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**1. Introduction**

The Foundation for Australia’s Most Endangered Species Ltd (FAME) financially supports a number of projects around Australia in keeping with its vision, mission and core values that underpin the organisation’s Constitution.

**Vision**

Our vision is to prevent any further extinction of Australian flora and fauna.

**Mission**

FAME is the only organisation dedicated to helping Australian species most at risk of extinction.

FAME seeks to fund on-ground conservation outcomes with a focus on seed-funding and innovation.

**Core Values**

* Commit to conservation and environmental issues
* Embrace open transparency at all times
* Display strong, clear corporate governance
* Maintain inclusiveness with all stakeholders and donors
* Respect the culture of Indigenous Australians

**2. Purpose – Project Funding Policy**

This policy is concerned with FAME’s grant application process.

FAME’s objective is to raise funds to invest in saving Australian native floral and faunal species from local, regional or national extinction. FAME develops partnerships with organisations with the capability to make a difference physically and hence every year FAME receives applications from such bodies with projects that need funding. The task of the FAME board is to select appropriate applications to fund from its scarce resources.

In assessing funding applications for projects, FAME will evaluate each project in light of the following criteria. Each criterion is equally and vitally important.

**3. Funding criteria**

* 1. **Does the project align with FAME’s vision, mission and core values?**

It is important both the project’s objectives and the applicant’s organisational goals align with those of FAME.

Does the project proposal come from a strong team of professionals with an effective leadership structure? FAME funds proposals from teams which have strong track records, effective leadership and strong networks, so that these proposals have greater chances of success.

* 1. **Project significance - does the project potentially help save a species or create awareness of threatened flora and fauna?**

Complications in assessment which may arise include the lack of a single purpose. For example, apart from saving a species locally, Project A might involve a cuddly species with high public appeal and may therefore enjoy potentially lucrative support from the public.

Project B, on the other hand, may be a project concerning a less-widely attractive species such as *Grevillea scortechinii*, which might have greater scientific merit and need. FAME will give highest weight to the likely more successful project based on the underlying science and the design and administration of the proposal (that is, its potential to save the species and yield collateral benefits if any) rather than its public appeal.

* 1. **Project demographics**

Where is the project situated? Does it align with key donors in the area? Does the outcome have an impact on a specific area, regional, state or all of Australia?

* 1. **Project outcomes**

Are there clear key performance indicators and tangible benefits with measurable outcomes for the project?

* 1. **Project Strategies**

Does the project use previously proven and widely-accepted methodologies? As FAME funding is a scarce resource, novel techniques, while they might prove to be effective, carry high risk of failure and the inefficient use of our resources. Thus, projects which include accepted methodologies have a higher potential success rate and greater potential funding efficiency.

For example, broad-scale suppression of predators has been shown to be more effective in the long-term than suppression in a number of smaller areas, as these smaller areas with their greater lengths of edges suffer from faster re-invasion. In addition, the selection of individuals of one sex or the other as the pioneer animals in a re-introduction program may be critically important in some species for long-term success.

* 1. **Project Innovation**

Does the project reflect sophisticated and comprehensive planning to try to ensure the effective use of funding? To try to protect FAME’s scarce resources, directors require project proposals to include evidence that planning has been meticulous. Planning is reflected in the level of detail in the proposal, the description of possible problems and the resolutions offered for those problems.

For example, even after broad-scale suppression of exotic predators/plants has been undertaken, there may still be a small population in an area. A well-planned project may then allocate some funding to destroy the final individuals when they are located.

* 1. **Project Sustainability**

How will the project be sustained after the funding period has concluded?

* 1. **Project Evaluation, both before commencement and after completion**
* Has a review committee evaluated the project and does it need and have ethics-committee approval?
* Does the project application demonstrate that the applicants have sought a ‘research and social licence’? That is, have they done an extensive literature review, have they assimilated relevant research and field results, have they sought local community support and/or funding?
* How will the project by evaluated and measured after completion and by whom?
  1. **Project Risks**

Are there any risks, either environmental or inherent to the species, which have high potential to endanger the long-term success of the project regardless of short-term success? If these risks cannot practicably be controlled, the project will not be undertaken..

Examples of these types of risks which should be considered are:

* Climate change (e.g. a currently cool area becoming too warm to sustain the species)
* Change in government policy (e.g selling a stock route)
* Narrow gene pool jeopardising long-term survival.

Does the project (involving fauna) take into account physical risks to individual native animals and include actions to reduce risks? FAME aims to act ethically, and such animals have ethical standing. Hence, FAME will not fund a project where the application does not reflect consideration of physical risks to native animals and mitigation where they exist.

* 1. Other Issues
* If there is likely to be intellectual property generated by the project, who will own it?
* How will FAME’s contribution be acknowledged and promoted?
* Are there any political risks attached to the project?

1. **Corresponding documentation**

The Project Funding Policy corresponds with the Project Grant Application document and process and should be considered in conjunction with this document.

1. **Frequency**

Grants will be tabled at Board meetings in April, July and November. Should a grant be approved, monetary distribution will be at the discretion of the Board.

1. **Reporting**

The CEO will report to the Board of grant rounds and applications received.

1. **Responsibility**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CEO | Responsibility to scope and coordinate grants to be tabled at relevant Board meetings. |

1. **Review of Policy**

The policy will be reviewed annually.

1. **Policy History**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Revisions to Policy |  |
| Date Approved | May 2017  FAME Board |
| Policy Created | January 2017 |

*(FAME acknowledges with thanks the input of Dr David Peacock to the drafting of this policy).*