

**Procurement Summary and Assessment of Proposals
for the Regional Implementation Team
for the Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot**

1. Summary of the Solicitation Process

The solicitation process for the Regional Implementation Team (RIT) for Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands has followed the timeline below.

14 May 2014	CEPF Secretariat formally submits final version of <i>Ecosystem Profile for the Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot</i> to the CEPF Donor Council for no-objection approval.
20 June 2014	CEPF Secretariat releases a call for Expression of Interests (EoIs) for the RIT. The announcement is placed on the CEPF website and sent to organizations that participated in the profiling process. At the same time as the release of this call, the Secretariat posts the draft Profile and draft terms of reference for the RIT on the CEPF website.
30 June 2014	End of no-objection period for Ecosystem Profile. Ecosystem Profile approved by Donor Council.
17 July 2014	Closing date for EoIs. Eight organizations/consortia submit EoIs.
18 July 2014	Grant Director Pierre Carret holds an open-line conference call to explain to interested parties the difference between being the RIT versus a typical project grantee and to elaborate on what CEPF seeks from a successful RIT. Representatives from eight organizations participate in the conference call. A recording of this call is posted to the CEPF website.
21 July 2014	Opening date of Request for Proposals (RfP). CEPF sends the RfP directly to the eight qualified organizations and posts the same to the CEPF website. RfP states that CEPF will only accept proposals from these; however, those organizations are free to form bidding consortia with other groups not listed. The maximum value of proposals is listed in the RfP at \$1,500,000.
15 August	Following messages from applicants mentioning the difficulties associated with finalizing the proposal while key staff are not available during the month of August, Secretariat decides to extend the deadline for the submission by two weeks, to 14 September. Qualified organizations are informed and a corrigendum is published on the CEPF website.
27 August	End of the period during which applicants could ask questions of CEPF Secretariat. Grant Director Pierre Carret prepares a document summarizing all questions and answers, which is sent to qualified organizations and published on the CEPF website.

14 September Closing date for RfP. Four organizations submit proposals by the deadline.

1. Biotope (based in Reunion Island, France). *Application in French*
2. Conservation International Madagascar (based in Antananarivo, Madagascar). *Application in English*
3. Fondation Tany Meva (based in Antananarivo, Madagascar). *Application in French*
4. WIOMSA/BirdLife International consortium (based in Nairobi, Kenya and Zanzibar, Tanzania). *Application in English*

4-5 November Clarification interviews conducted for short-listed applications.

CEPF maintains full electronic copies of these proposals in its Grants Management Unit “e-room.”

2. Evaluation Committee and Process

The proposals were evaluated by three members of the Secretariat.

- John de Wet, Vice President for Finance and Operations, Ecosystem Finance and Markets, Conservation International, with support from Antonia Cermak-Terzian, Grant Coordinator, for the two applications in French. Due to language issue, Mr. de Wet considered he couldn't provide a fair scoring – but instead provided detailed comments on the offers with support from Ms. Cermak-Terzian.
- Nina Marshall, Managing Director, CEPF
- Pierre Carret, Grant Director, CEPF

The Secretariat also decided to ask an external expert to review the proposals:

- John Watkin, Program Officer at MacArthur Foundation

The reviewers evaluated proposals per Section 15 of the RfP, Evaluation Criteria. Reviewers worked independently and assigned their own scores, as per the seven individual ranking categories listed below:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. Organizational Experience – Technical	5
2. Organizational Experience – Management	15
3. Personnel	30
4. Understanding of the Ecosystem Profile	5
5. Proposed Technical Approach	15
6. Proposed Management Approach	25
7. Budget	5

CEPF maintains full electronic copies of the individual evaluators scoring sheets in its Grants Management Unit “e-room.”

Initial scoring revealed that three of the four applications received close scores, and that each had key strengths and weaknesses, with no one application demonstrating all the required qualifications to fulfill

the role of the RIT. The Evaluation Committee determined that clarification was needed, and thus decided hold telephone interviews with the proposed RIT Leaders for the three proposals that scored the highest: CI Madagascar, Biotope and Fondation Tany Meva.

The Evaluation Committee first agreed on a series of questions for each applicant. The phone interviews were set up for the 4th and the 5th of November. The applicants were notified one week in advance but were not provided with the interview questions.

After interviews were held, scores were revised in light of new information arising. As such, the average scores exclude those of the external reviewer who did not participate on the interview panel. However, the views of the external reviewer were considered in the overall assessment of proposals.

CEPF maintains full electronic copies of the list of questions in its Grants Management Unit “e-room.”

3. Average Score by Category

The table below shows, for each category, the average score awarded to each applicant. The Fondation Tany Meva received the highest score, followed by CI-Madagascar and Biotope. The proposal from the WIOMSA/BirdLife consortium, received the lowest score.

Table 1. Average Score by Category

Category	Fondation Tany Meva	CI Madagascar	Biotope	WIOMSA/ BirdLife
1. Organizational Experience – Technical	3.75	4	2.5	2.5
2. Organizational Experience – Management	13	12.5	8.5	9
3. Personnel	23.5	18	18	15
4. Understanding of the Ecosystem Profile	3.5	3.25	4.5	4
5. Proposed Technical Approach	11.5	8	9.5	7.5
6. Proposed Management Approach	17.5	17.5	20	15
7. Budget	3.75	4	2.5	2.5
Overall Ranking	76.5	67.25	65.5	55.5

The proposal from the WIOMSA/BirdLife consortium received the lowest score, for the following key reasons:

- the lead organization has a strict focus on marine ecosystem, and the proposed RIT leader is an expert in fisheries.
- the consortium organizations are not based within the hotspot, and have no agreement yet from the Malagasy government to establish an office in the country.
- the understanding of the specificities of CEPF RIT role is weak, the related staffing structure not appropriate for management of the CEPF program in the region.

The three other proposals, from CI Madagascar, Biotope and Fondation Tany Meva, were short-listed, and subjected to an interview. The WIOMSA/BirdLife consortium, as the lowest scoring application, was excluded from further analysis.

4. Detailed Evaluation by Category

Criterion 1. Organizational Experience – Technical

Evaluators found all four proponents to have organizational missions that broadly align with the objectives outlined in the Ecosystem Profile, but that there was variation in their experience working in the region, as well as their existing conservation or development programs.

- **Fondation Tany Meva**'s mission is to support community involvement in sustainable management of natural resources, and in the long term is to be a leader in conservation throughout the region. They have solid experience working with community groups, development organizations, government and the private sector in Madagascar, and have an active grant-making program in Madagascar. Over the past 18 years they have funded 1700+ projects valued at over 14M ranging from \$1500 to \$300K. Tany Meva lacks implementation experience outside of Madagascar, although they do have good connections via the CAFE network of trust funds with financing mechanisms in Mauritius and Comoros.
- **CI-Madagascar**'s mission is congruent with the Ecosystem Profile. CI has substantial experience working with a diverse range of stakeholders including NGOs, development organizations, government and private sector, and an active program in Madagascar. CI developed its grant-making experience during CEPF's phase 1 with a grant for the "Nodes program". Their experience beyond Madagascar is minimal, although they note that in the early 2000s they supported the establishment of a Center for Biodiversity Conservation in Comoros, and also supported some local NGOs and students from Comoros to come to Madagascar for training.
- **Biotope** has at least 10 years of experience in the region, however they have no grant-making experience, nor any experience with a long term conservation project. Being a consultancy firm, they do have a wide range of experience in numerous countries and on numerous topics pertaining to conservation and development. They do have significant experience working with the private sector, government as well as diverse other stakeholders.

Criterion 2. Organizational Experience – Management

Evaluators used the four subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.2 of the RfP, judging the proponents based on their administrative, financial, and monitoring systems; experience managing programs of similar size, scale, and complexity as the RIT; and experience directly managing small grants programs.

- **CI-Madagascar** has experience managing a program of small grants (primarily microgrants), and in training organizations to regrant funds. CI has solid systems in place to manage a grants program.
- **Tany Meva** and has solid experience managing a grants program, although it is not a large one; they have disbursed 14M over the past 18 years. Tany Meva has significant experience supporting local community groups to receive and implement grants. They have solid systems in place to manage a grants program, including finance, administration and M & E.

- **Biotope** provides solid evidence of their administrative and financial systems, and their ability to monitor and evaluate, based on this topic being prevalent in their portfolio. They also stand out as being the only applicant to have on the ground experience in all of the countries in the hotspot. However, they have no experience managing a grants program of any size.

Criterion 3. Personnel

Evaluators used the five subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.3 of the RfP, judging the proponents based on the overall staffing plan, the individual and combined skills of named candidates (as supported by resumes), the plan for recruitment of “to be determined” candidates, and the organization’s ability to engage its other full-time personnel to fill vacant positions, as needed.

- **Tany Meva** proposes a team comprising a full time RIT lead (Antananarivo), a full time Finance and Admin Officer (Antananarivo), three part time (50%) Program Officers (base locations tbd), and various additional staff performing at a lower level of effort addressing M & E, compliance, accounts and audit support. Staff have relevant skills in grants management, forestry, geography and agronomy, and excellent French, Malagasy and English language capability. All staff are identified and currently work for Tany Meva. Concerns about whether staff have sufficient seniority to engage with government and private sector were much reduced following the telephone interview.
- **CI-Madagascar** proposes a core team of three staff: a full time RIT lead, a full time Project Officer, and a full time Financial Coordinator, all based on Antananarivo. This team is to be supported by 14 other CI staff, ranging from Executive Vice President to driver. The core team is regarded as extremely capable, and has all necessary language capability. The Team Leader has strong expertise in terms of grant making and administration and support to civil society. While this is a great asset for some of the tasks to be performed, there could be a gap in terms of capacity to develop a clear vision for CEPF implementation, and to lead high level discussions with private sector and government representatives. Further, the core RIT team would entirely replace the existing “partnership division” of CI-Madagascar – with limited clarity on how the organization would follow up with existing tasks. From the interview, it was clear that CEPF funding would be an opportunity for CI-Madagascar to its current program, thereby implying potential risk in terms of demarcating clearly CEPF and CI actions. The proposal is not detailed in terms of action plan or differentiated approach for Mauritius, Seychelles and Comoros, and insufficient mention of which staff would be responsible for the islands.
- **Biotope** proposes a detailed staffing plan with a full time RIT lead based in Reunion, a full time Program Officer based in Antananarivo, and a part time (50%) Finance and Admin Officer based in Reunion. The team will be supported by six other staff based in either Madagascar or France, including a director (109 days), technical experts (55 days), a senior ecologist (164 days), a graphic designer (44 days), as well as staff contributing for senior coordination, strategy and finance. Staff are well qualified and have experience throughout the region, making this team stand out above the others. That said, the proposed RIT leader has insufficient capability in English, and this will affect the RIT’s ability to communicate with stakeholders in Mauritius, Seychelles, and elsewhere including the CEPF Secretariat.

Table 2. Personnel of the three Competitive Proposals

Biotope	CI-Madagascar	Tany Meva
Core staff		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RIT lead 100% (Reunion) 2. Programme Officer 100% (Tana) 3. Finance/admin officer 50%(Reunion) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RIT Lead 100%(Tana) 2. Project Officer 100% (Tana) 3. Financial coordinator 100% (Tana) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RIT lead 100% (Tana) 2. Finance and admin officer 100% 3. 50% time Project Officers (North Madagascar+Comoros) 4. 50% time Project Officer (South, West and Central Madagascar, based?) 5. 50% time Project Officer (Mauritius and Seychelles, based?)
Additional/support staff		
8 support staff from Biotope: - 109 days (director) - 55 days x 2 (technical experts regional + Madagascar) - 109 days (senior coordination Madagascar) - 164 days (senior ecologist Madagascar) - 55 days finance/admin (France) - 55 days strategy (France) - 44 days graphic designer (France)	14 other staff for 12 to 56 days/year (from Executive vice-president to driver, including regional directors in Madagascar)	4 additional staff: - Quality manager and internal audit support (2 month/year) - Monitoring/Evaluation expert (2.5 month/year from year 2) - Finance/admin supervisor (1 month/year) - Accountant (1 month/year)

Criterion 4. Understanding of the Ecosystem Profile

Evaluators used the three subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.4 of the RfP, judging the proponents based on their understanding of what CEPF is seeking to accomplish in the region, the technical challenges of running a grants program, and the likelihood of the proponent being able to promulgate the goals of CEPF beyond the five-year period of investment.

- **Biotope** participated in the preparation of the Ecosystem Profile, and has a good understanding of the strategic directions and investment priorities. They have thought about the different types of grants needed to address the challenges in the different islands, and compare approaches. The proposal is also the only one to discuss how the French OCTs could be involved in terms of experience sharing, adding to the regional dimension.
- **Tany Meva** demonstrates solid understanding of the Ecosystem Profile, and provides an interesting discussion on how the diversity of situations would lead to different approaches on

the different islands. They propose a stepwise approach to different geographies in Madagascar, and emphasize a progressive approach with capacity building in Comoros, for example.

- Despite being the lead on preparation of the Ecosystem Profile, **CI-Madagascar** presents a vague and relatively brief discussion of the challenges of implementing the profile in the different countries in the hotspot. There is minimal discussion about how CEPF will advance the organizational strategy of CI, and the team is focused on Madagascar, with minimal discussion about the roles of the RIT in terms of capacity building, synergies with private sector, or how they will work effectively in the islands.

Criterion 5. Proposed Technical Approach

Evaluators used the six subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.5 of the RfP, judging the proponents based on their approach to running a grants program, including specifically responding to all the elements of the RIT Terms of Reference.

- **Tany Meva's** proposal addresses all aspects of the RIT role, with a sound approach for soliciting and reviewing proposals and conducting outreach and support to grantees. They propose a stepwise approach for Madagascar and justification for proceeding faster in the other countries. The description of communication is weak as is the collaboration with government and the private sector, although the interview clarified that they have good links and plans with these two stakeholder groups. Their reputation as grant maker is very solid, and they are regarded as competent, fair and capable.
- **Biotope** proposes an approach that addresses all components of the RIT role, and they have a solid plan for soliciting proposals, publicizing the CEPF opportunity, and monitoring projects. Their communications expertise is pronounced. However, their approach to capacity building, with minimal travel to the region, is likely to be insufficient, indicating that they don't understand how much face to face interaction will be needed.
- **CI-Madagascar** presents a basin approach that addresses the RIT role, but is focused mostly on operations in Madagascar with no description on the practical aspects of implementation in the islands. While the grant-making mechanism well described, there is lack of detail on capacity building, links with private sector, and links with government and donors. Further, the system to reach out to potential applicants (diffusion of the call, information etc.) is not detailed, nor is there much description of how CI will reach out to local communities.

Criterion 6. Proposed Management Approach

Evaluators used the four subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.6 of the RfP, judging the proponents based on their proposed administrative, financial, and monitoring functions for overseeing grants awarded directly by CEPF (i.e., grants greater than \$20,000) and directly managing and disbursing small grants (i.e., grants less than \$20,000).

- **Biotope** proposes a system with a segregation of duties, which includes staff in Reunion and in Antananarivo, as well as in France. The methods for tracking funds, in particular for small grants, appears robust.

- **Tany Meva's** proposal was weak in describing its administrative system, however the interview clarified and confirmed the quality of their procedures. Further, the interview made it clear that their system could be adapted where necessary to fit CEPF's needs.
- **CI-Madagascar** proposes a system with segregation of duties involving a dedicated finance person from the former "partnership division" of CI-Madagascar, staff from CI-Madagascar's finance department, and the General Counsel of CI Headquarters, however, the roles of each are not clearly defined. Further, the RIT Leader also has a background in accountancy, but his role regarding finances and admin is not detailed. In short there is lack of clarity about the roles of various staff included in the proposal.

Criterion 7. Budget

Evaluators used the six subordinate criteria listed in Section 15.7 of the RfP. As the RfP names a maximum budget of \$1,500,000, evaluators focused on clarity of presentation, symmetry between the budget and the technical proposal, transparency of unit costs, reasonableness of unit and total costs, and overall value, particularly as measured by total labor provided.

- **CI-Madagascar** has proposed a budget that responds to the RIT role. The main concern is the large number of staff included in the budget.
- **Tany Meva** proposed a budget with lack of detail in the staff category, in terms of how staff salaries were calculated as well as cost of support staff.
- **Biotope's** budget includes high salary costs, and a small allocation for travel that is likely to be insufficient.

Table 3. Budgets of the Three Competitive Proposals

Biotope		CI-Madagascar		Tany Meva	
Strength: fully detailed budget Weakness: travel budget very limited, most of the grant is for salaries.		Strength: clear budget		Weakness: budget presentation is poor. Some budget lines do not match the proposal. Budget needs to be revised.	
<u>Major Budget Elements</u>		<u>Major Budget Elements</u>		<u>Major Budget Elements</u>	
Staff (main staff)	\$790,638	Staff (main staff)	\$346,165	Staff (main staff)	\$211,192
Staff (additional support)	\$404,175	Staff (additional support)	\$242,776	Staff (additional support)	<i>(incl in previous - no details)</i>
Professional services (consultants)	\$100,037	Professional services (consultants)	\$203,493	Professional services (consultants)	\$307,469
<i>Sub-total Labor/service</i>	<i>\$1,294,850</i>	<i>Sub-total Labor/service</i>	<i>\$792,434</i>	<i>Sub-total Labor/service</i>	<i>\$518,661</i>
Travel	\$113,799	Travel	\$258,994	Travel	\$327,324
Supplies	\$0	Supplies	\$28,333	Supplies	\$19,667
Equipment	\$0	Equipment	\$41,900	Equipment	\$165,045
Events	\$8,220	Events	\$62,329	Events	\$148,910
Others	\$0	Others	\$142,985	Others	\$100,192
Indirect Costs	\$82,042	Indirect Costs	\$172,507	Indirect Costs*	\$127,980
TOTAL	\$1,499,913	TOTAL	\$1,499,482	TOTAL	\$1,407,779

* * The Indirect costs were calculated in the offer's budget on the basis of RIT allocation+ small grant budget. Budget presented here reflect this correction – which was agreed by applicant during interviews.

5. Strengths and Weaknesses of Short-listed Applications

Fondation Tany Meva

Strengths: Tany Meva has demonstrated experience in grant-making in Madagascar. The organization has worked with several international donors and has a good reputation for abiding by their requirements, policies and procedures. Their financial and management system appears sound and can be adapted to fit with CEPF procedures. Their understanding of the Ecosystem Profile is fully satisfactory, in particular regarding the challenges of a region with countries at very different stages in terms of conservation and civil society. The organization has good track records in engaging with and building the capacities of national as well as local and grassroots organizations. The action plan is quite detailed, with a differentiated approach for each country, and specifically a progressive, step-by-step approach in Madagascar and the Comoros. The staffing structure is coherent with three members in the core team, supported by three half-time experts focusing on sub-regions (North Madagascar and Comoros; South, West and Central Madagascar, and Seychelles and Mauritius). The three experts offer an interesting mix of expertise, with a geographer, an agronomist and a forester. The proposed RIT Leader has a good track record with Tany Meva, has engaged with international networks (CAFE network of environmental Trust funds in Africa) and demonstrates good leadership capacity. The proposal includes launching events, mid-term and final workshops, and several ad hoc capacity building events. The overall price is lower than the other offers, allowing for some flexibility if needed.

Weaknesses: The organization has limited experience with Comoros, Mauritius and the Seychelles, even if some partnerships exist thanks to the CAFÉ network of conservation trust funds in Africa, chaired by Tany Meva for several years. The proposal does not detail how Tany Meva intends to engage with private sector and decision makers. The budget presentation is not aligned with CEPF standards and several budget lines shall need to be revised.

Conservation International Madagascar

Strengths: CI-Madagascar has demonstrated experience in grant-making in Madagascar, in particular through the NODE program supported by CEPF. They have a good understanding of the Ecosystem Profile. The financial and management system they suggest is sound and adapted to CEPF procedures. CI-Madagascar has also built relationships with non-governmental organizations from Comoros, Seychelles and Mauritius. They have proven to be influential with decision makers and are in a leading position in terms of relationships with the private sector and government in Madagascar. The proposed RIT Leader has a good track record at CI-Madagascar as being in charge of regranting and partnership. This is especially evident with the success of the NODE program which has benefited local, grassroots organizations.

Weaknesses: The proposed management structure has been assessed as not optimal for managing CEPF investment, with a small core team (three people) with strong experience in grant-making, supported by 14 CI-Madagascar staff, for a limited number of days. The core RIT team would entirely replace the existing “partnership division” of CI Madagascar – with limited clarity on how the organization would follow up with existing tasks. From the interview, it had been made clear that CEPF funding would be an opportunity for CI Madagascar to “continue what CI [was] already doing” – which implies potential risk

in terms of demarcating clearly CEPF and CI actions. The proposal is not detailed in terms of an action plan or differentiated approach for Mauritius, Seychelles and Comoros.

Biotope

Strengths: The proposal of this organization had been unanimously considered as well detailed and articulated, as well as well presented with very pleasing layout and photos. The applicants have made an effort to articulate the different sections and propose an action plan for several years. The Biotope proposal is also strong on the regional aspects, with specific attention to Comoros, Seychelles and Mauritius. It is also the only one to specifically mention the European outermost regions and overseas territories. The proposed RIT Leader has a good experience in terms of conservation, private sector engagement, and has worked in the different countries in the hotspot, including Comoros.

Weaknesses: The experience of Biotope is extremely limited in terms of grant-making, even less so with civil society and grassroots organizations. The budget is dominated by staff costs, leaving a relatively small budget for travel and other actions. The core team is split between Madagascar and Reunion island (not in an eligible country), which has been considered by evaluators as sub-optimal: the advantages of “independence” were not considered as balancing enough of the inconveniences. The interviews revealed that the RIT Leader has insufficient proficiency in English, which could impact communication with Secretariat, as well as with Mauritius and Seychelles organizations and decision-makers.

Additional information on strengths and weaknesses can be found below.

Table 4. Major Strengths and Weaknesses of the Three Competitive Proposals

Biotope	Conservation International	Tany Meva
Organizational Experience – Technical		
<p>Strength: private sector engagement, experience in all the countries of the hotspot, conservation to a certain extent.</p> <p>Weakness: capacity building, working with civil society.</p>	<p>Strength: conservation, work with government agencies, regranting, capacity building</p> <p>Weakness: experience limited to Madagascar.</p>	<p>Strength: conservation, re-granting, capacity building. Close to local organizations.</p> <p>Weakness: conservation science, private sector engagement. Experience limited to Madagascar.</p>
Organizational Experience – Management		

<p>Strength: System is well described and includes all countries in the hotspot.</p> <p>Weakness: has not managed a small grants fund, nor any grant management program.</p>	<p>Strength: Ability to manage large small grant programs (i.e. NODE). Financial system equivalent to CEPF's (Agresso). Experience in grant management.</p> <p>Weakness: use of CI's financial system for small grant might be an issue. Very large team with lot of part-time staff.</p>	<p>Strength: has managed projects of similar overall size as CEPF, including large small grant programs.</p> <p>Robust operation system in place – fulfilling Helvetas, USAID requirements as well as UNDP, PAM. Ability to reach and work with grassroots organizations.</p> <p>Weakness:</p>
<p>Personnel – see above</p>		
<p>Understanding of the Ecosystem Profile</p>		
<p>Clear understanding of the profile, in particular regarding the small islands developing states and French overseas</p> <p>Weakness: the discussion/analysis on the role of civil society is weak.</p> <p>(nb. Biotope participated to the Ecosystem Profile preparation, for the islands other than Madagascar).</p>	<p>Satisfactory understanding of the profile, even if analysis remains weak. Focus mostly on Madagascar.</p> <p>(nb. CI Mada led the Ecosystem profile process for the Hotspot).</p>	<p>Clear understanding of the Profile, in particular on the civil society and development aspects. Even if the focus is mostly on Madagascar, the diversity of the situation in the different islands, and its implication on conservation, are well articulated. .</p>
<p>Proposed Technical Approach</p>		
<p>Strength: Well articulated process for grant-making. Good description of communication strategy. All the tasks in ToR covered.</p> <p>Weakness: reach-out to local, community-based organizations not convincing. Little mention of involvement with governments and policy influence.</p>	<p>Strength: Clear system in place for the granting mechanism (small and large grants) and good knowledge of CEPF procedures.</p> <p>Weakness: limited discussion of engaging the private sector. Limited explanation on reaching out to local communities as well as capacity building element. Few elements on approaching islands other than Madagascar.</p>	<p>Strength: intensive approach to capacity building and mentoring of grantees, very detailed approach on reaching out to local organizations. Proposed approach to islands other than Mada with discussion on different needs (even if might have to be reviewed).</p> <p>Weakness: Limited discussion on engaging with private sector. Limited mention of communication element.</p>

Proposed Management Approach		
Strength: existing systems and operations appear sufficiently robust to adapt to CEPF but limited experience of applicant in terms of re-granting implies the need to set up many systems.	Strength: existing systems and operations are similar to CEPF's (same software etc).	Strength: existing systems and operations are robust enough and can easily adapt to needs of CEPF.
Budget		
Strength: fully detailed budget Weakness: travel budget very limited, most of the grant is for salaries.	Strength: clear budget	Weakness: budget presentation is poor. Some lines do not match proposals. Budget needs to be revised.

5. Evaluation Summary and Recommendation

Based on the assessment by CEPF Secretariat and external reviewer, followed by a phone interview of the three best proposals, CEPF ranks Fondation Tany Meva as offering the best overall value and possibility for success. Tany Meva presents a detailed action plan including differentiated actions for each country, and a better structured management configuration, with a smaller team fully dedicated to the RIT role, which has proven the best model for RIT effectiveness in our experience. Based on the interviews of the proposed RIT Leaders, the Secretariat is confident that CEPF investment could have a transformative effect on Tany Meva as a regional organization.

Based on this evaluation, the Secretariat suggests that the Working Group recommend Fondation Tany Meva to the Donor Council and for the Donor Council to select Tany Meva as the RIT for the Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands Hotspot.

If the Working Group recommends Fondation Tany Meva to the Donor Council, the Secretariat will engage in negotiations with Fondation Tany Meva. Specifically, the Secretariat will ask Fondation Tany Meva to make various revisions to its proposal prior to award. Principally, these would be consolidation of the team to strengthen cooperation with Comoros, Seychelles and Mauritius, several changes and clarifications on the budget, and elaboration of plans for engagement with the private sector.