



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Effectively mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into government policy and private sector practice; piloting sustainability models to take the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to scale		
Country(ies):	Global (including Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, China, DR Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lao PDR, Malawi, Mozambique, Myanmar, Paraguay, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe)	GEF Project ID:	5735
GEF Agency(ies):	Conservation International	GEF Agency Project ID:	5735
Other Executing Partner(s):	Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund	Submission Date:	Feb 5, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (months):	60
Name of parent programme:	N/A	Agency Fee:	882,000

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	<p>Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management.</p>	<p>Output 1.1. New protected areas (five) and coverage (50,000 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.</p> <p>Output 1.2. New protected areas (five) and coverage (50,000 hectares) of unprotected threatened species (five).</p> <p>Output 1.3. Sustainable financing plans (three).</p>	GEF TF	1,862,000	15,349,797
BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	<p>Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.</p>	<p>Output 2.1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (three) for production sectors.</p> <p>Output 2.2. National and sub-national land-use plans (three) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.</p> <p>Output 2.3. Certified production landscapes and seascapes (1,000,000 hectares).</p>	GEF TF	7,448,000	61,399,188
Project management cost			GEF TF	490,000	7,751,015
Total project costs				9,800,000	84,500,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To demonstrate innovative tools, methodologies and investments, and build related capacities, through which civil society in three pilot biodiversity hotspots (in partnership with local and national public and private sectors) can cost-effectively conserve biodiversity and progress towards long-term institutional sustainability, and to replicate demonstrated approaches in nine additional hotspots						
Project Component	Grant Type¹	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Developing long-term conservation visions, financing plans and associated strategies for biodiversity hotspots	TA	<p>1.1 Long-term conservation visions developed for the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots, with participation of civil society, government, donor and private sector actors.</p> <p>Targets:</p> <p>1. 3 long-term visions incorporating resource mobilization strategies that support the mobilization of new funding, and policy targets addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss and guiding the development of new policy demonstration models.</p> <p>2. 3 hotspots with clear targets for graduation from CEPF support.</p> <p>3. 10 civil society, government, donor and/or private sector actors endorse the long-term visions.</p>	<p>1.1.1 Targets for civil society capacity building set for 3 pilot hotspots.</p> <p>1.1.2 Three financing plans describing the funding and projections defined for implementation of the long-term conservation visions.</p> <p>1.1.3 Sector and/or development policy targets for addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss set in three pilot hotspots.</p> <p>1.1.4 Strategies for engagement with private sector actors for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into business practices of industries driving biodiversity loss completed for three pilot hotspots.</p>	GEFTF	0	3,000,000
Component 2: Ensuring the financial and institutional sustainability of multi-sector conservation programs.	TA	<p>2.1 Increased capacity and credibility of conservation-focused civil societies in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots.</p> <p>Targets:</p> <p>1. 3 pilot hotspots show at least 20% improvement in collective civil society capacity tracking tool scores.</p>	<p>2.1.1 Long-term institutional structures in place for each of the 3 pilot hotspots.</p> <p>2.1.2 Civil societies in the 3 pilot hotspots with sufficient organizational and technical capacity for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p>	GEFTF	2,524,595	18,314,655

¹ TA includes capacity building, and research and development.

		<p>2. 60 CEPF grantees, including 5 Indigenous People's organizations and 5 women's groups, show at least 10% improvement in civil society tracking tool scores.</p> <p>3. 30 CEPF grantees show at least 20% improvement in gender mainstreaming tracking tool scores.</p> <p>2.2 Increased and more sustained financial flows to civil societies engaged in the conservation of biodiversity, from diverse sources, including non-traditional sources.</p> <p>Targets: 1. \$20 million available in sustainable financing mechanisms supporting priorities in long-term conservation visions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5 million in sustainable financing mechanisms from non-traditional sources (e.g. private sector, new economic and financial instruments, etc.); • \$2 million in conservation finance generated by innovative private sector models. 	<p>2.2.1 Three regional resource mobilization strategies developed to generate additional revenue for conservation programs in the 3 pilot hotspots.</p> <p>2.2.2 At least 2 innovative models for private sector conservation finance, such as biodiversity offsets, demonstrated in the pilot hotspots.</p>			
<p>Component 3: Amplifying the impacts of CEPF investments through enhanced and innovative public and private sector partnerships.</p>	TA	<p>3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane, and Indo-Burma Hotspots.</p> <p>Targets: 1. 1 million hectares of production landscapes demonstrate effective</p>	<p>3.1.1 At least 6 policies, programs or plans incorporate results of policy demonstration models addressing drivers of biodiversity loss in the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>3.1.2 At least 12 biodiversity-friendly management practices incorporated into the business practices of key change agents in the agriculture, energy,</p>	GEFTF	5,812,179	18,314,655

		<p>ways of mainstreaming biodiversity.</p> <p>2. 20 protected areas with new management models featuring direct participation of civil society organizations or indigenous and local communities show improvements in SP1 METT scores.</p> <p>3. 20 globally threatened species with reduced threats to their populations through mainstreaming of biodiversity into production landscapes and/or implementation of new protected area models.</p> <p>4. 6 conservation corridors with enhanced ecological connectivity through the incorporation of financial incentives into policy and the adoption of biodiversity-friendly management practices by private companies.</p> <p>5. 250 indigenous and local communities with increased, gender-equitable access to ecosystem services.</p> <p>6. 25,000 women and 25,000 men, with direct socio-economic benefits.</p> <p>7. 125,000 women and 125,000 men with indirect socio-economic benefits</p>	<p>mining and other sectors.</p> <p>3.1.3 New management models involving direct participation of CSOs or indigenous and local communities are introduced at 20 protected areas</p>			
<p>Component 4: Replicating success through knowledge products and tools.</p>	TA	<p>4.1 CEPF investments in other hotspots strengthened through the adoption of successful models and tools developed in the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Targets:</p> <p>1. 9 additional hotspots with long-term implementation structures.</p> <p>2. 9 additional hotspots with regional resource mobilization strategies.</p>	<p>4.1.1 Long-term implementation structures incorporating experiences from the pilot hotspots in place in at least 9 other biodiversity hotspots where CEPF invests.</p> <p>4.1.2 Regional resource mobilization strategies incorporate lessons learned to supplement global resources and better</p>	GEFTF	973,226	37,119,675

		<p>3. 2 successful policy demonstration models adopted in at least one additional hotspot.</p> <p>4. 2 management best practices adopted in at least one additional hotspot.</p>	<p>align resources with regional funders to achieve long-term sustainability in at least 9 other biodiversity hotspots where CEPF invests.</p> <p>4.1.3 At least 2 countries in other biodiversity hotspots adopt successful policy demonstration models from the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>4.1.4 At least 2 countries in other biodiversity hotspots replicate management practices for mainstreaming biodiversity through innovative partnerships of civil society and private sector.</p>				
		<p>4.2 Models, tools and best practices developed under the project are widely available and inform other actors developing public-private partnerships for biodiversity conservation globally.</p> <p>Targets: 1. 3 models, tools and best practices developed under the project adopted by conservation practitioners in areas outside CEPF investments.</p>	<p>4.2.1 At least 6 innovative knowledge products documenting models, tools and best practices developed under the project, including at least 1 related to gender mainstreaming and at least 1 related to Indigenous People and conservation, made publicly available through the CEPF website or other innovative means as appropriate.</p>				
		Subtotal				9,310,000	76,748,985
		Project Management Cost (PMC) ²			GEFTF	490,000	7,751,015
		Total Project Cost				9,800,000	84,500,000

² To be calculated as percentage of subtotal.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	Conservation International	Cash	14,000,000
Multilateral Agency	European Union	Cash	19,207,285
Government	Government of Japan	Cash	14,813,000
Other	Helmsley Foundation	Cash	900,000
Other	MacArthur Foundation	Cash	11,850,000
Other	Margaret A. Cargill Foundation	Cash	15,000,000
Other	MAVA Foundation	Cash	1,129,715
Multilateral Agency	World Bank	Cash	7,600,000
Total Co-financing			84,500,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name	In US\$		
				Project amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
CI	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	9,800,000	882,000	10,682,000
Total GEF Resources:				9,800,000	882,000	10,682,000

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	350,000	0	350,000
National/Local Consultants	0	0	0

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

1. The project design is consistent with the original PIF; there have been no significant changes with regard to alignment with national strategies and plans, or reports and assessments under relevant conventions.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

2. The project design is consistent with the original PIF; there have been no significant changes with regard to alignment with GEF focal areas, strategies, eligibility criteria or priorities.

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

3. The project design is consistent with the original PIF; there have been no significant changes with regard to the GEF Agency’s comparative advantage.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

4. The project design is consistent with the original PIF; there have been no significant changes with regard to the baseline project and the problem it seeks to address.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

Baseline scenario:

5. The baseline scenario is consistent with that in the original PIF, insofar as there have been no substantive changes to the underlying situation in the three pilot hotspots or with regard to the status of CEPF as a funding mechanism. In all three hotspots, there have been only incremental changes to the enabling environment for biodiversity conservation and the operating context for civil society organizations (CSOs). At the same time, the level of knowledge about baseline conditions in the Cerrado and the scope of CEPF's future grant making there has increased through the stakeholder consultation process to prepare an ecosystem profile for the hotspot, which was conducted in parallel to the PPG. Nevertheless, the actual baseline scenario presented in the ProDoc has been reformulated from that in the PIF, to provide a more linear analysis of the problem addressed by the project, which corresponds more closely to the proposed alternative scenario.
6. In the PIF, the baseline scenario is presented separately for each pilot hotspot. In the ProDoc, the common elements of the baseline scenarios for the three hotspots are combined into a single global analysis. These include elements that are strongly emphasized in the PIF, such as the recognition of unsustainable growth models as a driver of biodiversity loss in the hotspots, as well as elements that are reinforced in the ProDoc, such as the analysis of the limitations of civil society. Moreover, the analysis of persisting challenges under the baseline scenario contains three challenges identified in the PIF plus two additional ones that were added during the PPG stage: lack of adequate financial resources to address global conservation priorities; and difficulties in monitoring progress. The restructured baseline scenario is summarized below.
7. As the global economy grows and, with it, the rate of consumption of natural resources, anthropogenic pressures on ecosystems are increasing, jeopardizing the provision of essential ecosystem services and fuelling the biodiversity crisis, with extinction rates as much as 1,000 times higher than background levels.
8. Over the last century, establishment of protected areas has been the central strategy to respond to biodiversity loss in most countries of the world. While they have made demonstrated contributions to slowing and, even, reversing biodiversity loss in many places, protected areas are often undermined by land-use changes in surrounding production landscapes, or by incompatible developments within their boundaries.
9. Hence, biodiversity mainstreaming has emerged as a new conservation paradigm, with the idea being that integrating conservation goals into the plans, policies and practices of public and private sector actors can minimize pressures on protected areas and promote conservation of biodiversity in production landscapes beyond their boundaries. Biodiversity mainstreaming is central to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, being the focus of Strategic Goal A: "Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society".
10. Civil society can be an important partner for government and private sector, bringing global experience and good practice, transferring skills and knowledge, catalyzing innovation, brokering partnerships, and ensuring benefit sharing with local people. However, levels of capacity, awareness and financing among civil society organizations are insufficient to effectively integrate the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into policy and business practices. As a result, they are typically under-utilized, under-valued and under-financed.
11. Without the present project, biodiversity hotspots around the world would continue to be characterized by growth that relies on the unsustainable exploitation of natural capital, in which renewable resources are treated as if they were non-renewable. For many businesses operating in hotspots, this kind of short-term thinking would continue to predominate. Governmental policy frameworks would further enable this way of thinking and of acting. Growth would continue to be associated with local, national and global environmental damages.
12. One important reason why such trends would continue in so many parts of the world is the persistent relative weakness of civil society and its representative organizations, CSOs. Such organizations have a critical role and responsibility to represent the wider public interest, particularly with respect to ensuring the continuing supply of ecosystem goods and services and conserving biodiversity. These goods and services play an important role in food security, poverty alleviation and overall equity. To the extent that civil society lacks representation, or to the extent that its representatives lack power, including convening power, its interests will tend to lose out in the political process to the more concentrated and focused leverage brought to bear by the private sector.
13. Key persisting challenges under the baseline scenario would include the following:
 - Local civil society groups dedicated to global conservation priorities would lack sufficient organizational and technical capacity to act as effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development: Under the baseline scenario, within most of the world's hotspots, institutional constraints would persist, including an absence of long-term implementation structures at the hotspot level. This is an issue for all

hotspots but perhaps particularly so for the many multi-country hotspots. In both cases, long-term problems would not be responded to by organizations or networks of organizations with similarly long-term perspectives. In addition to a lack of hotspot-level institutional capacity, under the baseline scenario there would also remain significant capacity gaps at local and national levels. The greatest capacity constraints for domestic CSOs would be human and, especially, financial resources. Local and grassroots CSOs would continue to lack strong project planning, monitoring, and financial reporting capacities.

- Adequate financial resources would be lacking to address global conservation priorities: A range of finance-related barriers would persist under the baseline scenario. Among the most significant would be the limited ability of civil society actors to tap into potential non-traditional sources of financing for conservation. Several areas in particular appear to offer substantial, yet largely untapped, opportunities for financing civil society conservation actions. Particularly in the multi-country hotspots, the challenge of gaining a broad perspective on conservation financing, and planning accordingly, would remain significant.
- CSO impacts on public policies and on private sector business practices would be limited, and those policies and practices would continue in many cases to undermine biodiversity conservation efforts: The capacity of civil society in hotspots to engage in partnerships with public and private sector entities—including partnerships aimed at encouraging the emergence of a more environmentally and socially equitable legal and regulatory environment—would remain limited under the baseline scenario. CSOs would continue to work among themselves or directly with local communities, and relationships with government and, especially, private sector, would remain poorly developed. Difficult governance regimes, which in some cases have prevented CSOs from engaging in public policy making and/or implementation processes, make this challenge a greater one.
- Limited knowledge, awareness or application/replication of successful approaches: In cases where successful experience was gained, CSOs would lack the capacity to capture and document lessons as an evidence base to support proposed strategies or models. As a result, broader uptake or amplification of lessons by government or the private sector—such as within the legal environment for conservation, enforcement, and education and training systems—would remain opportunistic and limited. In addition, work within individual hotspots would tend to proceed in relative isolation, and successful approaches might not readily be captured and shared among remaining hotspots.
- Difficulties in monitoring progress: Under the baseline scenario, hotspots would lack detailed long-term visions and donors would not have a systematic means of measuring the progress of civil society within a hotspot towards a point where it becomes self-sustaining. Effective monitoring is difficult if not impossible without a clear set of criteria according to which the achievement of targeted conditions may be assessed. In the absence of a vision and criteria tailored to the reality of each hotspot, and associated monitoring, it would remain difficult to systematically measure progress towards, and eventual achievement of, hotspot level goals related to enhanced capacities and reduced levels of biodiversity loss.

14. From a biodiversity perspective, the above situation is perhaps most critical in landscapes that include KBAs. Here, in addition to well known failures to manage protected areas effectively, land use and development patterns within the broader landscape remain strongly linked to deforestation, land degradation and unsustainable use of resources. At the same time, governmental policy frameworks remain insufficient to counter these trends and are, in many cases, facilitating them. Overall therefore, these processes are having severe effects on the resiliency of critical ecosystems and unquantified impacts on the myriad threatened and endemic species supported by them, not to mention the hundreds of millions of people who depend on the ecosystem services they provide. .

15. In light of the above, and the concomitant and relentless pressures of economic activities and human populations within the hotspots, it seems inevitable that, under the baseline scenario, biodiversity would continue to decline rapidly within most hotspots. With the added and increasing ecological pressures associated with climate change, the pace of such losses could easily be expected to increase compared with the recent past, with irreversible losses, not only in terms of species extinctions but more broadly through loss of the long-term viability of critical ecosystems and KBAs.

16. Clearly, achieving conservation and sustainable use within the hotspots going forward will require widespread change within the overall nexus of policy, private sector practice and CSO participation. However, the kind of change that is required need not take place everywhere at once. Examples and demonstrations of shared prosperity are urgently needed. Such examples are best implemented at the level of landscapes, where key strategic elements can be identified that can help leverage a more sustainable development path. Absent the present project, such examples will remain rare and those that do exist would be poorly known and their lessons inadequately disseminated.

Alternative scenario:

17. Under the alternative scenario, biodiversity conservation will be more effectively mainstreamed into government policy and private sector practice in three pilot biodiversity hotspots through civil society. In particular, for the pilot hotspots, incremental funding will lead to the development and implementation of long-term conservation visions and the establishment of long-term implementation structures that will increase the capacity of civil society by at least 20 percent at the conservation community level and 10 percent at the level of individual organizations. The long-term visions will incorporate resource mobilization strategies that will support the mobilization of \$20 million in new funding, including \$5 million from non-traditional sources and \$2 million from innovative private sector models. The visions will also set policy targets addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss and guiding the development of new policy demonstration models (e.g., in agriculture, fisheries, energy, etc.). These demonstration models will be then rolled into six policies, programs or plans, amplifying effective conservation approaches and addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss. Additionally, new tools and approaches for mainstreaming biodiversity into business practices will be developed and implemented, leading to the incorporation of at least 12 biodiversity-friendly management practices by key agents in the agriculture, energy, mining and other sectors responsible for production of energy and key commodities, such as soybeans, cattle, palm oil, rubber, tea and coffee.
18. These innovative partnerships between civil society and public and private sector actors will impact the management of production landscapes covering at least one million hectares, by promoting a mosaic of land uses consistent with maintenance of biodiversity at the landscape scale, including new models of protected area management in at least 20 sites and financial incentives to maintain ecological connectivity within at least six conservation corridors. This will allow at least 20 local and indigenous communities to benefit from increased gender-equitable access to ecosystem services, particularly provisioning services, through demonstration and amplification of community fisheries, community forests and other community-based natural resource management models.
19. The project will be delivered through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), which was established in 2000 as a mechanism to enable CSOs to support conservation of critical ecosystems within biodiversity hotspots. Over the past 15 years, CEPF has become a well established grant-making facility, positioning itself as the only global fund exclusively targeting civil society to conserve biodiversity in hotspots. As of 2014, CEPF had granted more than USD 175 million to over 1,900 grantees in more than 89 countries and territories within 22 biodiversity hotspots. These grants helped to establish some 13 million hectares of protected areas and strengthened the management of biodiversity within 6 million hectares within production landscapes.
20. Independent evaluations have concluded that CEPF is a key, and largely irreplaceable, source of global funding and other support to CSOs engaged in biodiversity conservation. For instance, the World Bank's 2011 mid-term evaluation of the GEF's contribution found CEPF to have been successful at engaging a wide range of private, non-governmental and community institutions to support nations in addressing conservation needs through coordinated regional efforts. The convergence of these factors not only reinforced the rationale for CEPF itself but strongly suggested a need to expand the reach and capacities that the fund has developed in terms of both duration and scale. To this end, in 2014, CEPF's donors approved a strategic framework for a third phase of the fund, until 2020.
21. Although CEPF is beginning to deliver on its third phase strategy, the development of innovative models for effectively mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into government policies and private sector practices is still an area that needs dedicated support and attention in order to be rolled out effectively to all hotspots where CEPF invests. The GEF project will allow CEPF to jumpstart the development of innovative models for effective mainstreaming through public policy and business practices in a way that contributes critically to the transformation of CEPF, an institution that already delivers long-lasting conservation impact, into a global leader in reversing biodiversity loss.
22. In this way, the GEF project will form a vital bridge between the second and third phases of CEPF, which envisions a scaled-up and strengthened fund able to have a transformational impact, building on over 13 years of experience operating in CEPF's unique niche: empowering local actors to address global conservation priorities cost-effectively.

Specifically, the project will enable the introduction of a suite of new and refined approaches, including a significantly enhanced focus on partnerships between CSOs and both private and public sector partners. These approaches will be piloted in three priority hotspots, with lessons learned carefully assessed and integrated into a process of replication across nine other hotspots where CEPF works. For instance, the project will support the development of long-term visions to guide support for the emergence of credible, effective and well resourced civil societies. These visions will incorporate resource mobilization strategies targeting non-traditional as well as traditional sources of conservation funding. In addition, the project will support the transition from the existing RIT model to a new model of long-term implementation structure, able to provide continuing coordination, technical support and resources to civil society in a hotspot beyond the end of the project and, eventually, the withdrawal of CEPF support.

Global environmental benefits:

23. CEPF investments are focused in the biodiversity hotspots (Earth's most biologically important yet threatened regions), which provide essential ecosystem services to local and global populations. The project will focus on delivering biodiversity benefits by implementing new models for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, with a particular emphasis on production landscapes outside protected areas. These models will be demonstrated within three pilot hotspots through incorporation into the business practices of private sector actors with large biodiversity footprints, and replicated in other hotspots where CEPF works. Pressures from development sectors and key drivers of biodiversity loss that threaten to undermine site-level conservation actions will be mitigated through integration of biodiversity conservation into policies, plans and programs with government agencies and through support for enhanced private sector business practices. Lessons learned from work in the three pilot hotspots will be captured, adapted and replicated within nine additional hotspots, thereby multiplying their impacts.
24. Using CEPF's newly refined set of grant-making modalities (see Appendix XI of the project document), the project will deliver global benefits through a set of carefully selected grants to partner CSOs within three pilot and nine replication hotspots. Work implemented through these grants will generate biodiversity benefits by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and, thereby, reducing habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation within connective, productive landscapes totaling at least one million hectares. Additional grants will help to strengthen the management of, improve financing for, and/or reduce threats to, an estimated 20 protected areas within the three pilot hotspots alone.
25. The precise locations where the above benefits will be generated depend on the breakdown of CSO grants that will be awarded. However, CEPF's methodology provides useful guidance in this respect. Thus, ecosystem profiles prepared with the support of CEPF have identified and mapped out 1,586 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and 93 conservation corridors within the three pilot hotspots. These are among the highest priority conservation areas in the world, containing hundreds of globally threatened species and millions of hectares of critical ecosystems. This work constitutes an unparalleled macro-level knowledge basis and tool for prioritization of conservation support—and generation of biodiversity benefits—within the hotspots.
26. In addition to the above profiles, CEPF will rely on its extensive network of CSO partners, especially its Regional Implementation Teams (RITs), to help guide its investments, based on short- and medium-term changes in circumstances and opportunities related to threats, policies, plans and investments (both conservation-related as well as commercial ones). CEPF's efforts to broaden its own and its partners' relations with both governmental and private sectors partners will further enhance the reliability and timeliness of such information. These arrangements will enable CEPF and its partners to take advantage of opportunities and respond to emerging threats as appropriate.
27. The project design thus balances the need for flexibility (to take advantage of opportunities and create space for innovation) and the need for control over the development of the grant portfolio, with the aim of ensuring that individual grants are both accountable for their results and contributing to a larger strategically defined whole.
28. The project will also deliver co-benefits in other GEF Focal Areas, including climate change mitigation (by promoting management practices that enhance carbon stocks and minimize conversion of forest within production landscapes), international waters (by promoting practices that lead to reduced pollution load in the Mekong River and international lakes in the Albertine Rift Valley), land degradation (by promoting sustainable land-use practices in production landscapes), persistent organic pollutants (by promoting practices that reduce pollution of land and water) and sustainable forest management/REDD+ (by promoting sustainable forest management in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot).
29. During the PPG, the CEPF team has further refined the target biodiversity benefits expected to arise from the project's support within the three pilot hotspots. These targets have been informed by the identified priorities in the respective ecosystem profiles and long-term visions, as well as by an analysis of the capacities and missions of the civil society

organizations likely to be recipients of grants under the project. They are described below according to the relevant quantitative targets.

ONE MILLION HECTARES OF PRODUCTIVE LANDSCAPES EFFECTIVELY MAINSTREAMING BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE

30. Approximately half of this area is expected to be within the Cerrado hotspot. Here, grants to CSOs will emphasize mainstreaming of biodiversity into the agriculture sector. The remaining approximately 500,000 hectares will be located within KBAs and priority corridors in the Eastern Afrotropical and Indo Burma hotspots, including the Mekong River and Major Tributaries, the Northern Lake Nyassa Catchments, and the Tonle Sap and Inundation Zone corridors. These will include areas threatened by industrial agriculture, hydropower development, oil and gas exploration, and over-fishing. Mainstreaming efforts will include catalyzing partnerships among local CSOs and private sector and relevant governmental partners in areas such as eco-labeling, commodity certification, biodiversity offsets, participatory land-use planning, and zoning regulations. These efforts will help to avoid loss and/or encourage restoration of natural habitats within at least six conservation corridors across the one million hectares of productive landscapes. Together, these efforts will help to increase the viability of species populations and delivery of critical ecosystem services, while reducing rates of fragmentation, enhanced resiliency and improving ecological connectivity at the landscape scale.

STRENGTHENED MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCED SUSTAINABILITY OF 20 PROTECTED AREAS WITHIN KBAS

31. New management models featuring direct participation of CSOs or indigenous and local communities will be introduced into 20 protected areas within KBAs. Work enabled by CEPF grants will strengthen the management effectiveness (as measured by the SP1 METT) and financial sustainability of these areas, while generating biodiversity benefits by reducing encroachment, illegal hunting of wildlife and other threats. Participatory models will be introduced for conventional protected areas, giving local stakeholders an enhanced role and voice in protected area management and governance. These will be complemented by testing new conservation area models, including ones planned, established and managed by communities, CSOs and/or private land owners. These approaches will ensure greater ownership of protected areas by local stakeholders, thereby enhancing the sustainability of these models.

REDUCED THREATS TO POPULATIONS OF 20 GLOBALLY THREATENED SPECIES

32. Together, the aforementioned work on mainstreaming and new models for protected area management will help reduce threats to populations of at least 20 globally threatened species, especially landscape species that rely on production landscapes outside protected areas for some or all of their lifecycles. While the species in question will depend on the exact breakdown of landscapes and grants,³ they may include some or all of the following: giant anteater (*Myrmecophaga tridactyla*, VU) in the Cerrado, Ethiopian wolf (*Canis simensis*, EN) in the Eastern Afrotropical, and Bengal florican (*Houbaropsis bengalensis*, CR) in Indo-Burma, as well as charismatic flagship species, such as the giant armadillo (*Priodontes maximus*, EN), mountain gorilla (*Gorilla beringei beringei*, CR), Irrawaddy dolphin (*Orcaella brevirostris*, VU) and saola (*Pseudoryx nghetinhensis*, CR).

Changes since the PIF:

33. There have been no substantive changes to the design of the project from what was presented in the PIF. Such changes as have been made to the project results framework have been to clarify the purpose of the project, and to clarify and supplement the targets, to capture more fully the various results that the project is expected to deliver.

34. In comparison to the PIF, the objective definition has been modified during the project preparation phase to emphasize the essential purpose of the project as being to *demonstrate* innovative tools, methodologies and investments, and to capture other elements of the project that were not included in the original definition, namely the emphasis on *building capacity*, demonstrating *cost-effective* approaches to biodiversity conservation, and advancing *long-term institutional sustainability* for civil society engaged in conservation. The modified objective definition also quantifies (as nine) the number of additional hotspots where approaches demonstrated under the project will be replicated, which was left unspecified in the original definition. This number was informed by an elaboration of the business plan for the third phase of CEPF, undertaken in parallel to the PPG.

³ As a result, the final list of benefitting species will emerge and be reported on over the course of project implementation.

35. The wording of Component 1 has also been changed slightly to add associated strategies (“Developing long-term conservation visions, financing plans *and associated strategies* for biodiversity hotspots”), in recognition of the fact that, in addition to long-term conservation visions and financing plans for their implementation, this component involves the development of strategies for engagement with private sector actors for mainstreaming biodiversity into their business practices.
36. An additional target has been added under Outcome 1.1 (“3 long-term visions incorporating resource mobilization strategies and policy targets”), in order to create a comprehensive set of targets that captures the actual preparation of the long-term vision documents, as well as their endorsement.
37. An additional target has been added under Outcome 2.1 (“Number of CEPF grantees that show at least 20% improvement in gender mainstreaming tracking tool scores”), while an existing target has been modified (“60 grantees, including at least 5 Indigenous People’s organizations and 5 women’s groups, with 10% improvement over duration of project”), in response to a request from the GEF Secretariat to revise and incorporate gender-responsive indicators in the project framework.
38. The wording of Output 2.1.1 has been changed to standardize the terminology for long-term implementation structures (“Long-term implementation structures in place for each of the 3 pilot hotspots”), which were referred to variously as “long-term implementation structures”, “regional implementation structures” and “regional institutional structures” in different places in the PIF.
39. A more ambitious target has been set for Outcome 3.1, committing to 20 rather than 10 protected areas with new management models featuring direct participation of civil society organizations or indigenous and local communities that show improvements in SP1 METT scores. This target was informed by projections of the potential grant portfolios in the three pilot hotspots prepared during the PPG.
40. Three additional targets have been set for Outcome 3.1, to capture better the range of results anticipated under this outcome, and in response to a request from the GEF Secretariat to incorporate expected human well-being benefits in the project framework. Specifically, targets have been set that 20 globally threatened species will have reduced threats to their populations through mainstreaming of biodiversity into production landscapes and/or implementation of new protected area models, that 25,000 women and 25,000 men will receive direct socio-economic benefits through increased income, food security, resource rights or other measures of human wellbeing, and that 125,000 women and 125,000 men will receive indirect socio-economic benefits through enhanced and more secure delivery of ecosystem services. Again, these targets were informed by projections of the potential grant portfolios in the three pilot hotspots prepared during the PPG.
41. An additional output has been added under Component 3 (Output 3.1.3 “New management models involving direct participation of CSOs or indigenous and local communities are introduced at 20 protected areas”), in order to capture an important cluster of results anticipated under this component related to demonstration of innovative models for protected area management suitable for wider replication.
42. Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, which were not quantified in the PIF are now quantified in the ProDoc. Other than this change, the wording of these outputs remains the same. In both cases, the number of additional hotspots where innovations demonstrated in the three pilot hotspots will be replicated is set at nine. As in the case of the objective definition, this number was informed by an elaboration of the business plan for the third phase of CEPF, undertaken in parallel to the PPG.
43. Finally, Output 4.2.1 has been modified, to set an explicit target for the number of knowledge products that will be related to gender mainstreaming and/or Indigenous People and conservation. This change was made in response to a request from the GEF Secretariat to revise and incorporate gender-responsive indicators in the project framework and to incorporate concrete targets relating to Indigenous People.

System boundary:

44. The project focuses on the following pilot biodiversity hotspots:
 - (i) *The Cerrado biodiversity hotspot* is the most extensive woodland-savanna in South America. Of the more than 10,000 plant species found in the Cerrado, 4,400 are endemic, while 16 globally threatened species of birds, mammals and amphibians are endemic to the hotspot.
 - (ii) *The Eastern Afromontane biodiversity hotspot* comprises a discontinuous and divided chain of roughly four ranges of mountains extending from Saudi Arabia and Yemen down to Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Of the

10,856 species identified in the Eastern Afromontane, almost one third are endemic, including more than 2,350 endemic plants.

- (iii) *The Indo-Burma hotspot* encompasses numerous mountain ranges and several of Asia's largest rivers. The hotspot has extraordinarily high plant species richness with an estimated 15,000 to 25,000 species of vascular plant. It hosts more than 400 mammal species, 1,200 bird species and extraordinary numbers of freshwater fish.

Long-term sustainability:

45. The strategy for ensuring sustainability of the on-the-ground results of the project remains essentially unchanged from that presented in the PIF. Sustainability of the project is integral to the proposed components. The challenges to achieving sustainability are two-fold: first, lack of effective models for mainstreaming of biodiversity into public policy and private sector practices; and, second, lack of appropriate resource mobilization to support the conservation of biodiversity and the actions of civil society towards that goal. The project proposes to overcome these two challenges by creating a more favorable enabling environment by leveling the field for CSOs, so that they can more effectively advise, support and innovate with government agencies and private sector companies, resulting in policies and business practices that more effectively mainstream biodiversity. The development of public-private partnerships engrained in long-term visions of sustainability will allow civil society to play the role of innovator, influencer and adviser to government agencies and private sector companies, facilitating the emergence of more sustainable economies in areas that harbor globally significant biodiversity and critical ecosystems.
46. In terms of financial resources, the project proposes to develop long-term funding plans that identify traditional and non-traditional sources of funding, and to test models of non-conventional funding mechanisms that can be amplified within the three pilot hotspots and exported to other hotspots. The result of this will be greater availability of financial resources to continue to conserve critical ecosystems and ensure the provision of goods and services for human well-being.
47. The project includes a dedicated component on documenting successful models and tools demonstrated in the pilot hotspots, and facilitating wider replication by other conservation actors globally. There will be a particular focus on other hotspots where CEPF is active, including the Tropical Andes, Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands, the Guinean Forests of West Africa, and Wallacea, as well as new hotspots, such as the Mountains of Central Asia. The purpose of institutionalizing the long-term implementation structure is to actively promote the strategic conservation approach within the hotspot and the surrounding national environs.
48. Mechanisms for dissemination of knowledge will include but not be limited to: South-South exchanges; study visits between grantees; exchanges among RITs and long-term implementation structures; and audio-visual products, such as short films, webinars and websites. The use of smart and effective communication tools will allow for additional replication beyond the places where CEPF works, enabling learning by organizations that may not be current partners of CEPF. This will be a marked improvement over the baseline scenario, where dissemination of lessons learned and good practice has largely been among CSOs within the same hotspot, and the potential for replicating successful approaches in other hotspots or in other contexts globally has remained unrealized.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

49. In addition to the risks identified at the PIF stage, additional risks have been identified. The updated table of risks is as follows:

Table 1: Risks and Mitigation Measures

Project Outcome	Risk	Rating (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Mitigation Measures
2.1 Increased capacity and credibility of conservation-focused civil societies in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Lack of suitable organizations to become long-term implementation structures	Low	CEPF currently works with RITs in the hotspots where it is active but these do not necessarily have the common agenda or capacity mix necessary to become long-term stewards of the long-term conservation visions and supporters of the emergence of strong local civil societies. To mitigate this risk, a detailed stakeholder mapping has been conducted and a model for long-term implementation structures has been developed that accommodates differences in institutional landscapes within and among hotspots.
2.2 Increased and more sustained financial flows to civil societies engaged in the conservation of biodiversity, from diverse sources, including non-traditional sources	Resources for long-term conservation finance from non-traditional sources not available	Medium	The other key pillar of sustainability of the project will be to establish long-term conservation financing mechanisms. Traditional sources of resources for biodiversity conservation are decreasing in many countries in the pilot hotspots and are not necessarily being replaced by non-traditional sources. This risk has been mitigated through an analysis of the availability of non-traditional sources of conservation finance in the pilot hotspots, which will be updated and expanded during Y1 and Y2. The risk will be further mitigated by targeting grants towards countries and initiatives that offer the greatest opportunities for leverage.
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Lack of interest from CSOs	Low	The public-private partnership approach followed by this project is novel to many CSOs, especially local groups, many of which lack the necessary skills and tools, and some of which may have philosophical reservations to working with the private sector. To mitigate this risk, stakeholders in the three pilot hotspots were consulted during the PPG to identify target countries within the priority hotspots with existing or potential interest and capacity among CSOs to partner with private sector. Also, the project will provide targeted capacity building to CSOs to develop the necessary capacity and credibility to engage with government and private sector actors (informed by the long-term conservation visions developed in Y1).

Project Outcome	Risk	Rating (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Mitigation Measures
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Political space for civil society to influence public policy constricted in pilot countries	Medium	With a few exceptions, the political space available for civil society is expanding in most countries in the pilot hotspots, enabling them to have greater influence over public policy. However, relationships between government and civil society are dynamic, and political space for civil societies can be constricted if they are perceived as moving into sensitive areas. This risk will be mitigated through careful selection of civil society partners with a track record of constructive partnership with government, and fully involving government partners in the framing of policy questions addressed by the project.
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Opportunities for reform of particular policies do not arise during project duration or reforms take a long time	Medium	Mainstreaming biodiversity into public policies needs to be advanced according to the timeframes and processes of government, which may not necessarily match those of the project. This risk will be mitigated by giving strong weighting to time-bound opportunities for influencing policies when establishing public policy targets for the project, and by developing science-demonstration-policy models that fully engage government partners in the framing of policy questions, selection of demonstration sites, and the integration of the ensuing lessons into the policy process.
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Lack of interest from private sector actors	Medium	Private sector actors active in sectors with large biodiversity footprints in the pilot hotspots comprise a mix of multinational companies, some of which have existing commitments to biodiversity conservation, and companies from emerging economies (especially Brazil and China), which may have less prior exposure to the business case for biodiversity conservation. To mitigate this risk, economic valuations, biodiversity risk assessments and certified commodity market analyses will be supported through grants to civil society partners, to help present a convincing business case to private sector actors to engage in development of biodiversity-friendly management practices.

Project Outcome	Risk	Rating (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Mitigation Measures
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Strongly asymmetry in the capacity of civil society to influence government policy as compared to private sector	Medium	Private sector actors, particularly large corporations with large biodiversity footprints, not only have the incentive to influence government policy to avoid restrictive environmental policies and regulations but also the means to do so, given their resources, expertise and position as creators of jobs and wealth. Conversely, CSOs often lack the resources and specialist expertise necessary to influence policy, not to mention credibility in the eyes of policy makers. To mitigate this risk, a central strategy of the project (i.e. Outcome 2.1) is to increase the capacity and credibility of CSOs, individually and collectively, to enable them to more effectively influence public policy even in the face of opposition from vested interests within private sector. In addition, opportunities to engage private sector actors as champions of mainstreaming biodiversity into public policy will be proactively sought out. Such opportunities may exist where companies expect to benefit from policy changes that take the form of incentives rather than regulations. In this way, the power asymmetry will be turned to the advantage of CSOs seeking to influence public policy.
3.1 Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots	Effects of climate change and variability override conservation actions on the ground	Low	While they may only be manifested gradually over the project lifetime, the effects of climate change and variability are projected to compound other pressures on natural ecosystems. This risk will be mitigated by addressing threats to biodiversity that are amenable to on-the-ground interventions, such as habitat loss, fragmentation and over-exploitation, thereby reducing aggregate pressure on natural ecosystems. The project will also adopt climate change adaptation strategies that enhance resilience of natural systems and plan for future climate change scenarios, in particular by enhancing ecological connectivity within conservation corridors. Moreover, the project will incorporate analysis of climate change projections into the long-term visions, which will feature <i>inter alia</i> monitoring of climate change impacts and response by international donors, to enable adaptive response by civil society to changing threats and opportunities.

Project Outcome	Risk	Rating (Low, Medium, High)	Risk Mitigation Measures
Multiple	Political instability impedes project implementation in pilot countries	Medium	All pilot hotspots contain countries with a recent history of political instability, and conflagration could prevent work in a country or, at minimum, impede civil society's engagement with government partners. CEPF has wide experience of supporting civil society in countries undergoing or emerging from political conflict, and will continue to engage in such countries, provided opportunities to deliver the project's outcomes exist and the security situation does not present unacceptable risks to staff or partners. If continued engagement became untenable, an alternative pilot country would be selected in the same hotspot.
Multiple	Changes in institutions providing co-financing to the project could lead to their inability to do so	Low	There is a risk that some of the expected co-financing at the level of individual hotspots may not materialize, leading to more gradual implementation of the long-term visions and reduction in the number of models demonstrated over the duration of the project. This risk has been mitigated by closely engaging with the co-financing institutions during the PPG phase (all of whom are existing donor partners to CEPF at the global or regional scale), to ensure their ownership, involvement and investment. In the event that the identified co-financing institutions are unable to meet their commitments to provide co-financing, alternative partners will be sought.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

50. CEPF strives to collaborate and coordinate with GEF small grants programs in each of the countries where it works and has been actively collaborating not only with coordination units at the country level but also with UNDP globally to ensure synergies are developed and duplication is avoided. Within the pilot hotspots, responsibility for coordination with other GEF projects, including the small grants program, lies with the RIT, which establishes structures to solicit stakeholder input into the development of the CEPF grant portfolios at a strategic level. These structures comprise invited representatives of government, other funding agencies and civil society, typically including GEF Operational Focal Points (or their representatives), national coordinators of the GEF small grants program and/or representatives of GEF Implementing Agencies, such as the World Bank.

Table 2: Coordination with Other Relevant GEF-financed Initiatives

Hotspot	Other GEF Projects/Initiatives	Linkages and Coordination
Cerrado	Sustainable Cerrado Initiative GEF agency: WB GEF grant: \$13 million	<p>The Sustainable Cerrado Initiative was an umbrella program designed to allow executors to promote cooperation among states and/or institutions, ensure coordinated actions under a common framework, and replicate an approach to address biome-wide Cerrado conservation. It consisted of grants to the Ministry of Environment, the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation, and the states of Tocantins and Goiás. The project was implemented between 2009 and 2015.</p> <p>The Regional Implementation Team for the Cerrado will consult with staff from the Ministry of Environment and the state environmental secretariats that were responsible for implementing the Sustainable Cerrado Initiative, to inform the selection of policy targets, demonstration models and partnerships with private sector actors that will be taken up by the proposed project.</p>
	<p>Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains GEF agencies: CI, IADB, IFC, UNDP, UNEP, WWF GEF grant: USD 500 million</p>	<p>This Integrated Approach Pilot is currently being designed by a consortium of six GEF Implementing Agencies. It aims to link initiatives to promote sustainable production of commodities, such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil and the Tropical Forest Alliance, with the work of governments and other actors along the global supply chain. Brazil will be one of the key producer countries targeted by this initiative, with the focus being on soy and beef.</p> <p>Close coordination with the initiative will enable selection by the proposed project of demonstration projects that target barriers and bottlenecks in global supply chains for sustainable commodities, especially ones where civil society is well placed to make linkages among the different actors involved, and replication of successful models by other partners in the initiative. Practically, this coordination will be spearheaded by the RIT within Brazil, and the CEPF Secretariat in Washington DC, where four of GEF Implementing Agencies involved are headquartered.</p>
	Small Grants Programme (SGP) GEF agency: UNDP GEF grant: \$6.5 million (since 1992)	<p>The strategy of the SGP in the Cerrado has been to promote conservation through sustainable biodiversity use within sustainable production landscapes that combine native vegetation and agriculture. In this regard, it has similar objectives to the GEF project, and significant opportunities for alignment exist. To date, the SGP has supported more than 400 projects in the Cerrado since 1995, including 50 on sustainable-use supply chains and microenterprises for a range of products, such as golden grass, baru nuts, native fruits and other non-timber forest products.</p> <p>Since 1995, technical and administrative coordination of the SGP in the Cerrado has been provided by the Institute for Society, Population and Nature (ISPN), which has been part of the consortium leading development of the ecosystem profile for the Cerrado. Consequently, close alignment between the SGP and the CEPF investment strategy for the hotspot has been ensured. For instance, lessons learned about how to empower local civil society, avoid dependence on grant funding and enable participation in public policy dialogues have been incorporated into the ecosystem profile. This coordination will continue into implementation of CEPF grant-making in the Cerrado, through the involvement of ISPN in the donor coordination structure for the hotspot.</p>

Hotspot	Other GEF Projects/Initiatives	Linkages and Coordination
Eastern Afromontane	<p>GEF agencies: UNDP, UNEP, WB GEF funds: \$142.9 million</p>	<p>Through UNDP, the WB and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the GEF supports 32 national projects and five regional projects that together, overlap with every country in the hotspot. These include projects on biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, ecosystem services, protected areas, migratory soaring birds, transboundary sites, primate conservation, taxonomy, and combating invasive alien species.</p> <p>Among these, a specific example of an anticipated synergy is with the GEF-funded Trans Frontier Conservation Areas (TFCA) project implemented by the Directorate for Areas of Conservation (DNAC): the national protected area authority. Through TFCA, DNAC improves the management of national protected areas on the borders of South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, and Tanzania. By coordinating with DNAC, CEPF has made awards to CSOs on the Mozambiquean and Zimbabwean sides of the Chimanimani mountains, and to a CSO in Mozambique’s Mt. Mabu region, across the border from Malawi. The CEPF grantees conduct taxonomic research in direct collaboration with government counterparts, develop site management plans, and promote sustainable livelihood activities at those sites. The success of these CEPF grantees contributes directly to the success of the TFCA program overall. The results of the proposed project will further this collaboration taking these partnerships and developing demonstration models for management of protected areas at the landscape scale with strong participation of civil society and local and indigenous groups.</p>
Indo-Burma	<p>Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program GEF agency: Asian Development Bank (ADB) GEF grant: \$20 million (including four national sub-projects)</p>	<p>This regional program aims to improve biodiversity conservation and climate resilience across Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam, by addressing issues requiring a larger-scale, cross-border approach, and emphasizing regional dialogue and collaboration between countries.</p> <p>The CEPF RIT is engaged in ongoing discussions with the ADB team regarding data sharing and coordination of activities in the specific geographies in which they overlap. This includes ADB input into grantee selection, RIT input to grantees on the ADB’s work, and the RIT ensuring that grantee outputs are reflected back to the ADB. The information shared will serve as spring-board for replicating the models proposed in this project throughout the countries of the hotspot</p>
	<p>Scaling Up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of the Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their Coasts GEF agency: WB GEF grant: \$44 million</p>	<p>The goal of this program is to promote sustainable development of large marine and coastal ecosystems of the East Asia and Pacific Region (including China’s Guangdong province and Vietnam within the Indo-Burma Hotspot) and improve livelihoods of local populations by promoting sustainable marine fisheries, integrated coastal zone management and ecosystem based management.</p> <p>CEPF has broad-scale capacity building efforts and is also supporting grantees that bring biodiversity knowledge to development planning processes. Each of these relatively small CEPF interventions feeds into the broader goals of this GEF project.</p>

Hotspot	Other GEF Projects/Initiatives	Linkages and Coordination
	Collaborative Management of Cambodia's Protected Area System as Demonstrated in the Mondulkiri Conservation Landscape GEF agency: UNEP GEF grant: \$4.7 million	<p>The goal of this project is to enhance management effectiveness of Cambodia's protected area system and secure forest carbon through improving inter-sectoral collaboration, landscape connectivity and sustainable forest management, through demonstration activities in the Mondulkiri Conservation Landscape.</p> <p>CEPF is learning directly from this UNEP effort in its own grants to empower local communities to engage in conservation and management of priority KBAs. The RIT will ensure that target groups use best practices in community-managed protected areas and develop co-management mechanisms that conform with government standards. This coordination will be achieved through bilateral meetings between the RIT and the Project Management Unit, and study visits for CEPF grantees to project sites of the UNEP-led project.</p>

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1. Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

51. Engagement with stakeholders is fundamental throughout all stages of investment in a hotspot. Engagement begins during preparation of an ecosystem profile and investment strategy, through a series of local, national and regional consultations. A wide range of stakeholders is involved, including national and international experts, research institutions, NGOs, government agencies, indigenous peoples, women and women's groups, community groups and private sector representatives.
52. To date, more than 3,000 stakeholders have been involved in preparing CEPF's ecosystem profiles. This phase sets the foundation for future interaction, and paves the way for the partnerships, networks and collaborations that are the hallmark of the fund's approach. CEPF actively seeks out and supports stakeholder engagement during all phases of investment. Gender mainstreaming is something that CEPF has been continuously seeking to improve and increase. Throughout the project CEPF will ensure full and equitable representation in and benefit sharing from project activities. The project will seek to engage with all stakeholders within the community, including any potentially marginalized groups. The project will engage with existing leadership structures but will seek to ensure equitable representation of women, youth, minorities and other groups in planning and implementation of project activities. To this end, CEPF will put in place monitoring systems that disaggregate results by different groups, especially women and men, to track impacts on them separately throughout the life of the project. As part of the bridging of Phases II and III, the CEPF model will benefit from the GEF contribution to strengthen its tools and policies to more greatly mainstream gender in the fund's activities, including systematic use of gender analysis. As a result of the project, CEPF has already updated its Environmental and Social Management Framework to include specific measures of gender assessment and mainstreaming in its actions, and incorporated gender indicators into its global monitoring framework.
53. Specifically, CEPF has developed a draft gender policy, which will be adopted in 2015, subject to approval by its Donor Council. Based on this draft policy, a gender mainstreaming plan for the project has been prepared, to ensure that, for relevant grants, any gender-related adverse impacts are avoided, minimized and/or mitigated. The plan sets out actions that will be taken during the first year of the project, including nomination and training of a focal person within the CEPF Secretariat, updating of existing templates, tools and training materials, and nomination and training of gender focal points within each RIT. The plan sets out additional activities that will be implemented throughout the project, including training for RITs, incorporation of gender-responsive approaches and indicators into the log frames for the pilot hotspots, and incorporation of gender analyses and recommendations into relevant grants, together with gender-specific deliverables and indicators. In addition, CEPF will incorporate gender-specific indicators into its global Monitoring Framework to monitoring and report on progress with gender mainstreaming.
54. Appendix XIII of the Project Document provides a detailed analysis of over 500 institutional project stakeholders, by hotspot, and according to type of stakeholder, nature of interest / potential role and typical effect of the project.

- B.2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCAF/SCCF):
55. Delivering socioeconomic benefits to local communities is an integral aspect of many CEPF grants. Analysis of the results of CEPF investments during Phase II informs the following projections:
- *Cerrado*: As the Cerrado hotspot has not yet been the focus of any CEPF grant making, expected human well-being benefits under the GEF project cannot be informed by prior CEPF investments there. Nevertheless, given the significantly lower human population density in the Cerrado (13 persons/km²) compared with the Eastern Afromontane (92 persons/km²) and Indo-Burma (134 persons/km²), coupled with the typically lower level of dependency of local and indigenous communities on natural ecosystems, it can reasonably be expected that the aggregate number of direct and indirect beneficiaries will be lower in the Cerrado than in either of the other pilot hotspots.
 - *Eastern Afromontane*: Considering only the 16 completed projects in the Eastern Afromontane hotspot since the start of grant making in 2013, 39 communities have received direct socioeconomic benefits from CEPF-funded work, primarily in the form of alternative livelihoods and improved agricultural methods. There have been 3,399 individual beneficiaries, 1,229 of whom are women. These people received training leading to increased income or paid positions. In addition, there have been over 76,000 indirect beneficiaries from broader sustainable agriculture promotion and ecosystem services resulting from better management of forest areas.
 - *Indo-Burma*: Since the start of CEPF grant making in the Indo-Burma hotspot in 2008, direct socioeconomic benefits have been conferred to 186 communities at project sites. For instance, 53 communities received direct benefits from the establishment of community-managed fish conservation zones, due to increased fish yields leading to increased income and food security. A larger but unquantified number of local communities have received indirect benefits through the conservation of natural ecosystems that deliver essential provisioning and regulating services.
56. In light of the above results, and given the projected portfolio breakdown for Phase III support, human well-being benefits under the GEF project can be estimated for the three pilot hotspots as follows:

Table 3: Expected Human Well-being Benefits in the Pilot Hotspots

Human well-being indicator	Projected human well-being benefit due to grant portfolio, by hotspot (minimum estimates)		
	Indo-Burma	Eastern Afromontane	Cerrado
Communities receiving direct benefits (through increased income, food security, resource rights or other measures of human wellbeing)	100	100	50
# of individual beneficiaries (through increased income, food security, resource rights or other measures of human wellbeing)	20,000	20,000	10,000
# of indirect beneficiaries (through enhanced and more secure delivery of ecosystem services, especially freshwater provision, fisheries production and flood protection)	100,000	100,000	50,000

57. In addition to the above but not projected separately, CEPF grants will support the delivery of analogous human well-being benefits within nine other hotspots.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

58. The project's high level of cost effectiveness, as compared with alternative options, rests on a number of factors, as follows:

- *Focus on biodiversity hotspots:* The essential logic of the hotspots concept is based on recognition of the need to prioritize conservation expenditure in a context of scarce conservation finance, and it has long been recognized as an efficient tool for doing so. By focusing attention and effort on large-scale areas where both levels of biodiversity and threats are high, the concept helps to channel expenditure into investments that will have a high long-term level of cost effectiveness.
- *Piloting-learning-replication approach:* The complexity of the challenges facing hotspots around the world means that cost effectiveness of conservation investments depends to a significant extent on testing, adapting and replicating successful approaches. The project approach of working in three pilot hotspots, in three continents, together with a strong emphasis on lesson learning and replication to nine additional hotspots, is considered to be the most cost effective design in this context.
- *Protected area and mainstreaming synergies:* The project's emphasis on supporting both enhanced protected area effectiveness as well as mainstreaming within carefully identified KBAs and corridors, also contributes to cost effectiveness. Alternatives that focused on only one or other of these approaches would miss the important synergies associated with the ability to prioritize mainstreaming within landscapes where important and strengthened protected areas are located.
- *Cross-sector partnership approach:* Under Phases I and II, CEPF focused on grant making to conservation-focused CSOs. In Phase III, as piloted under the present project, this approach will be expanded to support partnerships between CSOs and private and public sector actors. This will be accompanied by a correspondingly increased emphasis on mainstreaming within corridors, as outlined above.

59. Taken together, and complemented by a strong emphasis on strengthening CSO capacities, these approaches are expected to substantially and cost effectively increase the resilience and viability of critical ecosystems and their globally significant biodiversity over the medium to long term.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

60. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established CI and GEF procedures by the project team and the CI-GEF Project Agency. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized at the project inception workshop, including a review of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

C.1. Monitoring and Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities

61. As the project Executing Agency, CEPF will be responsible for ensuring that the monitoring and evaluation activities are carried out in a timely and comprehensive manner. Specifically, CEPF will be responsible for initiating and organizing the project inception workshop and report, quarterly progress reporting, annual progress and implementation reporting, and documentation of lessons learned. The Executing Agency will also support and cooperate with the independent external evaluation exercises.
62. Key project executing partners, especially the RITs/long-term implementation structures in the three pilot hotspots, as well as the CSO grantees, will be responsible for providing information required for timely and comprehensive project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate.
63. The CEPF Working Group will play a key oversight role for the project, with regular meetings to receive updates on project implementation progress and approve annual workplans. The Working Group, which comprises technical staff from each of CEPF's global donor partners (including both CI and the GEF), will also provide continuous *ad hoc* oversight and feedback on project activities, responding to inquiries or requests for approval from the CEPF Secretariat.
64. The CI-GEF Project Agency will play an overall assurance, backstopping, and oversight role with respect to monitoring and evaluation activities.
65. CI's General Counsel's Office will be responsible for contracting and oversight of the planned independent external evaluation exercises at the mid-point and end of the project.

C.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Components and Activities

66. The project's M&E Plan will include the following components (see **Table 4** for details).
67. **Inception workshop:** A project inception workshop, involving the Executing Agency and the CI-GEF Project Agency, will be held within the first three months of the project. The overarching objective of the inception workshop is to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's objectives and outcomes. The inception workshop will be used to detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of the CI-GEF Project Agency and the Executing Agency.
68. **Inception workshop report:** The Executing Agency will produce an inception report documenting all changes and decisions made during the inception workshop to the project planned activities, budget, results framework, and any other key aspects of the project. The inception report should be produced within one month of the inception workshop, as it will serve as a key input to the timely planning and execution of project start-up and activities.
69. **Project Results Monitoring Plan:** A Project Results Monitoring Plan will be developed by the CI-GEF Project Agency, which will include objective, outcome and output indicators, metrics to be collected for each indicator, methodology for data collection and analysis, baseline information, location of data gathering, frequency of data collection, responsible parties, and indicative resources needed to complete the plan. Appendix IV of the Project Document presents the Project Results Monitoring Plan table, which will help complete this M&E requirement.
70. In addition to the objective, outcome and output indicators, the Project Results Monitoring Plan table will also include all indicators identified in the Safeguard Plans prepared for the project, thus they will be monitored consistently and on time. The monitoring of these indicators throughout the life of the project will be necessary to assess if the project has successfully achieved its expected results.
71. **Baseline Establishment:** in the case that any necessary baseline data have not been collected during the PPG phase, they will be collected and documented by the Executing Agency, in consultation with relevant project partners, *within the first year* of project implementation.
72. **GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools:** Two GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools are relevant to the project: the Protected Area Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (BD1); and the Biodiversity Mainstreaming Tracking Tool (BD2). The former tool will be prepared for each protected areas supported under the project. The Executing Agency will be responsible for ensuring that the tool is completed. The tool should be filled in by the relevant protected area managers, facilitated by the CSOs receiving grant support under the project, at three points in time: within three months of the start of the grant; at the mid-point of the grant (for grants two years or more in duration); and within three months of the end of the grant. The latter tool will be prepared for each of the three pilot hotspots. The Executing Agency will be responsible for completing the tool, by aggregating results reported by CSOs receiving grant support to mainstream biodiversity-friendly management practices into production landscapes or mainstream biodiversity considerations into public policy, at project start, mid-term and end. A comparison of baseline and mid-point tracking tools will inform the mid-term evaluation, while a comparison of baseline and final tracking tools will inform the Terminal Evaluation.
73. **Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings:** Meetings of the PSC, comprising nominated representatives of the CEPF Secretariat and CI-GEF Project Agency, will be held annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, as appropriate. Meetings shall be held to review and approve project annual budget and work plans, discuss implementation issues and identify solutions, and increase coordination and communication between key project partners. The meetings held by the PSC will be minuted and results adequately reported.
74. **CI-GEF Project Agency field supervision missions:** The CI-GEF Project Agency will conduct annual visits to selected countries within the pilot hotspots and potentially to project field sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report and annual work plan, to assess project progress at first hand. Oversight visits will most likely be conducted to coincide with the timing of semi-annual supervision missions organized by the CEPF Secretariat to oversee development of grant portfolios at the hotspot level and review the performance of RITs/long-term implementation structures. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the CI-GEF Project Agency staff participating in the oversight mission, and will be circulated to the project team and PSC members within one month of the visit.
75. **Quarterly progress reporting:** The Executing Agency will submit quarterly progress reports to the CI-GEF Project Agency, including a budget follow-up and requests for disbursement to cover expected quarterly expenditures.
76. **Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR):** The Executing Agency will prepare an annual PIR to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the reporting period (July to June 30). The PIR will summarize the annual project results and progress. A summary of the report will be shared with the Project Steering Committee.
77. **Final Project Report:** The Executing Agency will draft a final report at the end of the project.

78. **Independent external Mid-term Review:** The project will undergo an independent Mid-term Review within 90 days prior to or after the mid-point of the grant term. The Mid-term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. The Mid-term Review will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions, and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Review will be incorporated into the design of the project to secure maximum project results and sustainability during the second half of project implementation.
79. **Independent Terminal Evaluation:** An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place within the last 90 days before the end of the project, and will be undertaken in accordance with CI and GEF guidance. The Terminal Evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The Executing Agency in collaboration with the PSC will provide a formal management answer to the findings and recommendations of the Terminal Evaluation.
80. **Lessons learned and knowledge generation:** Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through information-sharing networks and forums developed by the project. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Time and resources are explicitly allocated to documentation and dissemination of lessons learned under Component 4 but opportunities for sharing with other GEF projects will also be sought out on an opportunistic basis throughout the project. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.
81. **Financial statements audit:** A separate audit of CEPF records, accounts, and financial statements is undertaken annually, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The purpose of this external audit is to provide assurance on the financial statements of CEPF. The audit will test CEPF's compliance with certain provisions of the CEPF Operational Manual and consideration of its related internal control. This external CEPF audit will be conducted by independent auditors in accordance with Terms of Reference approved by the CEPF Donor Council.
82. CI will provide certified copies of its financial statements for the year audited; and the report of the auditors as well as a separate opinion on CEPF no later than five months after the close of each fiscal year (June 30).
83. The Terms of References for the evaluations will be drafted by the CI-GEF Project Agency in accordance with GEF requirements. The procurement and contracting for the independent evaluations will be handled by CI's General Counsel's Office. The funding for the evaluations will come from the project budget, as indicated at project approval.

Table 4: Project M&E Plan Summary

Type of M&E	Reporting Frequency	Responsible Parties	Indicative Budget from GEF (USD)
1. Inception Workshop	Within three months of signing of CI Grant Agreement for GEF Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency CI-GEF Project Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
2. Inception Workshop Report	Within one month of inception workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency CI-GEF Project Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
3. Project Results Monitoring Plan (Objective, Outcomes and Outputs)	Annually (data on indicators will be gathered according to monitoring plan schedule shown on Appendix IV)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI-GEF Project Agency 	n/a
4. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools	i) Project development phase; ii) prior to project mid-term evaluation; and iii) project completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
5. Project Steering Committee Meetings	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency CI-GEF Project Agency 	Covered under personnel budget

Type of M&E	Reporting Frequency	Responsible Parties	Indicative Budget from GEF (USD)
6. CI-GEF Project Agency Field Supervision Missions	Approximately annual visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CI-GEF Project Agency Executing Agency 	Covered under CI-GEF Project Agency budget
7. Quarterly Progress Reporting	Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
8. Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Annually for year ending June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
9. Project Completion Report	Upon project operational closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency 	Covered under personnel budget
10. Independent External Mid-term Review	Within 90 days prior to or after project midpoint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent consultant; contracted by CI's Internal Audit function 	25,000
11. Independent Terminal Evaluation	Within 90 days before project end	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent consultant; contracted by CI's General Counsel's Office 	25,000
12. Lessons Learned and Knowledge Generation	One knowledge product per year in Y2-Y3, two per year in Y4-Y5	Independent consultants; contracted by Executing Agency	300,000
13. Financial Statements Audit	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executing Agency 	Covered by co-financing

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

84. In terms of obtaining endorsement of GEF operational focal points (OFPs), CEPF has a process approved by the GEF CEO as a member of CEPF's Donor Council, by which it requests OFP endorsement when an ecosystem profile is approved by the Donor Council and before investing in the countries included in that strategy. Agreement was reached by the Donor Council on the process and currently the endorsement request process operates on a 60-day no-objection basis. CEPF's Secretariat meets and presents CEPF's strategy with OFPs and reaches out multiple times to ensure support of the OFP for the strategy. This same practice will apply to the current project.

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Lilian Spijkerman,			Orissa Samaroo	7033412550	osamaroo@conservation.org

Conservation International					
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objective:	To demonstrate innovative tools, methodologies and investments, and build related capacities, through which civil society in three pilot biodiversity hotspots (in partnership with local and national public and private sectors) can cost-effectively conserve biodiversity and progress towards long-term institutional sustainability, and to replicate demonstrated approaches in nine additional hotspots
Indicator(s):	<p>a. Number of long-term conservation visions and financing plans for biodiversity hotspots developed and implemented with clear targets for CEPF graduation and endorsed by civil society, government, donor and/or private sector actors</p> <p>b. Number of civil societies and CEPF grantees in the pilot hotspots that improve their financial and institutional sustainability</p> <p>c. Total area of production landscapes, protected areas, and conservation corridors implementing biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p> <p>d. Number of policy demonstration models and management best practices adopted in number of additional biodiversity hotspots</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
Component 1: Developing long-term conservation visions, financing plans and associated strategies for biodiversity hotspots			
<p>Outcome 1.1: Long-term conservation visions developed for the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots, with participation of civil society, government, donor and private sector actors.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.1.1: Number of long-term visions incorporating resource mobilization strategies that support the mobilization of new funding, and policy targets addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss and guiding the development of new policy demonstration models.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.1.2: Number of hotspots with clear targets for graduation of civil society from CEPF support.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.1.3: Number of civil society, government, donor and/or private sector actors that endorse the long-term visions.</p>	<p>Baseline 1.1.1: 0 long-term visions incorporating resource mobilization strategies and policy targets</p> <p>Baseline 1.1.2: 0 pilot hotspots with graduation targets</p> <p>Baseline 1.1.3: 0 endorsements of the long-term visions</p>	<p>Target 1.1.1: 3 long-term visions incorporating resource mobilization strategies and policy targets</p> <p>Target 1.1.2: 3 pilot hotspots with graduation targets</p> <p>Target 1.1.3: 10 endorsements of the long-term visions</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: Targets for civil society capacity building set for 3 pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.1: Number of approved vision documents incorporating civil society ‘graduation’ targets.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Three financing plans describing the funding and projections defined for implementation of the long-term conservation visions.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.2: Number of financing plans defined for implementation of the long-term conservation visions.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Sector and/or development policy targets for addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss set in three pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.3: Number of vision documents incorporating a full set of targets covering major sectoral drivers and key policies, developed with broad stakeholder participation.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4: Strategies for engagement with private sector actors for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into business practices of industries driving biodiversity loss completed for three pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.4: Number of pilot hotspots with completed strategies for engagement with private sector actors.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
Component 2: Ensuring the financial and institutional sustainability of multi-sector conservation programs			
<p>Outcome 2.1: Increased capacity and credibility of conservation-focused civil societies in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2.1.1: Number of pilot hotspots that show at least 20% improvement in collective civil society capacity tracking tool scores.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2.1.2: Number of CEPF grantees, number of Indigenous People's organizations and number of women's groups that show at least 10% improvement in civil society tracking tool scores.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2.1.3: Number of CEPF grantees that show at least 20% improvement in gender mainstreaming tracking tool scores.</p>	<p>Baseline 2.1.1: 0 pilot hotspots with 20% improvement over duration of project</p> <p>Baseline 2.1.2: 0 grantees, including 0 Indigenous People's organizations and 0 women's groups, with 10% improvement over duration of project</p> <p>Baseline 2.1.3: 0 grantees with 20% improvement over duration of project</p>	<p>Target 2.1.1: 3 pilot hotspots with 20% improvement over duration of project</p> <p>Target 2.1.2: 60 grantees, including at least 5 Indigenous People's organizations and 5 women's groups, with 10% improvement over duration of project</p> <p>Target 2.1.3: 30 grantees with 20% improvement over duration of project</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: Long-term implementation structures in place for each of the 3 pilot hotspots</p> <p>Output Indicator 2.1.1: Number of hotspots with long-term institutional structures in place</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Civil societies in the 3 pilot hotspots with sufficient organizational and technical capacity for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>Output Indicator 2.1.2: Number of local civil society organizations engaged in biodiversity conservation in each pilot hotspot with a civil society tracking tool score of 80 or more.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.2: Increased and more sustained financial flows to civil societies engaged in the conservation of biodiversity, from diverse sources, including non-traditional sources.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2.2.1: Funds available in sustainable financing mechanisms to support priorities in long-term conservation visions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustainable financing mechanisms from non-traditional sources (e.g. private sector, new economic and financial instruments, etc.) conservation finance generated by innovate private sector models. 	<p>Baseline 2.2.1: \$8.9 million available in sustainable financing mechanisms in the pilot hotspots</p>	<p>Target 2.2.1: \$20 million of additional funding in sustainable financing mechanisms, including \$5 million from non-traditional sources and \$2 million from private sector models</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: Three regional resource mobilization strategies developed to generate additional revenue for conservation programs in the 3 pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 2.2.1: Number of regional resource mobilization strategies developed to generate additional revenue</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: At least 2 innovative models for private sector conservation finance, such as biodiversity offsets, demonstrated in the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 2.2.2: Number of models for private sector conservation finance demonstrated</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
Component 3: Amplifying the impacts of CEPF investments through enhanced and innovative public and private sector partnerships			
<p>Outcome 3.1: Integrating biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes implemented with public and private sector actors across at least total 1,000,000 hectares in the Cerrado, Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma Hotspots.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.1: Number of hectares of production landscapes that demonstrate effective ways of mainstreaming biodiversity.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.2: Number of protected areas with new management models featuring direct participation of civil society organizations or indigenous and local communities that show improvements in SP1 METT scores.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.3: Number of globally threatened species with reduced threats to their populations through mainstreaming of biodiversity into production landscapes and/or implementation of new protected area models.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.4: Number of conservation corridors with enhanced ecological connectivity through the incorporation of financial incentives into policy and the adoption of biodiversity-friendly management practices by private companies.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.5: Number of indigenous and local communities that have increased, gender-equitable access to ecosystem services.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.6: Number of women and number of men that receive direct socio-economic benefits</p>	<p>Baseline 3.1.1: 389,569 hectares of production landscapes with effective biodiversity mainstreaming</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.2: 0 protected areas with new models</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.3: 0 globally threatened species with reduced threats to their populations</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.4: 0 conservation corridors with enhanced ecological connectivity</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.5: 0 communities with increased, gender-equitable access to ecosystem services</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.6: 0 women and 0 men, with direct socio-economic benefits</p> <p>Baseline 3.1.7: 0 women and 0 men with indirect socio-economic benefits</p>	<p>Target 3.1.1: 1 million hectares of production landscapes with effective biodiversity mainstreaming</p> <p>Target 3.1.2: 20 protected areas with new models</p> <p>Target 3.1.3: 20 globally threatened species with reduced threats to their populations</p> <p>Target 3.1.4: 6 conservation corridors with enhanced ecological connectivity</p> <p>Target 3.1.5: 250 communities with increased, gender-equitable access to ecosystem services</p> <p>Target 3.1.6: 25,000 women and 25,000 men with direct socio-economic benefits</p> <p>Target 3.1.7: 125,000 women and 125,000 men with indirect socio-economic benefits</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: At least 6 policies, programs or plans incorporate results of policy demonstration models addressing drivers of biodiversity loss in the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.1.1: Number of policies, programs, or plans incorporating results of policy demonstration models.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: At least 12 biodiversity-friendly management practices incorporated into the business practices of key change agents in the agriculture, energy, mining and other sectors.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.1.2: Number of biodiversity-friendly business practices adopted by key private sector change agents.</p> <p>Output 3.1.3: New management models involving direct participation of CSOs or indigenous and local communities are introduced at 20 protected areas.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.1.3: Number of new management models involving direct participation introduced at protected areas.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<p>through increased income, food security, resource rights or other measures of human wellbeing.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.7: Number of women and number of men that receive indirect socio-economic benefits through enhanced and more secure delivery of ecosystem services.</p>			
Component 4: Replicating success through knowledge products and tools			
<p>Outcome 4.1: CEPF investments in other hotspots strengthened through the adoption of successful models and tools developed in the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.1.1: Number of additional hotspots that have long-term implementation structures.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.1.2: Number of additional hotspots that have regional resource mobilization strategies.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.1.3: Number of successful policy demonstration models that have been adopted in at least one additional hotspot.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.1.4: Number of management best practices that have been adopted in at least one additional hotspot.</p>	<p>Baseline 4.1.1: 0 additional hotspots with long-term implementation structures</p> <p>Baseline 4.1.2: 0 additional hotspots with regional resource mobilization strategies</p> <p>Baseline 4.1.3: 0 policy demonstration models adopted in at least one additional hotspot</p> <p>Baseline 4.1.2: 0 management best practices adopted in at least one additional hotspot</p>	<p>Target 4.1.1: 9 additional hotspots with long-term implementation structures</p> <p>Target 4.1.2: 9 additional hotspots with regional resource mobilization strategies</p> <p>Target 4.1.3: 2 policy demonstration models adopted in at least one additional hotspot</p> <p>Target 4.1.4: 2 management best practices adopted in at least one additional hotspot</p>	<p>Output 4.1.1: Long-term implementation structures incorporating experiences from the pilot hotspots in place in at least 9 other biodiversity hotspots where CEPF invests.</p> <p>Output Indicator 4.1.1: Number of additional (non-pilot) hotspots with long-term implementation structures</p> <p>Output 4.1.2: Regional resource mobilization strategies incorporate lessons learned to supplement global resources and better align resources with regional funders to achieve long-term sustainability in at least 9 other biodiversity hotspots where CEPF invests.</p> <p>Output Indicator 4.1.2: Number of hotspots with regional resource mobilization strategies</p> <p>Output 4.1.3: At least 2 countries in other biodiversity hotspots adopt successful policy demonstration models from the pilot hotspots.</p> <p>Output Indicator 4.1.3: Number of countries in other hotspots adopting policy demonstration models</p> <p>Output 4.1.4: At least 2 countries in other biodiversity hotspots replicate management practices for mainstreaming biodiversity through innovative partnerships of civil society and private sector.</p> <p>Output Indicator 4.1.4: Number of countries in other hotspots replicating management practices for mainstreaming biodiversity</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<p>Outcome 4.2: Models, tools and best practices developed under the project are widely available and inform other actors developing public-private partnerships for biodiversity conservation globally.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 4.2.1: Number of models, tools and best practices developed under the project that have been adopted by conservation practitioners in areas outside CEPF investments.</p>	<p>Baseline 4.2.1: 0 models, tools and/or best practices adopted in areas outside CEPF investments</p>	<p>Target 4.2.1: 3 models, tools and/or best practices adopted in areas outside CEPF investments</p>	<p>Output 4.2.1: At least 6 innovative knowledge products documenting models, tools and best practices developed under the project, including at least 1 related to gender mainstreaming and at least 1 related to Indigenous People and conservation, made publicly available through the CEPF website or other innovative means as appropriate.</p> <p>Output Indicator 4.2.1: Number of innovative knowledge products, number of knowledge products related to gender mainstreaming and number of knowledge products related to Indigenous People and conservation made publicly available</p>

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

1. GEF Secretariat comments and responses

Comments from GEF Secretariat review of PIF	Responses	ProDoc page ref.
<p>Global environment benefits are further substantiated with tangible indicators, baseline information, and targets.</p>	<p>This has now been done in section 4D of the ProDoc and in the Project Results Framework. The analysis of global environmental benefits has been consolidated and made more robust, informed by detailed projections of the possible grant portfolios in the three pilot hotspots. These projections allowed the expected results of individual grants to be estimated, and these were then aggregated for each category of global environmental benefit. This also provided a validation of the targets in the Project Results Framework.</p>	<p>55-57</p>
<p>Provide further information on the target policies and private sector partnerships that will be pursued in the hotspots.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, CEPF has developed criteria for assessing potential private sector partnerships as well as related criteria for supporting public sector policy enhancement. As part of this analysis, target policies and sectors / partners were identified. These will be further specified at the level of individual hotspots during the first year of project implementation, as a component of the strategies for engagement with public and private sector actors (Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4).</p> <p>Target policies for support within the hotspots will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal legislation and laws at all levels of governance. • Regulations to support implementation of laws, including land-use planning and zoning and the procedures to execute key initiatives. • Conservation and development strategies, plans and programs. • Economic incentives for conservation, such as payments for ecosystem service schemes. • Funding mechanisms for long-term conservation finance. • Standards that govern practices in the use of natural capital and biodiversity. <p>Target sectors and types of private sector partners for CEPF co-operation are as follows:.</p> <p>Sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture: soy, cattle, maize, rice, rubber, coffee, tea, cotton • Energy: oil, gas, hydropower • Transportation: roads • Fisheries: aquaculture, freshwater <p>Private-Sector Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small and medium-sized enterprises • National corporations and their associations • Multinational corporations • Financial services companies • Commodity round tables 	<p>39-41; Appendix XIV (189-195)</p>

Comments from GEF Secretariat review of PIF	Responses	ProDoc page ref.
<p>Reflect and update based on the progress made on the development of the business plan and its content.</p>	<p>As part of the implementation of the third phase strategy, the CEPF Secretariat is developing a business plan to define the elements of a transformational and scaled-up fund that can respond to the global biodiversity crisis at scale. The business plan, which is due to be completed by the end of 2015, will assess the implications for the CEPF model of scaling up its activities and operations. Questions involving partnership, membership, governance and financing will be addressed by the business plan. The early development of the other components of the strategy, namely the long-term visions and long-term implementation structures, will be facilitated by the GEF project. This is a key step, which complements the development of the business plan, by informing the scaling up of CEPF's activities in operations, for example by elucidating the scale, duration and type of support that CEPF will need to provide in each hotspot to enable civil society to reach graduation. Further, the early development of models for mainstreaming results of CEPF investment into public policy and business practice enhances CEPF's efforts to engage government agencies and private sector actors as key members or partners of the fund. Implementation of the GEF project will, therefore, seamlessly connect the current phase of GEF investment in CEPF with the launch of the third phase of the fund, providing key inputs to the production of the business plan in 2015 but also spearheading the demonstration of models that will subsequently be rolled out across the 12 hotspots where CEPF will operate during the third phase. Additionally, the findings of the Implementation Completion Report for CEPF II, to be produced in the second half of 2015, will provide key recommendations that will be folded into the production of the business plan.</p> <p>Development of the GEF project document has been coordinated closely with process of developing the business plan to ensure that the project design and, in particular, the implementation arrangements are consistent with the new directions set out in the plan.</p>	<p>70</p>
<p>Reflect further feedback and inputs provided by the CEPF donor partners and others.</p>	<p>Feedback and inputs provided are described in ProDoc sections 3J (Project Consistency and Alignment with CI Institutional Priorities) and 4G (Project Stakeholders). Extensive feedback was provided by the CEPF Working Group, RITs, current and potential future CSO grantees and other stakeholders on key aspects of project design. Key issues discussed included: (i) granting modalities used under the project (and, by extension, the rest of Phase III); (ii) contents and purpose of the long-term visions; and (iii) the recruitment process for, and functions of long-term implementation structures. This feedback is summarised in Section 4N and has been integrated into the overall design of the project.</p>	<p>33-34; 62-65</p>
<p>Secure cofinancing letters from partners as listed in the PIF, and continue efforts to leverage additional finance.</p>	<p>Co-financing commitment letters are provided in Appendix VIII of the project document.</p>	<p>134-139</p>

2. STAP review comments and responses

Comments from STAP review of PIF	Responses	Page ref.
<p>Indicators at the Outcome level should be reviewed. Component 1, 3 and 4 Outcomes require indicators. What is presented for Outcomes 3 and 4 are targets, as is recognized in the proposal, but the indicators for which these are the targets are not precisely defined. Indicators under Outcome 2 are appropriate but the second and third indicators should refer to a change in funding as opposed to amounts from those sources.</p>	<p>The Project Results Framework presents indicators and associated targets for all project outcomes. Baselines have been set for the sustainable funding mechanisms that have been established through CEPF support in the pilot hotspots. To date, \$8.9 million has been made available through in sustainable financing mechanisms, none of which is from non-traditional sources or private sector models.</p>	<p>Appendix I (95-100)</p>
<p>The project stakeholders are indeed numerous. Not all of them are presented in the proposal, but they are clearly defined by categories using an example on the basis of the Brazilian Cerrado, one of the three hotspots involved in the project. In the future project preparation process, their particular roles in the project should be made more explicit.</p>	<p>An extensive stakeholder identification and analysis at the level of each hotspot. The results of this analysis are presented in Appendix XIII of the project document</p> <p>This analysis defines the roles of each group of stakeholders in the project. Moreover, the analysis has been extended to include all three pilot hotspots. More than 500 institutional stakeholders were identified as part of the analysis, and a significant proportion of these were consulted with on key elements of project design.</p>	<p>Appendix XIII (178-188)</p>
<p>A risk specific to the scope and objectives of this project, namely the strongly asymmetry in the capacity of civil society organizations to influence government policy as compared to that of the private sector (particularly large corporations) is not mentioned, and it should be addressed.</p>	<p>This risk was added to the table on Project Risk Assessment and Mitigation Planning. It was assessed as medium, and the risk mitigation measures were defined as follows: Private sector actors, particularly large corporations with large biodiversity footprints, not only have the incentive to influence government policy to avoid restrictive environmental policies and regulations but also the means to do so, given their resources, expertise and position as creators of jobs and wealth. Conversely, CSOs often lack the resources and specialist expertise necessary to influence policy, not to mention credibility in the eyes of policy makers. To mitigate this risk, a central strategy of the project (i.e. Outcome 2.1) is to increase the capacity and credibility of CSOs, individually and collectively, to enable them to more effectively influence public policy even in the face of opposition from vested interests within private sector. In addition, opportunities to engage private sector actors as champions of mainstreaming biodiversity into public policy will be proactively sought out. Such opportunities may exist where companies expect to benefit from policy changes that take the form of incentives rather than regulations. In this way, the power asymmetry will be turned to the advantage of CSOs seeking to influence public policy.</p>	<p>66-69</p>
<p>The Panel wishes to draw the proponent's attention to an upcoming STAP guidance document: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice (in press), which will be presented to Council in May 2014. In addition, STAP wishes to stress the importance of ensuring that project investments in this area also ensure that tangible evidence is generated over time, which will allow empirical analysis of the</p>	<p>The project design was informed by the GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel Advisory Document Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice, which contains important learning, drawn from the GEF biodiversity portfolio, on mainstreaming biodiversity into production landscapes. In particular, the design includes an effort to inquire more systematically into the effectiveness of different approaches to biodiversity mainstreaming, even if these may not prove amenable to rigorous testing. Moreover, it emphasizes the need to strike a balance between working in countries and sectors where there is sufficient governance capacity for mainstreaming to have a good chance of success and tackling the most pressing mainstreaming challenges in settings where global biodiversity is threatened but capacity is lacking. The guidance document will be made available to CSOs applying for grants under Component 3, in order to inform the design of their activities.</p>	<p>35, 73</p>

Comments from STAP review of PIF	Responses	Page ref.
effectiveness of these measures in delivering biodiversity-related global environmental benefits.	The project design includes several elements designed to ensure that tangible evidence is generated of global benefits arising from project investments in mainstreaming. These elements include: (i) a dedicated component on monitoring and documenting experiences with the demonstration projects; (ii) the long-term implementation teams being established under Component 2 of the project will be tasked with monitoring and evaluating the impacts of CEPF's large and small grants; (iii) CEPF and the long-term implementation teams will work with the CSOs developing large and small grant applications (respectively) to ensure that appropriate activities to generate tangible evidence that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these actions are incorporated into grant design and budgeted for; and (iv) during the PPG, the CEPF Secretariat structure has been revised to establish a dedicated Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation team, which is adequately resourced (under the GEF grant and through co-financing) to conduct the type of empirical analysis envisioned here.	

3. Response to GEF Council comments

Comments from Council review of PIF	Responses	Page ref.
France		
Examine the possibility of providing long-term support, with a goal of development and empowerment over 5 to 10 years, to a smaller number of NGOs per country that will forward the emergence of national "champions" and obtaining a critical mass of civil society in the hotspots covered by CEPF. CEPF must redouble its efforts to increase the size and share of funding to local NGOs as their capabilities gradually increase, with a view to support future national champions on issues of biodiversity conservation.	<p>Under Phase III, capacity building for local civil society has been put front and center of CEPF's approach. This is one of main purposes of the long-term visions: to determine how CEPF (and other funders) can provide support over an extended period of time to civil society, individually and collectively, to strengthen its capacity. In a number of hotspots, focused investment on fostering the emergence of national champions has already been identified as a central activity. For instance, it is an explicit Investment Priority in the Ecosystem Profile for the East Melanesian Islands hotspot, approved in 2013. Because CEPF strategies (ecosystem profiles and long-term visions) are tailored to specific conditions present in hotspots, it cannot be said that emergence of national champions will necessarily be a component everywhere (for instance, in small island developing states, such as the Caribbean Islands hotspot, a focus on <i>regional</i> civil society organizations may be more appropriate).</p> <p>CEPF will everywhere redouble its efforts to increase the size and share of funding to local NGOs. Such a trend is already being observed. For example, in the Indo-Burma hotspot, local CSOs received 19% of the investment under the first investment phase but have received 38% of the investment under the second investment phase to date. These trends are expected to continue in all geographies where CEPF invests.</p>	41-47
Although the CEPF was launched since 2000 (and "As of 2013, CEPF had granted more than \$163 million in 23 hotspots in more than 60 countries and territories, reaching out to over 1,800 grantees and influencing the management of more than 30 million hectares within Key Biodiversity Areas"), still today the CEPF lack a mechanism to monitor the impacts of its financing on conservation. Although it's a complex subject, CEPF could surely develop a simple conservation impacts tracking tool, like it is doing for civil society assessment/tracking tool.	CEPF has developed a global monitoring framework, which has been reviewed and strengthened during the PPG phase, to ensure that it is fit for purpose in capturing the results of the GEF project and integrating them seamlessly into CEPF's global monitoring and reporting. As previously mentioned, a dedicated Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation Team has been established within the CEPF Secretariat, fully capacitated since July 2015, which provides CEPF, for the first time, with the necessary capability to monitor the impacts of its grant making on conservation. The team is currently developing a number of tracking tools and other monitoring tools, which will be rolled out as part of the GEF project, including an updated long-term financing tracking tool; and will continue to use available GEF tools, such as the SPI METT.	87-91 Appendix IV (118-126)

Comments from Council review of PIF	Responses	Page ref.
Japan		
Since CI is a new GEF project agency, it is recommended for CI to closely consult with GEF in implementing this project, while retaining and making full use of innovative nature of CI.	The CEPF Working Group (and its reporting line to the Donor Council, on which the GEF is represented by its CEO and Chairperson) represents a practical mechanism whereby recommendations and advice from the GEF can be incorporated into the design (as has already happened) and implementation of the grant.	84-86
Canada		
We are pleased to welcome this project, which includes innovative long-term financing for biodiversity hotspots, as well as high levels of co-financing. We are also pleased to note the inclusion of a knowledge management component and encourage this to be present in all GEF proposals.	The knowledge management component that was included in the PIF has been retained and further elaborated in the ProDoc.	51-54
We look forward to the implementation of this project and its lessons learned, particularly as the mainstreaming of biodiversity into both public policy and private sector practice is a key area that requires additional attention and innovation.	The central focus of the grant remains mainstreaming of biodiversity into public policy and private sector practice. This is captured in the project vision, which recognizes that “Mainstreaming conservation goals into the plans, policies and practices of public and private sector actors can minimize pressures on protected areas and promote conservation of biodiversity beyond their boundaries”.	35

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁴

Funding amounts of the PPG activities are presented in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$200,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder consultations, preparation of pilot long-term conservation visions, safeguard analysis and development of safeguard plans, and preparation of Project Document.	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	200,000	200,000	200,000

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up) N/A

⁴ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.