subprograms not only determine positive progress and achievements made thus far in a subprograms duration, but they also reveal areas of improvement, gaps, challenges, and ineffective strategies to inform adaptive management. Marine Fisheries, Gulf of California, CCMI, Science, Marine Birds, and Western Pacific have all undergone external evaluations.

Evaluation has been an effective tool in refining and streamlining Packard’s ocean and coastal subprogram’s strategies. When comparing evaluation documents, the majority of recommendations were specific to the subprogram. This is likely due to the variations in strategies, differing indicators for success and distinct challenges faced by the subprogram. These recommendations and key finding provide guidelines for strategy revision. For example, Western Pacific underwent an evaluation by Foundations of Success in 2005. Although the results of the evaluation were positive, the final report described key findings from the evaluation and laid out specific recommendations for improving
subprogram grant-making. Findings reflected that informants that participated in the evaluation believed that the “Analysis and Technology strategic portfolio was less important than other existing or missing components,” and the evaluator recommended that more thorough evaluation was necessary to determine if this portfolio was worth continued support (Foundations of Success, 2005). Based on these insights, subprogram staff revised the subprogram strategy, replacing “Analysis and Technology” with an emerging “Public Education and Media” strategic portfolio. The evaluation of the Science subprogram’s Ecosystem-based Management (EBM) Initiative revealed several findings that indicated a need to shift strategies and continued large investment at a small spatial scale, leading to phase out of this initiative in conjunction with budget cuts. In the last decade, evaluation has proved to be an effective tool for adapting the Program’s approach and for prioritizing investments; ultimately leading to success.

**Primary Strategies**

In the past ten years, the ocean and coastal subprograms have demonstrated similarities in the primary strategies that they fund. Common strategies across the subprograms include:

- Design and effectively implement MPAs;
- Policy reform;
- Market-based initiatives;
- Capacity building;
- Knowledge building;
- Outreach to user groups and the general public; and
- Science integration and science-based decision-making.

The strategy of designing and implementing effective MPAs, for example, has successfully been used by the Western Pacific, Gulf of California, Marine Fisheries, and California Coast subprograms to help protect, restore and maintain healthy ocean ecosystems and create systems that improve management capacity and skills. The Gulf of California, Science, Marine Fisheries, and California Coast subprograms all have supported policy reform strategies to garner long-term sustainable management of ocean and coastal resources. Similarly, market-based initiatives have been employed by Marine Fisheries and Gulf of California to generate substantial shifts in the sustainable seafood movement.

Nevertheless, while the subprograms do employ overlapping bigger picture strategies, the strategy documents also outline specific outcomes for the goals and within the context of the region in which they are working. Subsequently, the activities undertaken as part of the strategy vary widely. For example, in the Gulf of California, an outcome aimed at MPA management states “By 2011, published management plans exist for entire network of MPAs” (Dashboard Q1 2010). On the other hand, CCMI focuses on providing support for the convening of stakeholder groups to create consensus-based MPA networks.
That being said, informants and evaluations frequently discussed the undertones of science as a common thread between all subprograms. It is viewed as being an integral and fundamental aspect of subprogram design and strategy, and a component that is essential to the achievement of outcomes, and the Foundation’s goals.

Subprogram staff also spoke of the need to work at multiple scales to achieve success. A strategy funding policy change at the federal, regional, or state levels coupled with building community support for sustainable management and conservation measures works to increase opportunities for success. The very nature of a regionally-designed subprogram facilitates this top-down, bottom-up approach. For example, CCMI has focused its strategy on developing a state-wide network of MPAs through a process that is broken up by sub-regions of the State of California.

**Most Effective Strategies**
The ocean and coastal subprograms have a strong history of learning through experience, adaptive management, and refining subprograms to be increasingly effective overtime (see Strategic Planning, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management). While the strong majority of strategies used have been effective, a few of them were consistently identified, by staff and evaluations, as helping move forward the achievement of the subprograms’ goals the most. Interestingly, in some cases, these strategies are not those specifically identified in the strategy documents. Informant and evaluation identified best strategies include:

- Long-term and consistent funding support;
- Focus on site-based programs;
- Technical assistance to fill need gaps and alleviate the bureaucracy of government giving;
- Partnership building and improving relationships between sectors;
- Strong stakeholder involvement; and
- Strengthening capacity and skills.

In general, ocean and coastal subprogram strategies are driven by both the Foundation and grantee organizations. Packard’s role is focused mainly on the strategic level, looking for new opportunities to remain a forerunner in the ocean conservation movement. Packard’s success in being an ocean and coastal funding leader is two-fold; its knowledgeable and well-informed Board of Trustees understand the issues, and its experienced staff – many of whom have worked as implementers in their regions of expertise, and thus, have a clear grasp on what has been effective on the ground. That being said, program officers use a collaborative approach, working with grantees to indentify the best opportunities, strategies, and activities to accomplish their goals. Part of the success of this strategy is that, over the years, Packard has developed trust with many of its grantees, creating an environment for grantees to feel comfortable proposing new, innovative, and even risky strategies, often supported by subprogram staff. Whether through capacity building efforts or through an NGO’s history of follow-through and successful projects, Packard has created a network of reliable grantee partnerships. The
collaboration with the Organizational Effectiveness Program has been essential in achieving subprogram outcomes related to building capacity in the relatively new marine conservation sector. The subprograms’ success in integrating this collaborative approach is evident from the many positive responses we received from staff informants. Some highlights are shown below:

- Fostering a productive synergy among donors, grantees, and other implementing groups.
- Achieving the right balance between setting strict targets and maintaining the posture of a flexible, helpful donor that allows grantees to design appropriate approaches.
- Minimizing project discontinuity when funding sources shift by allowing grantees to be more involved in designing project strategies.

This understanding of the importance of a collaborative approach extends beyond donor-grantee relationships. Building other types of partnerships, both formal and informal, has been another key strategy employed by the Foundation. These alliances create a number of benefits such as the ability to leverage funds, share information and exchange knowledge, create organized coordination that minimizes overlap while maximizing the area of impact, and strengthening channels for generating a shared and strategic vision.

Establishing strong partnerships has been an essential strategy to accomplishing some major achievements. For example, Packard facilitated the Arctic Funders Group that included Packard, Oak, Wilburforce, Kaplan, Gordon, and the 444S Foundations. The Group jointly funded an international study of governance in the arctic that helped to put conservation more prominently on the agenda of national governments jockeying for position in the most rapidly changing ecosystem in the world. Similarly, the public-private partnership between CCMI via the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation and the State of California has been integral in realizing the implementation of the state’s MLPA – implementation that the state had failed to implement in two previous attempts. In the Western Pacific, Packard established a partnership with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to support the establishment of LMMAs throughout the region. Partnership in the Gulf of California between funders, regional NGOs, and government has been critical for the design of a strategy to protect the vaquita (See text box above more details on this partnership).

**Lessons Learned: Prerequisites and Key Elements for Sustaining Ocean Conservation**

Ocean and coastal conservation and sustainable resource management is a relatively new field. Private philanthropy in this field really started in the late 1990s with the Packard Foundation leading the effort and actively recruiting funding partners in the first decade of 2000s. Foundation staff have rich insights.
into ocean and coastal conservation grant-making and the implementation of successful and unsuccessful programs and strategies. In this section, we highlight lessons learned themes shared by Packard staff, and organized them by prerequisites and sustaining features of ocean conservation results at the portfolio scale.

Prerequisites for Ocean Conservation
Staff past and present identified the following prerequisites for pursuing successful ocean conservation initiatives:

- **Knowledgeable Donors**: Almost all staff stated that having donor staff who are knowledgeable about the issues and the cultural and political aspects of a topic and/or region is one of the most important preconditions and key elements for ocean conservation success. Staff not only need to understand the current context, but also all the drivers and threats. This knowledge is essential for developing and implementing a successful strategy. Place-based programs all see value in regional expertise and field staff. Staff stated that this was not always possible to support financially, but crucial for developing and implementing partnerships, and worth the investment. Many evaluations suggested a need to continue to develop the Foundation staff capacity, both in terms of number of staff and support for developing even deeper levels expertise.

- **Resiliency**: Selecting issues and regions where it is possible to have an impact on improving or recovery of the ecological and social system is another essential precondition. There must be the opportunity, and resiliency in place to enable changes and results in ocean and coastal ecosystem and community health.

- **Strategic Planning and Adaptive Management**: The role of strategic planning is essential to ensure strong ocean conservation success. Strategic planning helps prioritize efforts and provides clarity of purpose and targets. Many suggested that in order to create lasting change, the design, Theory of Change and resulting logic model, need to look at creating incentives outside of the conservation of the environmental community. However, it is not just producing a strategic plan, it is the process of how a strategic plan is developed that is equally important. Typically, experts are pulled into one room to strategize. Packard staff stated that it is very important to close the gap between what needs to happen at a high level, and how it is implemented with input from people on the ground. Ground-truthing strategic plans or sub-strategies is critical and can prevent investing in the wrong strategy or at the wrong time and place. For example, both evaluation documents and subprogram staff stated that the EBM Initiative’s focus on improving science advice for sustainable management of shrimp in the Gulf of California would have been more effective if there had been a clear and viable strategy, vetted by regional experts. They recognized that this was not easy to do, but very necessary when donors are thinking about how and where to invest. This is when the staff knowledge and expertise driving the process is so essential because they understand the issues and players and can navigate the prioritization process.
It is also important to design a strategy that enables evaluation. All recognized the value of evaluations and adaptive management. The focus on monitoring and evaluation will help achieve goals and outcomes more effectively.

- **Organizational Capacity**: Local capacity for conservation is critical for achieving durable results. Staff commented on the need to help organizations and potential leaders develop and refine their skills. There is always a need to have strong and talented leadership. This cannot be under-rated, and although passion and alignment with Packard goals is also key, strong leadership is equally if not more important. There is value in strengthening capacity and working with groups to ensure continuity of staff. This capacity can be created over time when there is a plan to do so. One of the opportunities in the future is for each subprogram, prior to approving a new or revised strategy, to really examine the organizational landscape and capacity and determine where there are gaps and needs for development.

- **Donor Staying Power**: Prior to starting an initiative, donors need to be committed in the future and they must have the mindset that in order to achieve real outcomes they need to be in it for the long-term, and provide adequate funding over that timeframe. Packard subprograms are realizing great results because of the dedicated, focused strategy with continual funding for, in some cases, more than a decade. For example, unlike other funders, Packard has successfully supported the creation of MPAs around the world, and are now focusing on how to make MPAs more effective in the future.

**Key Elements for Sustaining Ocean Conservation**

Many of the prerequisites described above overlap with a set of important factors for sustaining the momentum for ocean conservation over time. These factors or “key elements” have more to do with the implementation of the subprograms. The following key elements, identified in independent evaluations of Packard subprograms and by past and present Packard staff, include the following:

- **Political Support**: Need to secure lasting champions in government and need to have governance structure that can lend itself to implementation of management and conservation outcomes. The latter can be a policy opportunity and with the right plan, a good strategy could help create and/or refine that structure. For example, Science is influencing governance with JOCI support federally and in Oregon through grants for the Nearshore Research Task Force. Staff recognized that having a political environment that is supportive of the work is helpful. Although some important policy progress was made over the past decade, such as the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 2006, Marine Fisheries, for example, experienced barriers to garnering considerable support for ocean policy prior to the Obama Administration. Now, under the new administration, significant strides have already been made.

Building this political support at all levels requires developing a conservation ethic for the ocean, for policy-makers, industry, and the public. There is a considerable need to change the sentiment that ocean ecosystems are so vast and resilient that industry and people can
overexploit and pollute without making a permanent impact on its resources. Education and incentives are needed to create this shift. For example, there may be an opportunity to have the Marine Fisheries markets goals more directly align and link to goals in the regional programs and be cross-cutting like the Science subprogram.

- **Scale**: Working at multiple scales is key when working towards ocean conservation. It is not enough to work at one scale, for example, just at the community-scale or just at the federal scale. A combination top-down, bottom-up approach is critical to ensure progress at both levels. There is a need and opportunity to work across scales to leverage and institutionalize ocean conservation and sustainable management processes and mechanisms. There has also been quite a bit of discussion on how the Foundation and ocean funding community in general can scale-up strategies and impacts as well as making a land-sea connection. No one has the answers yet, but one thing is clear to staff – do not implement anything unless conditions are right for success, and the initiative is adequately funded.

- **Cross-sector Dialogue**: It is important for an issue or place to have an opening and opportunity for dialogue between different sectors. If this does not exist, it is hard to move forward in developing long-term ocean conservation and sustainable management results. Staff recognized if resourced adequately and planned strategically, the opportunity for cross-sectoral dialogue can be created. CCMI saw and created that opportunity. After a few failed attempts by the California Resources Agency to implement the MLPA, CCMI developed the opportunity and designed a transparent and robust process with stakeholders. It was key to integrate science into decision-making, and depoliticize the process, as much as possible, by having strong information and data on the natural and social sciences. Strong, knowledgeable facilitation was, and continues to be, an essential element of the process.

- **NGO Partnerships**: All subprograms stated they have and want strong partnerships and working relationships with NGOs and grantees. This collegial relationship is essential to successful, aligned priorities. Evaluations recommended the need for grassroots engagement and coordination amongst grantees, and improved coalition building. Evaluations also suggested improving transparency and communications about goals priorities and the grant-making process.

- **Public and Private Partnership**: As discussed in the achievements section, partnership is an essential component across all of the ocean and coastal subprograms. There is a need and opportunity to develop more public and private partnerships. Packard has blazed the trail with developing innovative partnerships. The Marine Fisheries subprogram supports the Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions, a partnership with NGOs, and CCMI supports the MLPA partnership between RLFF and the California Resources Agency. Some of the partnerships are amongst donor partners, like in the Gulf of California and the Arctic Funders Group. These partnerships take different forms, some informal and some formal. It is important, especially for the public private partnerships, to build trust, identify communication channels for
collaboration, and develop an effective process for working together and decision-making. All of this requires adequate resourcing, both human and financial.

In summary, many program officers stated that whether formal or informal, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) could help outline roles and responsibilities, alignment of interests, and clarification of shared and/or complimentary goals and objectives. All recognized that it takes a considerable amount of resources to manage these relationships, but is a worthwhile investment, as having regular engagement with grantee and non-grantee partners is extremely important.

- **Long-term Funding**: A key element missing in the earlier design of strategies was long-term sustainable financing mechanisms to support ocean and conservation and management. Strategies like the Western Pacific, Gulf of California, and CCMI in their second phases are beginning to focus on building mechanisms for funding. Linked to this is the need to encourage NGOs to develop diverse sustainability (financing) plans, especially for smaller organizations.

- **Internal Communication and Coordination**: Coordination between subprograms is important and there is an opportunity for Packard to improve leveraging knowledge, lessons, and networks. It is also important to continually effectively engage and communicate with Trustees about the subprogram strategy successes and lessons learned as this could help generate essential feedback and insights. Packard subprograms would benefit from increasing internal communication between program officers and more frequently soliciting strategic insights from each other and the Board on topics such as long-term sustainable financing for ocean conservation, measuring success and evaluation, and MPA creation and management effectiveness. 

### A Distinctive Legacy: What Sets Packard Apart from Other Funders

The Foundation is regarded by staff and grantees (as indicated in external evaluation documents) as a leader in ocean conservation grant-making. In many regions, like the Western Pacific and Gulf of California, and many strategies, such as Marine Fisheries markets strategy, Packard was one of the first funders supporters in this arena. Over time, Packard has built capacity by supporting organizations to implement solutions and by establishing funding partnerships to expand the Foundation’s reach and advance its ambitious ocean conservation goals.

Many characteristics and approaches set the Foundation and its staff apart from other ocean conservation funders. At a high level, the Board and key Trustees, past and present, like Ms. Julie Packard and Dr. Jane Lubchenco are recognized visionary leaders, committed for the long-term to achieving durable ocean conservation outcomes. Packard staff report that Board leadership strives for the design of innovative, strategic subprograms that focus on specific issues or regions and show strong

---

6 In February 2009, Blue Earth Consultants presented to three Packard subprograms, CCMI, Marine Fisheries, and Science, on coordination and learning opportunities.
commitment for longer time frames, not just following the next latest trend. External evaluators described the Packard subprograms as leaders in the donor community within each of the regions or issues areas in which they operate. Marine Fisheries, for example, has been on the forefront of the sustainable seafood movement and in helping to establish the Marine Stewardship Council. Packard has also strategically funded in areas that were previously receiving minimal support. For example, prior to Packard’s entry into the Western Pacific, there were very few marine funders operating within the region.

Packard staff and evaluations noted the following unique characteristics about the Foundation:

- Understands that change takes time and believes in flexibility and continuity for ocean conservation;
- Supports many smaller organizations and community-based efforts in addition to larger organizations and large-scale efforts;
- Supports more diverse strategies from science to policy to market solutions, as well as organizations capacity building efforts;
- Acts as a collaborative and convening partner;
- Leverages greater amounts of funding than other donors, often bringing new funders to the table;
- Maintains a low profile; is focused on making progress toward conservation and improved ocean management, rather than being concerned with visibility;
- Innovates and catalyzes new approaches to create ocean conservation solutions appropriate to the region or issue at hand and seen as willing to take risks; and,
- Invests in staff and administrative support to be thoughtful, transparent designers and implementers of subprogram strategies.

Like, the Trustees, the Packard Foundation ocean and coastal subprogram staff, carry forward the knowledge and commitment to the field. They are known in the ocean conservation community as having deep expertise, collegial, professional, and leaders who are committed to their work. The program officer role is much more than a “check-writer”, program officers are seen as coordinators, facilitators, conveners, leaders, and advisors in their area of grant-making. They balance a fine line, successfully, of setting the agenda while respectfully getting buy-in from grantee, government, and funding partners.

Profiles: Summaries of the Conservation and Science Subprograms
The following profiles offer a snapshot of each of the ocean and coastal subprograms, including a brief overview of the threats Packard is working to address, length of the subprogram, level of funding, number of grants approved, stated goals and strategies, scale of investments, a few examples of key achievements, and innovations. They are presented in alphabetical order for ease of the reader.

---

7 The number of grants approved include the period 2004 through Q1 2010, unless otherwise indicated.
## California Coastal Marine Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>California is home to thousands of plant and animal species, with more threatened and endangered species than any state in the contiguous United States. The California Current is more of the world’s most rich and productive marine ecosystems, providing habitat, nurseries, and sources of food to hundreds of species. In order to enhance the protection and long-term health of California’s coast and ocean for future generations, the CCMI works to advance ecosystem-based conservation of coastal and marine resources and to generate more effective statewide management policies and programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>7.5 years to date; Board approval 2003-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Funding</td>
<td>$6.5M spent in 2003; $6M spent each year 2004-2008; $5.1M spent in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grants</td>
<td>117 ocean and coastal grants (2003 – 2007); 4 OE grants (2005 – present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>The goals of the CCMI are to bring about ecosystem-based conservation of coastal and marine resources in California through more effective statewide policies and programs, and to serve as a springboard for similar efforts on the west coast of North America and nationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategies Funded | • Marine ecosystem protection through the establishment of MPAs  
• Promote governance reform  
• Deepen the ocean and coastal constituency  
• Increase and find more secure sources of funding |
| Scale | Regional: The CCMI’s initially focused intensively on California’s Central Coast, with the intention of creating significant, tangible, and permanent impacts in the region. This served as a springboard for statewide conservation; with the MLPA Initiative, CCMI is now helping apply statewide policy through regional implementation. |
| Key Accomplishments | • Design, launch and implementation of the MLPA Initiative, including multi stakeholder, consensus-based creation of a network of marine protected areas along much of the California Coast.  
• Establishment of the California Ocean Protection Council and secure of bond-funding. This governance model, though still new in its implementation, was well conceived and offers a place from which to launch significant governance improvements.  
• Launch of Reef Check California, which organized and coordinates rocky reef surveys by hundreds of volunteer SCUBA divers along the California coast. |
| Innovations | • Technical assistance has been a critical component to the success of this program. Although it is not specifically identified in the strategy, it has allowed CCMI to actively engage with the Department of Fish and Game on how best implement projects so that funding and accomplishments can be maximized.  
• CCMI staff provide a significant amount of administrative support for public-private partnerships. Although almost invisible on the surface, this has contributed significantly to the success of the MLPA process; it has eliminated the constraints of government contracting processes, and allowed for flexibility and responsiveness. |
## Gulf of California

### Overview
The Gulf of California is Mexico’s most productive fishing zone and an important habitat for a diversity of marine mammals, sea birds, fishes and plants, many of which are endemic and/or endangered. While much of the area has remained unspoiled, rapid changes to the ecosystem are also occurring from a variety of external pressures. The Gulf of California subprogram works to address environmental degradation while helping support sustainable economic development.

### Length of Program
11.5 years to date; Board approval 1999-2011

### Level of Funding
- $0.3M spent in 1999
- $1.6M spent in 2000
- $3.6M spent in 2001
- $3.3M spent each year in 2002-2003
- $3.1M spent in 2004
- $3.4M spent in 2005
- $3.8M spent in 2006
- $12M spent in 2007
- $3.8M spent each year in 2008-2009

### Number of Grants
- 125 ocean and coastal grants (2004 – Q1 2010)
- 25 OE grants (2005 – present)

### Goals
The goal of the Gulf of California subprogram is to assist Mexican business, civil society, and government in efforts to chart a course to sustainability that will conserve the region’s marine richness and productivity.

### Strategies Funded
- Assist in fisheries sustainability improvements and the conservation of marine resources in Marine Protected Areas and other marine management zones of conservation priority.
- Support Mexican efforts to reduce the environmental impact of the shrimp trawl fishery while maintaining or enhancing its economic benefits.
- Coastal habitat protection and monitoring through the maintenance of key coastal conservation sites.

### Scale
Regional: Northwest Mexico (including the entire Gulf of California and the Pacific side of Baja California); 54 key coastal conservation sites.

### Key Accomplishments
- Development of a well-informed and strong civil society movement in the region. Packard’s investments played a large role in pushing this forward; it has helped attract new donors to the region and supported the establishment of a network of MPAs that did not exist prior to foundation investment.
- Establishments of no-take zones has been driven by both “bottom-up” and “top-down” approaches (from local communities and stakeholders to federal government), increasing effectiveness, compliance and sustainability.
- Stopped the proposed large-scale development of Escalera Náutical, which included the creation or expansion of 22 marinas and associated tourism infrastructure.
- Long standing protection of Cabo Pulmo – after 14 years of conservation efforts, there is clear evidence of ecosystem and species recovery.

### Innovations
A multi-tiered approach to forwarding conservation efforts: the subprogram’s deliberate coordination and partnership with other funders has had profound impacts on the creation and implementation of a comprehensive strategic vision for the upper Gulf. Leveraging these alliances has opened opportunities for dialogue between sectors, and catalyzed change at a federal level by working with the government to get policies implemented in the region.
| **Overview** | Seabirds are some of the most threatened animals on earth, with 37% listed as threatened on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Similarly, 90% of North American Pacific coast shorebirds are declining in population. In an effort to positively impact seabird and shorebird populations, the Marine Birds subprogram works to address the primary threats contributing to the decline of these species. |
| **Length of Program** | Board formally approved a 10-year initiative in 2008, though grant-making began at a smaller scale in 2006 |
| **Level of Funding** | $1.52M spent in 2006; $2.9M spent in 2007; $4.7M spent in 2008; $3.6M spent in 2009 |
| **Number of Grants** | 27 ocean and coastal grants (2007 – Q1 2010); 3 OE grants (2005 – present) |
| **Goals** | The Marine Birds program seeks to stop or reverse the decline of threatened and endangered seabird and shorebird populations, particularly those that rely on coastal and island habitats in the eastern and central Pacific. |
| **Strategies Funded** | • Island restoration and increased breeding success through the eradication of introduced predators;  
• Bycatch mitigation and reduction of adult seabird mortality at sea  
• Shorebird habitat protection and monitoring |
| **Scale** | Community-Based to Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs)  
**Geographic range:**  
*Primary:* Pacific coast of North and South America, Polynesia and Micronesia  
*Secondary:* Caribbean, Atlantic and Indian oceans |
| **Key Accomplishments** | • Eradication efforts have far exceeded the original targets in number of islands restored and impacts to bird populations (initial data).  
• Three bycatch mitigation technologies have significantly progressed in development and testing due to Packard’s funding.  
• Stricter mandates for adherence to bycatch mitigation techniques have been adopted in Ecuador and Argentina.  
• Increase in the number of individuals trained and using newly acquired island restoration skills. |
| **Innovations** | • Influx of Packard funding to an area with typically little support has created the space for grantees to push the envelope with more experimental and creative eradication techniques.  
• In Washington and California, Packard is working with farmers to help change their view of shorebirds as benefit rather than a pest. Farmers, economists, and biologists are working together to show how the presence of shorebirds on farmland is mutually beneficial; it increases bird habitat, while reducing farmers’ costs. |
## Marine Fisheries

### Overview
Overfishing, destructive fishing practices and poor management are some of the most significant threats to ocean ecosystems. With a huge percentage of the world’s population relying on fisheries as a primary source of protein and livelihood, it is imperative that better fisheries practices be identified and utilized. The Marine Fisheries subprogram works to reduce fisheries pressures and promote sustainable marine management through market transformation, policy reform and building leadership for conservation.

### Length of Program
10.5 years to date; Board approval 1998-2011

### Level of Funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$13M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$10.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$8.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$8.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$11.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$19.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$20.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$17.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$11.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Grants
- 228 ocean and coastal grants (2004 – Q1 2010)
- 19 OE grants (2005 – present)

### Goals
To restore and maintain healthy, productive marine ecosystems capable of contributing to vigorous coastal communities and to economies, food systems, and communities beyond the coast; and to transform the aquaculture industry to protect fish populations and habitats by making sustainable aquaculture the norm for the global aquaculture industry.

### Strategies Funded
- Transformation of global seafood markets, aquaculture operations, and fishing practices by building demand for sustainable seafood.
- Strengthen fisheries and aquaculture management, habitat protections, and ocean conservation by reforming policies governing U.S. waters and selected international areas.

### Scale
Work is conducted at multiple geographic scales with a focus on domestic policy reforms at the federal, regional, and state levels along the West. A small portion of the portfolio supports international work.

### Key Accomplishments
- Arctic initiative hit its policy target to prevent the expansion of commercial fisheries north of the Bering Strait. The ban is supported by the fishing industry and reflects a science-based precautionary approach by limiting the additional stress imposed by fishing on Arctic ecosystems in light of global climate change. NGOs are advocating a similar approach be taken for oil and gas and shipping. It sets the stage for the U.S. to be an international leader in Arctic conservation.
- Packard funding has been a major catalyst in understanding shifts in markets (consumer and corporate). This work is helping build a set of tools and solutions that NGOs can use, rather than having a focus on just advocacy and science.
- Policy support: In 2005-2006, large bottom-trawling closure goes into effect on the West Coast. In 2006, the Magnuson-Stevens Act was amended to end overfishing. In 2010, the National Ocean Policy was established by executive order.

### Innovations
- Providing support for and promoting the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), to create a uniform and consistent standard for certifying environmentally responsible fisheries.
- Catalyzing the Sustainable Seafood movement and pushing forward seafood markets through coordinated efforts with NGOs (e.g., Conservation Alliance for Seafood Solutions).
- Bolstering sustainable seafood efforts through governance reform mechanisms, such as the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative (JOCI).
- Advocating adoption of precautionary measures that prevent expansion of fishing into areas not yet impacted by destructive fishing gear.
## Science

| Overview | Recognizing the importance reliable information for informed decision-making, and the belief that advances in science are critical to addressing the needs of society, the Science subprogram focuses on assessment, synthesis, and applied research in order to improve the use of scientific knowledge to meet critical conservation challenges. |
| Length of Program | 0.5 years to date; annual Board review (EBM program 2004-2009) |
| Level of Funding | $6M spent in 2004; $5M spent in 2005; $6M spent each year in 2006-2008; $2M spent in 2009 |
| Number of Grants | 152 ocean and coastal grants (2004 – Q1 2010); 22 OE grants (2005 – present) |
| Goals | The goal of the Science subprogram is to identify opportunities where the integration of science can help accelerate progress toward the Foundation’s conservation goals. |
| Strategies Funded | - Catalytic Science: provide timely, useful, and credible knowledge for important conservation policy considerations.  
- Bridging Mechanisms: support better utilization of science in decision-making through assessments and effective communications.  
- Policy and Institutional Reform: support the reform of policies and institutions to require evidence-based decision-making and to strengthen accountability.  
- Previously under EBM: Knowledge, tools and pilot projects to advance EBM in coastal and marine ecosystems. |
| Scale | Current implementation is generally at the state and regional scale. Geographically, the Science subprogram has been centered around project in the northern Gulf of California, coastal California and the Bay Delta, Oregon, and the Western Pacific. |
| Key Accomplishments | Under EBM Initiative:  
- Changing the concept of EBM: over the past decade, Packard has help to shift the concept of EBM as a complex link between natural and physical systems to one that now recognizes the importance and inextricable link between natural and human systems.  
- Development and application of tools to support decision making, such as Marine Map, Miradi, and Ecotrust’s EBM toolkit.  
Under new Science subprogram:  
- Now also manage PISCO, COMPASS, COS, and MBARI institutional grants. |
| Innovations | - Recognizing the importance of science integration and science-based decision-making: Science supports institutions including COMPASS, Aldo Leopold Leadership Program, COS and PISCO, that further science communications and bridge gaps between hard science and education/awareness.  
- Emphasis on user-driven science in current subprogram. |
The Western Pacific is home to the highest levels of coastal marine biodiversity and endemism on Earth. In addition, the majority of people living on the islands are concentrated in coastal areas. Growing populations, rising sea temperatures, coastal development and increasing pressures on the ecosystem are contributing to the critical need for effective and sustainable marine and coastal management in the region. To address these challenges, the Western Pacific subprogram works to increase the number and improve the management of marine protected areas, build individual skills for marine conservation, strengthen government effectiveness, and raise public awareness.

Length of Program: 10.5 years to date; Board approval 1998-2012


Number of Grants: 97 ocean and coastal grants (2004 –Q1 2010); 32 OE grants (2005 – present)

Goals: The goal of the Western Pacific subprogram is to support long-term conservation and responsible stewardship of critical coastal marine habitats and resources in the Western Pacific region. It helps people improve the knowledge, skills, and institutions needed to ensure biologically diverse marine ecosystems that are high functioning and contribute to healthy human communities.

Strategies Funded:
- Site-based conservation: create, expand, and improve the management of networks of representative marine protected areas.
- Skills exchange: substantially increase the number of individuals with skills to implement marine conservation.
- Public education and media: increase salience of marine threats in media and in school curricula.

Scale: Community-based Management: The subprogram focuses on six countries in the Western Pacific; Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, and Palau. Originally there were eight countries of focus, however, Malaysia and Philippines were phased out in 2002 and 2007, respectively.

Key Accomplishments:
- Packard has been one of the largest and most consistent donors for marine conservation in the Western Pacific region. It helped catalyze the whole Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA) and MPA movements, in terms of both the number of managed and protected areas, and in the strengthened capacity of individuals with skills to expand and sustain marine conservation efforts.
- Direct assistance by the subprogram’s core grant recipients has resulted in positive legislative changes for increasing enforcement, and stronger restrictions on fishing and resource harvest.
- Foundation activities have greatly contributed to overall community well-being, increased community cohesion and awareness, and marine resource education.
- The LMMA program has been hugely successful. It also catalyzed Fiji’s government to set aside 30% of coastal area for protection. This had a domino effect in the region with the announcement of the Micronesia Challenge (30% of coastal area under protected status, and 20% of terrestrial areas); with Indonesia’s decision to raise its MPA target to 20% of its territorial waters; and with the Caribbean committing to place 25% of both its coastal waters and terrestrial areas under protected status by 2020.

Innovations:
- Strong skills exchange program, including an organizational management component that is helping to give NGOs and others management tools and techniques that increase effectiveness.
- A focus on identifying which MPAs are particularly successful, and using that to build momentum for sustainable and effective programs, rather than viewing success solely as expansion and increasing the number of MPAs, has led to longer-term success and sustainability.
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### Appendix A: Informant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David and Lucile Packard Foundation Subprogram</th>
<th>Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Coast Marine Initiative</td>
<td>• Michael Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Robin Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>• Richard Cudney-Bueno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Birds</td>
<td>• Bernd Cordes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Fisheries Subprogram</td>
<td>• Heather Ludemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lisa Monzón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science - Formerly Ecosystem Based Management (EBM)</td>
<td>• Kai Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Pacific</td>
<td>• Bernd Cordes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pam Seeto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Science Program</td>
<td>• Walter Reid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants for Overarching Program Information</th>
<th>Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Program (Former)</td>
<td>• Jim Leape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of California Subprogram (Former)</td>
<td>• Sergio Knaebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Fisheries Subprogram (Former)</td>
<td>• Mike Sutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Survey Tool

SURVEY TOOL FOR OCEAN CONSERVATION FUNDING INITIATIVE
PACKARD SYNTHESIS MEMO SUBPROGRAMS

After reviewing case study documents, we will revise and tailor each interview to each organization, and informant. Below are questions to guide our interview.

Objectives of the Interview (for internal reference by [1 %6A417, ^A 142%]4,2):

- Identify and examine principles and/or criteria funders outline to guide strategies and portfolio level decision-making on whether or not to invest in an initiative.
- Identify what funders want to achieve and how they measure success and determine if initiatives are setting realistic goals and metrics of success.
- Identify successful and unsuccessful strategies.
- Identify preconditions and key elements during implementation for success.
- Identify barriers (barrier removal strategies) and lessons learned.
- Determine the appropriate scale of ocean conservation investment.
- Understand what role funding partnerships plan in initiatives.
- Identify internal operations, capacity and governance for successful grant-making.

Background

Historically, both bilateral and foundation donors focused on marine conservation have tended to develop their strategies and approaches through forward looking examinations of issues and opportunities. We now have a much richer ‘history’ of past strategies and initiatives that might better inform today’s strategic choices and design considerations. The purpose of the interviews we are conducting for this survey is to try to distill those lessons learned, key findings, successes and failures.

This interview is confidential, so any information you provide will not be affiliated with your name outside of this discussion and our data analysis.

Organizational Priorities and Reasoning for Entering and Exiting:

1. Could you provide a brief overview of Packard’s priorities in alignment with marine and coastal conservation?

   1a) What led to a decision to invest, or enter into, in an ocean related initiative?
1b) What led to a decision to exit out of an ocean conservation initiative?

Goals/Outcomes, Defining and Measuring Success:

2. What are the goals/outcomes of the subprogram?

2a) Are these realistic goals/outcomes and did Packard have realistic expectations of what could be achieved?

3. How does this subprogram define success?

4. How does it measure success?

5. What are the key achievements/outcomes of this subprogram?

Strategies:

6. What are the strategies utilized to achieve your goals?

6a) Are the strategies donor driven, or driven by the implementing organization?

6b) If donor driven, did this approach help/hurt the strategy’s success/failure?

7. Which of these strategies were most effective and helped to achieve the goals?

8. Which strategies, fell short, or did not contribute to achieving your stated goals/outcomes, and why?

Success and Barriers:

9. In general, what do you think are the preconditions for success in ocean conservation funding? For this subprogram?

10. What are (have been) the key ingredients, or essential elements to success, achieving goals/outcomes?

10a) How and why are certain aspects of the subprogram more effective than others? What could you as a funder have done differently, if anything?

11. Has this subprogram experienced any setbacks?

12. What have been the major barriers to success?

12a) What approach (is/was) needed to overcome those barriers?
13. **General Question**: In your opinion, how and why did certain initiatives or elements of an initiative not work as anticipated? What can funders do differently if anything?

13a) From this subprogram, what lessons learned can you share with us to ensure more effective investments in ocean conservation? Please be specific.

**Scale:**

14. **At what scale(s) is this subprogram investing? Why was this scale(s) selected?**

14a) In this subprogram, at what scale of investment resulted in success?

14b) In this subprogram, is there a scale of investment that was unsuccessful or may have hindered success or results?

**Partnership:**

15. **Are there multiple funders with similar goals as this subprogram?**

16. **Is/Was there a role of funding partnerships in this subprogram? If so, please describe it.**

16a) How was/is this partnership structured? Was/is this an effective structure? Are there things that could have made it more effective?

16b) Has this partnership contributed to results of the subprogram? If so how, why, please describe and explain your answer.

17. **General Questions**: Based on your experience and in your opinion, can one funder focusing on an issue or in a region have an impact?

17a) If there is government support and involvement could this change the level of impact? What if there is no government support? What if there a strong private funder partnership?

**Grant-making and Approach:**

18. What is unique to Packard’s approach to ocean conservation funding?

19. Has Packard conducted any strategic planning and/ or evaluation exercises over the course of this subprogram?

19a) If so, did you think they helped with the achievement of outcomes?
20. Did Packard and the subprogram have the right staff capacities and/or institutional structure to achieve its goals/outcomes? Please describe and explain response.

20a) Any operational or process aspects that you think were constraining or helping that are worth noting?

Awarded Grant Amount:

21. Is the amount of [INSERT NUMBER FROM DB] correct for the grants awarded to date in this Subprogram?

Overall – Packard Subprograms:

22. As an overall program (all ocean conservation related sub-programs), what have been the greatest successes?

23. As an overall program, what have been the biggest challenges?

24. Can you share any lessons learned?

Other:

25. Is there anything else you would like to share with us today to help inform this study?
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