CEPF/DC27/6b

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Donor Council
Arlington, Virginia, USA
Wednesday, 24 June 2015

8 a.m. – 11 a.m. EDT

Technical Framework for Graduating Civil Society from CEPF Support in the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains

Presented to the CEPF Donor Council on 24 June 2015

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Current CEPF investment in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot

CEPF and a team of international experts prepared the *Ecosystem Profile for the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot* over the course of 2011. The CEPF Donor Council approved this profile in January 2012, and in September of that year, the Secretariat formally engaged BirdLife International, through its program office in Nairobi, Kenya, as the Regional Implementation Team (RIT). BirdLife, along with two subordinate partners – the Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society and IUCN – is engaged to serve as the RIT for five years, currently through August 2017. To date, CEPF has obligated $7 million out of a total allocation of $9.8 million to civil society partners working in the region per the strategic directions outlined in the Ecosystem Profile. Apart from the RIT, the Ecosystem Profile has three strategic directions:

1. Mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors.
2. Improve the protection and management of the KBA network throughout the hotspot.
3. Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.

The profile defines the conservation need for investment in the region with a focus on species, sites, and corridors. While it is meant to be a resource that can guide investment for the broader donor community, it is also, strictly speaking, a design document specifying the scope in which CEPF will award grants through 2017. The profile defines the hotspot to include fifteen countries, below, of which all but Saudi Arabia are eligible for investment.

1. Burundi
2. Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
3. Eritrea
4. Ethiopia
5. Kenya
6. Malawi
7. Mozambique
8. Rwanda
9. Saudi Arabia
10. South Sudan
11. Tanzania
12. Uganda
13. Yemen
14. Zambia
15. Zimbabwe

1.2. Context for long-term vision / technical framework

The Ecosystem Profile outlines investment priorities for immediate CEPF grant-making over five years. In that period, CEPF certainly expects to be successful at a site scale and with the sub-set of civil society with which we directly and indirectly work. However, given the scope of conservation and development challenges in the region, in five years, CEPF grants will only make a small difference, at least at a national or regional level, toward allaying existing problems and threats. The question from a donor then becomes, "Knowing that donors cannot finance a response to all conservation needs, at a minimum, how do we know when civil society is in a position to fulfill its role in conservation?"

In June 2014, CEPF's Donor Council provided guidance in establishing conditions and criteria to answer this question, to establish the conditions under which CEPF can withdraw from a hotspot with confidence that effective biodiversity conservation programs will continue in a self-sustaining manner. This does not necessarily mean that biodiversity is no longer threatened, but only that the conservation movement, collectively, is able to respond to all present threats and any future threats that could reasonably be expected to arise. The five conditions that need to be met in order for a hotspot to graduate from CEPF support comprise:

1. Global conservation priorities and best practices for their management are documented, disseminated and used by public and private sector, civil society and donor agencies to guide their support for conservation in the region.
2. Local civil society groups dedicated to global conservation priorities collectively possess sufficient organizational and technical capacity to be effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development, while being equal partners of private sector and government agencies influencing decision making in favor of sustainable societies and economies.
3. Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities.
4. Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity.
5. Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation challenges.[1]

Each of these "conditions" itself has five defining criteria. If properly elucidated, having specific criteria and targets for each of these conditions can serve as a guide: for CEPF in its program design and grant-making, for CEPF's donors – and other donors – via their support for complementary work, and for host-country governments, the private sector, conservation NGOs, and civil society at large to positively influence conservation in a region.

[1] Twenty-fifth Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council, Washington, DC, 24 June 2014, Long-term strategic visions for graduating civil society from CEPF support in the biodiversity hotspots.

1.3. Piloting the Long-Term Vision (Technical Framework) Concept in the Eastern Afromontane

The conditions and criteria that establish the technical framework present a challenge of scale. As an analogy, consider that CEPF uses biodiversity hotspots to identify where – on earth – to invest; that is, in the regions with the greatest biodiversity under the greatest threat, usually spanning national boundaries. However, CEPF grants most typically focus on smaller units, such as key biodiversity areas (defined, in part, as sites that are currently, or can potentially be, managed for conservation). Similarly, when defining a technical framework, conditions and criteria must relate to the appropriate management unit.

The most appropriate unit for understanding most of the conditions and criteria is national, or smaller. The laws that govern the way civil society organizes and interacts with the public and private sector are defined nationally. The economic incentives that affect how the private sector behaves can be quite distinct from one country to the next. The largest single land managers with legal authority are national government agencies. This is not to propose that CEPF will diverge from its focus on hotspots. Rather, just as CEPF uses smaller units – KBAs and corridors – to provide focus for its grant making, the technical framework uses the country to delineate criteria and targets.

The result might be a rephrasing. Rather than:

> *A Long-Term Vision for CEPF Graduation in the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot*

The alternative, for example, in Uganda, would be:

> *A Long-Term Vision for CEPF Graduation from the <u>Ugandan Portion</u> of the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot*

The Eastern Afromontane region includes fifteen countries. For this exercise, CEPF focused on a subset of these, thinking there might be commonalities in social, economic, and political conditions to allow for common statements about graduation conditions. The focus here is on the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains, the sub-region of the hotspot that includes seven countries: Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda.

To assist with this effort, CEPF awarded a contract to Alex Muhweezi of Future Dialogues International of Kampala, Uganda in November 2014 and an associated agreement to BirdLife International for logistical support from its office in Nairobi, Kenya. Mr. Muhweezi conferred in person, by phone, or in writing with over 80 people in the seven countries to compile information presented here.

1.4. Other Long-Term Vision Documents and Processes

This long-term vision is unique in that it is oriented toward biodiversity conservation at a hotspot scale. However, the pathways directed here are not unique, in and of themselves, and in fact, can be found, in whole or in part, in several other places. The subject countries' National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and at least some of their multi-year poverty reduction and development plans discuss the same types of graduation targets as this document. In addition, there are regional efforts, such as Conservation International's Gaborone Declaration [to which Kenya, Rwanda, and Tanzania are signatories), the African Great Lakes Partnership being led by the Nature Conservancy, and others that

fall under regional economic and market communities (e.g., COMESA, IGAD, EAC, CEEAC). This long-term vision does not supplant any of the others and should not contradict any of the others.

2. Background

The seven countries of the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains include 142 freshwater and terrestrial "afromontane" KBAs. These KBAs do not exist in isolation. The seven countries are home to a population of 220 million, a number expected to increase by fifty percent in fifteen years at current rates. This population creates massive forces on its own – demand for food and wealth – and is itself subject to forces imposed by global demand for resources.

2.1. Social, political, and economic context for conservation

The Ecosystem Profile (Chapter 5) contains detailed information on the hotspot, including the seven countries of interest here.

Social context and trends

As noted above, population growth, with rates between 2 and 3 percent, is a major factor in any discussion of conservation. Rwanda, with 394 people per square kilometer, and Burundi, with 314 people per square kilometer, are among the most densely populated countries on the continent, and the percentages of people living in urban areas are more than doubling in both countries. Meanwhile, the UNDP's Human Development Index shows Burundi, DRC, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Tanzania as all being in the bottom twenty five of its global rankings.

Looking to the future, national and local governments should be predicted to put the immediate needs of people first, even if it means making trade-offs on sustainable use of resources. Conservation organizations, to be relevant in national discussions, will need to address biodiversity in the context of development: health, education, and poverty.

Political Context and trends

Political context must be addressed separately for each country. Political context is also, by its nature, both subjective and very sensitive. Rather than go into the details for each country here, the table below summarizes recent indices from three organizations. These indices are themselves compilations of different data points, but the general point is evident: none of the countries is fully open to the political, civic, or economic engagement of its citizenry at this time.

Table 1. Indices Measuring Political Context

Country	Freedom House Ranking Index 2015	Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index 2012	Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Index 2015
Burundi	Not free	Authoritarian	Difficult situation
DRC	Not free	Authoritarian	Difficult situation
Kenya	Partly free	Hybrid	Noticeable problems
Rwanda	Not free	Authoritarian	Difficult situation
South Sudan	Not free	n/a	Difficult situation
Tanzania	Partly free	Hybrid	Noticeable problems
Uganda	Not free	Hybrid	Noticeable problems

In theory, trends should improve, but in practice, it is easy for destabilization in one country to move to its neighbors. Even as of this writing, there are indigenous and exogenous challenges in each of the countries. The implication for civil society organizations is that democracy and governance will continue to be an issue for the foreseeable future, let alone the ability of civil society to engage in conservation.

Economic context and trends

Countries in the region have enjoyed annual economic growth of over five percent. This has been facilitated by macroeconomic reforms (e.g., trade liberalization, privatization, revised land laws), external demand for primary commodities, economic growth in foreign markets (particularly Asia), and major investment from foreign countries (particularly China, Korea, and the Gulf States).

Trends in Agriculture in this region are reflective of those on the continent as a whole, as the World Bank reports in *Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness* (January, 2013). There is increasing demand for food due to internal population growth, rising incomes and urbanization, and export markets. At the same time, there are supply challenges from slowing yield growth of major food crops, land degradation, water scarcity, and climate change. In the same report, the Bank sees agriculture as critical to maintaining high growth rates, creating jobs, and reducing poverty. The continent holds 450 million hectares of land that is not forested, protected, or densely populated, and this will surely be targeted for increased production. There is huge export market demand for rice, maize, soybeans, sugar, palm oil, biofuel, and feedstock and domestic demand for rice, feed grains, poultry, dairy, vegetable oils, horticulture, and processed foods.

The African Development Bank reports that while the continent holds 30 percent of the world's total mineral reserves, it is responsible for only 8 percent of global production. This will surely change as expenditures increase on exploration and on industrialization [to process raw materials before export.][2] Meanwhile, oil is the dominant factor in the economy of South Sudan, but due to political instability and relations with Sudan, revenue oscillates wildly. In the other countries in the Albertine Rift, there have been new discoveries of reserves and prospecting in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania.

[2] http://www.afdb.org/en/blogs/afdb-championing-inclusive-growth-across-africa/post/mining-industry-prospects-in-africa-10177/

The implication for civil society is that (1) there will be a greater need for organizations to serve as "watchdogs" monitoring against potential negative environmental impact, and (2) civil society will need to engage with the private sector and governments whose use, if not exploitation, of resources is likely inevitable.

2.2. Current status of civil society: conservation, health, education

The Ecosystem Profile (Chapter 7) contains detailed information on civil society in relation to conservation in the hotspot, including the seven countries of interest here. As part of the stakeholder consultation process, stakeholders scored civil society by country in terms of:

- Protected area management
- Science
- Community engagement
- Awareness
- Advocacy
- Networking

The composite country scores are as follows:

Relatively high:	Kenya, Tanzania
Moderate:	Uganda
Relatively low:	Burundi, DRC, Rwanda
Nascent:	South Sudan

During the profiling process, stakeholders reported the legal framework for civil society to be constrained in DRC and only moderately supportive in Tanzania, but with no constraints in the other four countries (not including South Sudan). Political space was seen as only moderate in Burundi, Tanzania, and Uganda, but as not constraining in the other three countries. Funding was seen as a constraint in all but Tanzania and Uganda.

The Profile uses the Directory of Development Organizations and the African Conservation Foundation database as proxies to understand the broader set of CSOs, including those active in health, education, agriculture, and enterprise, and finance. All of these could work with "conservation organizations" or could themselves work on conservation issues directly or indirectly.

Large number of CSOs:	Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda (relative to its size and population)
Small number of CSOs:	Burundi, DRC, South Sudan

The understanding from this categorization is that the breadth and depth of civil society organizations in Burundi, DRC, and South Sudan is not robust enough today to deal with conservation challenges.

In addition, there are the following national and regional networks.

Table 2. National and Regional Networks

Country	Network
Burundi	Forum pour le Renforcement de la Société Civile Plan d'action pour la gestion intégrée ressources en eau
DRC	Alliance Congolaise des Organisations de Conservation des oiseaux Coaltion pur la Conservation au Congo Groupe de Travail Climat REDD Dynamique des Groupes des Peuples Autochtones Union of Associations for Gorilla Conservation and Community Development in Eastern DRC Reseau Ressources naturelles RESEAU CREF Conseil national des ONG
Rwanda	Rwanda Environmental NGOs Forum
Tanzania	MJUMITA Tanzania Natural Resources Forum Forum CC Wildlife Management Areas Consortium
Uganda	Uganda Forest Working Group Wetlands Advisory Group Uganda Network on Collaborative Forest Management Associations Civil Society Coalition on Oil and Gas Uganda Uganda Forest Governance Group Uganda Nile Discourse Forum
Kenya	IBA National Liaison Committee Kenya Wetlands Forum Wildlife Conservation Working Group Kenya Climate Change Working Group National Alliance of Community Forest Associations
Regional	Albertine Rift Conservation Society East African Wildlife Society Eastern African Environmental Network Horn of Africa Regional Environment Network Réseau des Aires Protégées d'Afrique Centrale Congo Basin Forest Partnership

2.3. Existing and potential sustainable conservation financing mechanisms

The Convention on Biological Diversity defines financial sustainability as "The ability to secure stable and sufficient long-term financial resources, and to allocate them in a timely manner and appropriate form, to cover the full costs of protected areas (direct and indirect) and to ensure that PAs are managed effectively and efficiently." It goes on to state that "through a diversified mix of conventional funding sources (e.g., national budgetary allocations, overseas development assistance) and innovative funding sources (e.g., payments for ecosystem services, trust funds and green taxes), countries can achieve stable and sufficient long-term financial resources to support their protected area systems."

Relative to national government revenue allocations official development assistance, funding currently available in the seven countries from the "innovative" sources named above is minuscule.

Table 3. Conservation Finance Mechanisms

Country	Mechanism
Rwanda	National Fund for Environment
Tanzania	Tanzania Forest Fund
	Eastern Arc Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund
Uganda	National Environment Fund Uganda Rhino Fund
Kenya	Wildlife Endowment Fund
Regional	Masaai Wilderness Conservation Fund (Kenya and Tanzania) Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust Fund Nile Basin Trust Fund Mountain Gorilla Conservation Fund African Elephant Fund

It is very difficult to access data on current capitalization of these funds. Other than the Eastern Arc fund and Bwindi Mgahinga, which both report capitalization of approximately $7 million, the others do not publish this data. It is easier to see, however, the relatively small amount of activity of each. Certainly, they solicit grant applications and support others' work, and they use their endowments to support their own efforts, which is legitimate. From this, we understand the institutional baseline – mechanisms with governance structures – as greater than zero, while we understand the funding baseline – the amount of money flowing to civil society – as practically zero.

2.4. Review of public policies in agriculture, forestry, tourism, mining, energy, and civil society organizations

The Ecosystem Profile Chapter 6.4 discusses this issue in detail, reviewing national development strategies from Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda to understand themes in relation to their environmental impacts.

Agriculture

Agriculture is a priority in all seven subject countries. They wish to improve food security, increase cash crop production to increase export revenues, improve subsistence agriculture through greater access to pesticides, fertilizers, and farm-to-market infrastructure, and increase irrigation. Uganda, Rwanda, and to some degree, Tanzania, do include more agroforestry and soil conservation as part of their plans. All speak of converting "unused" land to agriculture. Other than in Rwanda's strategy, none discuss the role of forest and natural systems as relevant to maintaining agricultural productivity.

Extractive Industry

Uganda intends to exploit its oil, Tanzania intends to increase its mining, Rwanda intends to increase mineral exports, and Burundi lists mining as one of six priority sectors.

In order to attract investment into the sector, governments are trying to make exploration easier and encouraging mining industrialization (i.e., post-processing). In addition to traditional American, European, Australian, and South African companies, China and India are now also investing, leading to

more incentive to scale up the overall supporting infrastructure, including energy and transport. Governments are taking deliberate steps to attract his investment.

Energy Production and Distribution

Kenya plans to increase electricity production from current levels of 1,300 megawatts to 16,000 megawatts by 2030. While smaller in scale, Rwanda wishes to triple current production of 45 megawatts. Uganda and Burundi also have ambitious plans.

All recognize the importance of reducing the use of firewood and increasing rural electricity coverage. For the majority of potential customers, the strategies discuss conventional production methods (e.g., hydropower, coal) as opposed to renewable sources (e.g., solar, wind, micro-hydro, biogas).

Tourism

Apart from DRC and South Sudan, the five countries view tourism as an important economic sector and are putting into place plans to either further promote mass tourism or to diversify the market toward small-scale, culture, and "under-visited" parks.

Natural Resource Use

Tanzania has CBFM and CBNRM laws that date back to the 1995 National Land Policy, with subsequent implementation guidelines on joint forest management government reserves and CBFM in village forest reserves. Kenya has similar regulations that date back to the 2005 Forest Act. Uganda allows for collaborative forest management under its National Forestry and Tree planting Act, but it has been difficult to implement. DRC established a Forest Code in 2002 that demarcates forest zones and mandates that logging concessions pay fees to support local infrastructure, but this has not happened.

Civil Society

The subject countries all place value on the role of civil society in rural development. This may be for idealistic reasons or because national governments recognize that they do not have the funds to undertake these activities themselves. In particular, the countries support farmers' associations as channels for improving productivity. Uganda and Tanzania both call on civil society to assist with ecosystem restoration and community-based forest management.

The primary policies regulating civil society in each country are as follows:

Burundi:	Internal Affairs Act
Kenya:	Public Benefits Organization Act (2013), Public Order Management Act
Rwanda:	National NGO Regulation Bill
Tanzania:	Non-Governmental Organization Act (2002), Public Order Management Act
Uganda:	National NGO Registration Bill (2014), Public Order Management Act

2.5. Industries affecting biodiversity, leading "change agents," and engagement of civil society with them thus far

The major industries affecting biodiversity in the subject countries are similar to others in Africa: agriculture and agribusiness, oil, gas, mining, hydropower, and real estate development and associated infrastructure, with tourism and forestry in specific locations. A list of market-leading companies would be exhaustive, and would probably change as these companies merge with or are purchased by others. While such a list would turn up expected names in eastern Africa (e.g., Unilever, Total Oil, BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto, Anglo American), also interesting is consideration of the largest companies overall in each country; for example: Safaricom in Kenya (telecommunications), Mukwano Group in Uganda (cooking and household products), Tanga Cement in Tanzania, and almost everywhere, financial institutions, media conglomerates, and state-controlled utilities. Links between a telecommunications or soap and detergent company and conservation might not be immediately obvious, but these companies can be as influential as the direct land managers.

Of course, the direct land managers, like the mining companies, are hugely influential. Many major companies have shifted efforts to Africa due to high costs elsewhere, such as labor and environmental compliance. To prevent potential exploitation, the African Union adopted the Africa Mining Vision in 2008 to promote improved mining sector governance, better management of mining-related revenue, and improved management of environmental and social issues.

3. Theory of Change

3.1. Actions to reach graduation criteria (including those not involving CEPF)

The theory of change for the sub-region holds true for the entire hotspot and for all CEPF hotspots, and is the basis for the development of the five graduation conditions and subordinate criteria. Specifically:

> *If five conditions are met -- relating to conservation priorities and best practices, civil society capacity, sustainable financing, the enabling policy and institutional environment, and mechanisms allowing for responsiveness to emerging issues -- then conservation of species, key biodiversity areas, corridors, and the ecosystem services they support, will occur indefinitely.*

The theory is based on five arguments.

1. In order to conserve species, sites, corridors, and natural systems, stakeholders must identify them, prioritize them, make management plans, and implement those plans.

2. Civil society [organizations], as stakeholder, beneficiary, and legal or *de facto* manager of species, sites, and corridors, needs the capacity to assume a management role, which is a function of a strong conservation community, strong individual organizations, partnerships among CSOs and other stakeholders, adequate financial resources, and the ability to engage with policy-makers and the private sector.

3. Conservation of species, sites, corridors, and systems requires funds for or from multiple parties, including funding for civil society (cited above) and funding for the major public sector agencies responsible for resource management, which itself is a function of those agencies' ability to

generate revenue and is a function of finance and line ministries using conservation goals as a way to determine allocation of money. Funding must come from multiple donor sources and also from continued revenue of long-term mechanisms.

4. Conservation of species, sites, corridors, and systems does not occur in a geographic or institutional vacuum. For any of the above arguments to have constancy, laws need to give proper incentives and disincentives for conservation behavior and need to allow civil society to engage in the policy process, and those laws need to be enforced. Major private sector actors need to be supportive of conservation, regardless of the laws and enforcement capacity of the government. The education system needs to produce a continuing domestic supply of capable environmental managers.

5. The world is not static, so conservation actions and plans must adapt. This requires monitoring of species, sites, and corridors, monitoring of threats, and monitoring of the provision of services from natural systems. It requires public discussion of changes and threats and it requires that government and non-government resource managers have the ability to adapt their approaches.

The actions to implement these arguments are detailed in the tables below.

3.2. Assumptions

In addition to CEPF's eight assumptions underpinning its global theory of change (stated in the Long-Term Vision terms of reference and not repeated here), the following hold true over a 15-20 year planning period, for this sub-region.

1. Engagement of civil society makes conservation outcomes better. (This assumption may be contested by government agencies with formal protected area enforcement responsibilities or by government agencies tasked with security, in general.)

2. We can plan for engagement of individual parties (i.e., lead government agencies, lead members of civil society, lead private sector companies) over 15-20 years.

3. Stakeholders with foreknowledge of long-term engagement will remain altruistic – thinking of national conservation goals and civil society at large – and not try to capture all financial or political resources for themselves.

4. Political leaders and private companies will be willing to forego more certain near-term gains in exchange for uncertain long-term gains.

5. Political leaders in each of the seven countries manage democratic transitions.

6. South Sudan resolves disputes over oil revenue and other matters with Sudan.

7. DRC, Kenya, and Uganda manage domestic issues of peace and stability.

8. Burundi, DRC, Rwanda, and Tanzania have systems in place to manage large temporary populations of refugees and internally displaced people.

4. Graduation conditions, criteria, baseline, milestones, and targets through 2030

Table 4.1. Graduation Condition 1: Conservation Priorities and Best Practices

1. Conservation priorities and best practices: Global conservation priorities (e.g., globally threatened species, Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), reservoirs of natural capital, etc.) and best practices for their management are identified, documented, disseminated and used by public sector, private sector, civil society and donor agencies to guide their support for conservation in the hotspot				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
1.1. Globally threatened species: Comprehensive global threat assessments conducted for all terrestrial vertebrates, vascular plants and selected freshwater taxa	The hotspot *[not the sub-region or individual countries]* has 7,598 plant species and 3,258 terrestrial and aquatic vertebrates; 677 threatened species; at least 102 data deficient species.	Country-specific plans for threat assessments in place, including prioritization that recognizes that "comprehensive" does not mean "all"	50% of prioritized list in each country is assessed	100% of prioritized list in each country is assessed – with submission to IUCN for Red Listing
1.2. Key Biodiversity Areas: KBAs identified in all countries and territories in the hotspot, covering, at minimum, terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems	KBAs identified by country, *not the sub-region:* Burundi: 8 Congo DR: 22 Kenya: 26 Rwanda: 10 South Sudan: 2 Tanzania: 43 Uganda: 31	Country-specific plans in place for identification and delineation of KBAs, including prioritization of regions in context of ecosystem services and political, economic, and social factors	KBA identification complete for 50% of prioritized regions	KBA identification complete for 100% of prioritized regions
1.3. Reservoirs of natural capital: Reservoirs of natural capital identified in all countries and territories in the hotspot, covering ecosystem services particularly critical to human survival	Major river basins/lake basins/watersheds, wetlands, and forests are known for: Burundi: Congo DR: Kenya: Rwanda: South Sudan: Tanzania: Uganda:	Identification of additional reservoirs by country (e.g., pollinators, flood plains)	Delineation of reservoirs by manageable and meaningful geographic units that correspond to social/political/economic structures	Major reservoirs of natural capital in each country incorporated into national economic accounts

1. Conservation priorities and best practices: Global conservation priorities (e.g., globally threatened species, Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), reservoirs of natural capital, etc.) and best practices for their management are identified, documented, disseminated and used by public sector, private sector, civil society and donor agencies to guide their support for conservation in the hotspot				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
1.4. Conservation plans: Conservation priorities incorporated into national or regional conservation plans or strategies developed with the participation of multiple stakeholders	- Lake Tanganyika, Masai Mara, Virunga landscape management plan - NBSAPs for each country Conservation and or management plans for protected forests, wildlife reserves/national parks, selected wetlands and lakes exist in all countries in the hotspot	By country, overlay of plans with species, sites, corridors, and areas containing reservoirs of natural capital	Specific plan/strategy, in each country, incorporating conservation priorities is identified as priority, validated by stakeholders, and funded	In each country, implementation of national conservation plan or strategy incorporating species, sites, corridors, and reservoirs of natural capital
1.5. Management best practices: Best practices for managing conservation priorities (e.g., sustainable livelihoods projects, participatory approaches to park management, invasive species control, etc.) are introduced, institutionalized, and sustained at CEPF priority KBAs and corridors	Best practices are understood by local, national, and international *environmental* NGOs and by local and national *environmental* government agencies, but not by agencies/NGOs from other sectors or the private sector; and practices are not universally implemented	Implementation by environmental agencies/NGOs; understanding by non-environmental agencies/NGOs	Implementation by non—environmental agencies/NGOs; understanding by private sector	Environmental and *non-environmental* agencies/NGOs, and the private sector, understand and implement best practices in priority locations

Table 4.2. Graduation Condition 2: Civil Society Capacity

2. Civil society capacity: Local civil society groups dedicated to conserving conservation priorities collectively possess sufficient organizational and technical capacity to be effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
2.1. Conservation community: The community of civil society organizations is sufficiently broad and deep-rooted to respond to key conservation issues and collectively possesses the technical competencies of critical importance to conservation	Number of organizations per country: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Sufficient number of CSOs exist in each country to appropriately engage in management of all priority species, sites, and corridors
2.2. Organizational capacity: Local civil society groups collectively possess sufficient operational capacity and structures to raise funds for conservation and to ensure the efficient management of conservation projects and strategies	Status of organizations by country (high, mid, low): Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Sufficient numbers of CSOs in each country have high capacity by objective measurement tool

2. Civil society capacity: Local civil society groups dedicated to conserving conservation priorities collectively possess sufficient organizational and technical capacity to be effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
2.3. Partnerships: Effective mechanisms (e.g., discussion forums, round-tables, mutual support networks, alliances, etc.) exist for conservation-focused civil society groups to work in partnership with one another, and through networks with local communities, governments, the private sector, donors, and other important stakeholders, in pursuit of common conservation and development objectives	Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda all have forestry, wetlands, fisheries, water and sanitation, biodiversity, and civil society working groups and networks; these countries plus Congo also have coalitions on oil, gas, and mining; these countries plus South Sudan have associations for timber marketing and tourism; various participate in Friends of Lake Victoria, East Africa Sustainability Watch, ARCOS network, and Nile Basin Discourse	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Sufficient number of partnerships are strong enough to leverage complementary capabilities of members
2.4. Financial resources: Local civil society organizations have access to long-term funding sources to maintain the conservation results achieved via CEPF grants and/or other initiatives, through access to new donor funds, conservation enterprises, memberships, endowments, and/or other funding mechanisms	Availability of funding to CSOs by country (high, mid, low): Burundi: low Congo DR: low Kenya: low Rwanda: low South Sudan: low Tanzania: low Uganda: low	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: low Congo DR: low Kenya: mid Rwanda: mid South Sudan: low Tanzania: mid Uganda: low	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: mid Congo DR: low Kenya: high Rwanda: high South Sudan: mid Tanzania: high Uganda: high	Sufficient number of local civil society organizations in each country have access to diversified long-term funding sources to maintain their programs indefinitely
2.5. Transformational impact: Local civil society groups are able, individually or collectively, to influence public policies and private sector practices in sectors with a large footprint on biodiversity	Baseline understood by country and in terms of infrastructure, energy, land use, water use, oil/gas, mining, tax policies	Milestones vary by country per baseline	Milestones vary by country per baseline	By country, conservation models incorporated into major policies or business practices of major private companies every two years

Table 4.3. Graduation Condition 3: Sustainable Financing

3. Sustainable financing: Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
3.1. Public sector funding: Public sector agencies responsible for conservation in the hotspot have a continued public fund allocation or revenue-generating ability to operate effectively	Understood by financial status (high, mid, low) of the three largest public sector agencies in each country responsible for conservation Burundi: Agency 1 (low) Burundi: Agency 2 (low) Burundi: Agency 3 (low) Congo DR: Agency 1 (low) Congo DR: Agency 2 (low) Congo DR: Agency 3 (low) Kenya: Agency 1 (low) Kenya: Agency 2 (low) Kenya: Agency 3 (low) Rwanda: Agency 1 (low) Rwanda: Agency 2 (low) Rwanda: Agency 3 (low) South Sudan: Agency 1 (low) South Sudan: Agency 2 (low) South Sudan: Agency 3 (low) Tanzania: Agency 1 (low) Tanzania: Agency 2 (low) Tanzania: Agency 3 (low) Uganda: Agency 1 (low) Uganda: Agency 2 (low) Uganda: Agency 3 (low)	Burundi: Agency 1 (low) Burundi: Agency 2 (low) Burundi: Agency 3 (low) Congo DR: Agency 1 (low) Congo DR: Agency 2 (low) Congo DR: Agency 3 (low) Kenya: Agency 1 (mid) Kenya: Agency 2 (mid) Kenya: Agency 3 (low) Rwanda: Agency 1 (low) Rwanda: Agency 2 (low) Rwanda: Agency 3 (low) South Sudan: Agency 1 (mid) South Sudan: Agency 2 (low) South Sudan: Agency 3 (low) Tanzania: Agency 1 (mid) Tanzania: Agency 2 (low) Tanzania: Agency 3 (low) Uganda: Agency 1 (low) Uganda: Agency 2 (mid) Uganda: Agency 3 (low)	Burundi: Agency 1 (mid) Burundi: Agency 2 (mid) Burundi: Agency 3 (mid) Congo DR: Agency 1 (mid) Congo DR: Agency 2 (mid) Congo DR: Agency 3 (mid) Kenya: Agency 1 (mid) Kenya: Agency 2 (mid) Kenya: Agency 3 (mid) Rwanda: Agency 1 (mid) Rwanda: Agency 2 (mid) Rwanda: Agency 3 (mid) South Sudan: Agency 1 (mid) South Sudan: Agency 2 (mid) South Sudan: Agency 3 (mid) Tanzania: Agency 1 (mid) Tanzania: Agency 2 (mid) Tanzania: Agency 3 (mid) Uganda: Agency 1 (mid) Uganda: Agency 2 (mid) Uganda: Agency 3 (mid)	Three largest agencies in each country have sufficient financial resources to effectively deliver their missions

3. Sustainable financing: Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
3.2. Civil society funding: Civil society organizations engaged in conservation in the hotspot have access to sufficient funding to continue their work at current levels	Understood by financial security (high, mid, low) of the ten largest relevant CSOs in each country. By example: Burundi: CSO 1 (low) Burundi: CSO 2 (low) Burundi: CSO 3 (low) Congo DR: CSO 1 (low) Congo DR: CSO 2 (low) Congo DR: CSO 3 (low) Kenya: CSO 1 (low) Kenya: CSO 2 (low) Kenya: CSO 3 (low) Rwanda: CSO 1 (low) Rwanda: CSO 2 (low) Rwanda: CSO 3 (low) South Sudan: CSO 1 (low) South Sudan: CSO 2 (low) South Sudan: CSO 3 (low) Tanzania: CSO 1 (low) Tanzania: CSO 2 (low) Tanzania: CSO 3 (low) Uganda: CSO 1 (low) Uganda: CSO 2 (low) Uganda: CSO 3 (low)	Burundi: CSO 1 (mid) Burundi: CSO 2 (mid) Burundi: CSO 3 (low) Congo DR: CSO 1 (mid) Congo DR: CSO 2 (low) Congo DR: CSO 3 (low) Kenya: CSO 1 (mid) Kenya: CSO 2 (low) Kenya: CSO 3 (low) Rwanda: CSO 1 (mid) Rwanda: CSO 2 (low) Rwanda: CSO 3 (low) South Sudan: CSO 1 (mid) South Sudan: CSO 2 (low) South Sudan: CSO 3 (low) Tanzania: CSO 1 (mid) Tanzania: CSO 2 (low) Tanzania: CSO 3 (mid) Uganda: CSO 1 (low) Uganda: CSO 2 (mid) Uganda: CSO 3 (low)	Burundi: CSO 1 (mid) Burundi: CSO 2 (high) Burundi: CSO 3 (mid) Congo DR: CSO 1 (high) Congo DR: CSO 2 (mid) Congo DR: CSO 3 (high) Kenya: CSO 1 (mid) Kenya: CSO 2 (high) Kenya: CSO 3 (mid) Rwanda: CSO 1 (high) Rwanda: CSO 2 (mid) Rwanda: CSO 3 (high) South Sudan: CSO 1 (mid) South Sudan: CSO 2 (high) South Sudan: CSO 3 (mid) Tanzania: CSO 1 (high) Tanzania: CSO 2 (mid) Tanzania: CSO 3 (high) Uganda: CSO 1 (mid) Uganda: CSO 2 (high) Uganda: CSO 3 (mid)	Nine of the ten largest relevant CSOs have access to secured funds to continue their work at sufficient levels for the next five years
3.3. Donor funding: Donors other than CEPF have committed to providing sufficient funds to address global conservation priorities in the hotspot	Understood by country, funding for conservation typically less than 1% of total humanitarian and development aid	Conservation funds as percent of aid Burundi: 1.5% Congo DR: 1.5% Kenya: 1.5% Rwanda: 1.5% South Sudan: 1.5% Tanzania: 1.5% Uganda: 1.5%	Conservation funds as percent of aid Burundi: 2.5% Congo DR: 2.5% Kenya: 2.5% Rwanda: 2.5% South Sudan: 2.5% Tanzania: 2.5% Uganda: 2.5%	By country, funding for conservation represents 4% of international aid

3. Sustainable financing: Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
3.4. Mainstreaming of conservation goals: Ministries of finance and line ministries responsible for development have adopted key conservation goals and use them as criteria for allocating resources	Understood by country ministries and degree to which it uses conservation goals to allocate resources (high, mid, low) Burundi: Finance 1 (mid) Burundi: Ministry 2 (high) Burundi: Ministry 3 (high) Congo DR: Finance 1 (low) Congo DR: Ministry 2 (high) Congo DR: Ministry 3 (high) Kenya: Finance 1 (mid) Kenya: Ministry 2 (high) Kenya: Ministry 3 (high) Rwanda: Finance 1 (mid) Rwanda: Ministry 2 (high) Rwanda: Ministry 3 (high) South Sudan: Finance 1 (mid) South Sudan: Ministry 2 (high) South Sudan: Ministry 3 (high) Tanzania: Finance 1 (mid) Tanzania: Ministry 2 (high) Tanzania: Ministry 3 (high) Uganda: Finance 1 (mid) Uganda: Ministry 2 (high) Uganda: Ministry 3 (high)	Burundi: Finance 1 (mid) Burundi: Ministry 2 (high) Burundi: Ministry 3 (high) Congo DR: Finance 1 (mid) Congo DR: Ministry 2 (high) Congo DR: Ministry 3 (high) Kenya: Finance 1 (mid) Kenya: Ministry 2 (high) Kenya: Ministry 3 (high) Rwanda: Finance 1 (mid) Rwanda: Ministry 2 (high) Rwanda: Ministry 3 (high) South Sudan: Finance 1 (mid) South Sudan: Ministry 2 (high) South Sudan: Ministry 3 (high) Tanzania: Finance 1 (mid) Tanzania: Ministry 2 (high) Tanzania: Ministry 3 (high) Uganda: Finance 1 (mid) Uganda: Ministry 2 (high) Uganda: Ministry 3 (high)	Burundi: Finance 1 (mid) Burundi: Ministry 2 (high) Burundi: Ministry 3 (high) Congo DR: Finance 1 (mid) Congo DR: Ministry 2 (high) Congo DR: Ministry 3 (high) Kenya: Finance 1 (mid) Kenya: Ministry 2 (high) Kenya: Ministry 3 (high) Rwanda: Finance 1 (mid) Rwanda: Ministry 2 (high) Rwanda: Ministry 3 (high) South Sudan: Finance 1 (mid) South Sudan: Ministry 2 (high) South Sudan: Ministry 3 (high) Tanzania: Finance 1 (mid) Tanzania: Ministry 2 (high) Tanzania: Ministry 3 (high) Uganda: Finance 1 (mid) Uganda: Ministry 2 (high) Uganda: Ministry 3 (high)	Ministry of finance and two other ministries in each country use conservation goals to allocate resources to a high degree

3. Sustainable financing: Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities for at least the next 10 years				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
3.5. Long-term mechanisms: Financing mechanisms (e.g., endowment funds, revenue from the sale of carbon credits, revenue from payment for ecosystem services, revenue from "green" taxes;) exist and are of sufficient size to yield continuous long-term returns for at least the next 10 years	Great Virunga Transboundary Cooperation Fund: $_____ Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme: $ ____ Nile Basin Trust Fund: $_____ International Gorilla Conservation Programme: $_____ Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust Fund: $_____ Eastern Arc Endowment Fund: $_____	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	By country, sustainable financing mechanisms are robust enough that financial constraints are not a barrier to conservation in 90% of country-identified priority KBAs

Table 4.4. Graduation Condition 4: Enabling policy and Institutional Environment

4. Enabling policy and institutional environment: Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
4.1. Legal environment for conservation: Laws exist that provide incentives for desirable conservation behavior and disincentives against undesirable behavior	Baseline understood by country by (1) law that does not exist, (2) law that needs improvement, and (3) law that need implementation. Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Targets understood by country Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __
4.2. Legal environment for civil society: Laws exist that allow for civil society to engage in the public policy-making and implementation process	Baseline laws understood by country allowing for CSOs to convene, organize, register, receive funds, and engage in conservation activities Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Targets understood by country Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __

4. Enabling policy and institutional environment: Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
4.3. Education and training: Domestic programs exist that produce trained environmental managers at secondary, undergraduate, and advanced academic levels	Baselines understood by country; status of domestic training programs (low, mid, high) Burundi: low Congo DR: low Kenya: low Rwanda: low South Sudan: low Tanzania: low Uganda: low	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: low Congo DR: low Kenya: mid Rwanda: mid South Sudan: low Tanzania: mid Uganda: low	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: mid Congo DR: low Kenya: high Rwanda: high South Sudan: mid Tanzania: high Uganda: high	Domestic and regional training programs exist such that 90% of senior leadership positions in government agencies and leading NGOs are staffed by local country nationals

4. Enabling policy and institutional environment: Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
4.4. Enforcement: Designated authorities are clearly mandated to manage the protected area system(s) in the hotspot and conserve biodiversity outside of them, and are empowered to implement the enforcement continuum of education, prevention, interdiction, arrest, and prosecution	Understood by capacity (high, mid, low) of the primary national, provincial, or site-based designated enforcement authorities: Burundi: Authority 1 (low) Burundi: Authority 2 (low) Burundi: Authority 3 (low) Congo DR: Authority 1 (low) Congo DR: Authority 2 (low) Congo DR: Authority 3 (low) Kenya: Authority 1 (low) Kenya: Authority 2 (low) Kenya: Authority 3 (low) Rwanda: Authority 1 (low) Rwanda: Authority 2 (low) Rwanda: Authority 3 (low) South Sudan: Authority 1 (low) South Sudan: Authority 2 (low) South Sudan: Authority 3 (low) Tanzania: Authority 1 (low) Tanzania: Authority 2 (low) Tanzania: Authority 3 (low) Uganda: Authority 1 (low) Uganda: Authority 2 (low) Uganda: Authority 3 (low)	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: Authority 1 (low) Burundi: Authority 2 (low) Burundi: Authority 3 (low) Congo DR: Authority 1 (low) Congo DR: Authority 2 (low) Congo DR: Authority 3 (low) Kenya: Authority 1 (low) Kenya: Authority 2 (low) Kenya: Authority 3 (low) Rwanda: Authority 1 (low) Rwanda: Authority 2 (low) Rwanda: Authority 3 (low) South Sudan: Authority 1 (low) South Sudan: Authority 2 (low) South Sudan: Authority 3 (low) Tanzania: Authority 1 (low) Tanzania: Authority 2 (low) Tanzania: Authority 3 (low) Uganda: Authority 1 (low) Uganda: Authority 2	Milestones vary by country per baseline Burundi: Authority 1 (low) Burundi: Authority 2 (low) Burundi: Authority 3 (low) Congo DR: Authority 1 (low) Congo DR: Authority 2 (low) Congo DR: Authority 3 (low) Kenya: Authority 1 (low) Kenya: Authority 2 (low) Kenya: Authority 3 (low) Rwanda: Authority 1 (low) Rwanda: Authority 2 (low) Rwanda: Authority 3 (low) South Sudan: Authority 1 (low) South Sudan: Authority 2 (low) South Sudan: Authority 3 (low) Tanzania: Authority 1 (low) Tanzania: Authority 2 (low) Tanzania: Authority 3 (low) Uganda: Authority 1 (low) Uganda: Authority 2	High capacity of authorities demonstrated by country, with 70% of protected areas in each country having clear boundary demarcation, regular patrols, and regular arrests, and regular imposition of penalties

4. Enabling policy and institutional environment: Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
4.5. Business practices: Private sector business practices in sectors with a (potentially) large biodiversity footprint are supportive of the conservation of natural habitats and species populations	Understood by country's leading companies' commitment (high, mid, low) to conservation as expressed in their business practices Burundi: Company 1 (low) Burundi: Company 2 (low) Burundi: Company 3 (low) Congo DR: Company 1 (low) Congo DR: Company 2 (low) Congo DR: Company 3 (low) Kenya: Company 1 (low) Kenya: Company 2 (low) Kenya: Company 3 (low) Rwanda: Company 1 (low) Rwanda: Company 2 (low) Rwanda: Company 3 (low) South Sudan: Company 1 (low) South Sudan: Company 2 (low) South Sudan: Company 3 (low) Tanzania: Company 1 (low) Tanzania: Company 2 (low) Tanzania: Company 3 (low) Uganda: Company 1 (low) Uganda: Company 2 (low) Uganda: Company 3 (low)	Milestones vary by baseline: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by baseline: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	At least two market-leading or influential companies in each business sector in the hotspot have introduced business practices supportive of conservation across their operations

Table 4.5. Graduation Condition 5: Responsiveness to Emerging Issues

5. Responsiveness to emerging issues: Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation issues				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
5.1. Biodiversity monitoring: Nationwide or region-wide systems are in place to monitor status and trends of the components of biodiversity	Systems understood by country as not existing, existing, and implemented Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Milestone vary by baseline: Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Milestone vary by baseline: Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Systems are in place to monitor status and trends in selected habitats, species and populations across at least 90% of the hotspot by area, and data from these systems are being used to guide the allocation of conservation resources
5.2. Threats monitoring: Nationwide or region-wide systems are in place to monitor status and trends of threats to biodiversity (e.g., fire, wildlife trade, invasive species, socio-demographic factors)	Systems understood by country as not existing, existing, and implemented Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Milestone vary by baseline: Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Milestone vary by baseline: Burundi system 1: __ Burundi system 2: __ Congo DR system 1: __ Congo DR system 2: __ Kenya system 1: __ Kenya system 2: __ Rwanda system 1: __ Rwanda system 2: __ South Sudan system 1: __ South Sudan system 2: __ Tanzania system 1: __ Tanzania system 2: __ Uganda system 1: __ Uganda system 2: __	Systems are in place to monitor status and trends in threats to biodiversity (e.g., forest fire, wildlife trade, invasive species, etc.) across at least 90% of the hotspot by area, and results are being used to guide the allocation of conservation and development resources

5. Responsiveness to emerging issues: Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation issues				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
5.3. Natural capital monitoring: Nationwide or region-wide systems are in place to value and monitor status and trends of natural capital	Systems understood by country as not existing, existing, and implemented for tracking ecosystem services (ES): Burundi ES 1: __ Burundi ES 2: __ Burundi ES 3: __ Congo DR ES 1: __ Congo DR ES 2: __ Congo DR ES 3: __ Kenya ES 1: __ Kenya ES 2: __ Kenya ES 3: __ Rwanda ES 1: __ Rwanda ES 2: __ Rwanda ES 3: __ South Sudan ES 1: __ South Sudan ES 2: __ South Sudan ES 3: __ Tanzania ES 1: __ Tanzania ES 2: __ Tanzania ES 3: __ Uganda ES 1: __ Uganda ES 2: __ Uganda ES 3: __	Burundi ES 1: __ Burundi ES 2: __ Burundi ES 3: __ Congo DR ES 1: __ Congo DR ES 2: __ Congo DR ES 3: __ Kenya ES 1: __ Kenya ES 2: __ Kenya ES 3: __ Rwanda ES 1: __ Rwanda ES 2: __ Rwanda ES 3: __ South Sudan ES 1: __ South Sudan ES 2: __ South Sudan ES 3: __ Tanzania ES 1: __ Tanzania ES 2: __ Tanzania ES 3: __ Uganda ES 1: __ Uganda ES 2: __ Uganda ES 3: __	Burundi ES 1: __ Burundi ES 2: __ Burundi ES 3: __ Congo DR ES 1: __ Congo DR ES 2: __ Congo DR ES 3: __ Kenya ES 1: __ Kenya ES 2: __ Kenya ES 3: __ Rwanda ES 1: __ Rwanda ES 2: __ Rwanda ES 3: __ South Sudan ES 1: __ South Sudan ES 2: __ South Sudan ES 3: __ Tanzania ES 1: __ Tanzania ES 2: __ Tanzania ES 3: __ Uganda ES 1: __ Uganda ES 2: __ Uganda ES 3: __	Systems are in place to value and monitor status and trends in at least three ecosystem services essential to healthy, sustainable societies across at least 90% of the hotspot by area, and results are being used to guide the allocation of conservation and development resources

5. Responsiveness to emerging issues: Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation issues				
Criteria	**Baseline**	**Milestone - 2020**	**Milestone - 2025**	**Target – 2030+**
5.4. Adaptive management: Conservation organizations and protected area management authorities demonstrate the ability to respond promptly to emerging issues	Baseline understood by country and by agency/NGO having responded (yes/no) to emerging issue during last three years: Burundi agency:__ Burundi agency:__ Congo DR agency: __ Congo DR agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Rwanda agency: ___ Rwanda agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___	Burundi agency:__ Burundi agency:__ Congo DR agency: __ Congo DR agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Rwanda agency: ___ Rwanda agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___	Burundi agency:__ Burundi agency:__ Congo DR agency: __ Congo DR agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Kenya agency: __ Rwanda agency: ___ Rwanda agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ South Sudan agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Tanzania agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___ Uganda agency: ___	The major conservation organizations in each country demonstrate that they have adapted their missions, strategies or work plans to respond to an emerging conservation issue at least once during the past three years
5.5. Public sphere: Conservation issues are regularly discussed in the public sphere, and these discussions influence public policy	Baseline understood by country, by method of discussion (print, airwaves, electronic, public forums), and by whether discussions influence public policy (yes/no) Milestones vary by baseline: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by baseline: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Milestones vary by baseline: Burundi: __ Congo DR: __ Kenya: __ Rwanda: __ South Sudan: __ Tanzania: __ Uganda: __	Conservation issues are regularly (i.e. at least monthly) discussed in the public sphere in each country and these discussions influence relevant public policy (i.e. at least annually in each country)

5. Actions to achieve targets

5.1. Actions to achieve targets for conservation priorities and best practices

CEPF, through funds to civil society, and other donors, through funds to public sector agencies, are well-placed to make grants to identify species, sites, corridors, and reservoirs of natural capital, to develop management plans, and to implement these. Actions are constrained by volume (the sheer number of sites), access (by definition, some sites are remote), lack of agreement on how to efficiently measure natural capital, and lack of domestic capacity (addressed in Conditions 2, 3.1., 3.2, and 4.3).

5.2. Actions to achieve targets for civil society capacity

CEPF has the ability to directly build the organizational capacity of individual CSOs and to facilitate partnerships between CSOs, the private sector, and the public sector. These actions will allow CEPF to affect the conservation community, but not the broader civil society sector in each country. CEPF would need to work with other donors to ensure that civil society has financial resources and the ability to make a transformational impact, or CEPF would provide indirect support (e.g., via a grant to establish, but not capitalize, a financing mechanism).

5.3. Actions to achieve targets for sustainable financing

Public sector agency funding is critical, but beyond the means or remit of CEPF. CEPF could, however, identify those agencies in most need of funds and work with donors to properly target any assistance. CEPF can directly affect the financial sustainability of individual CSOs, but could only indirectly affect whether more external funds come to the sector. CEPF's primary ability to generate more donor funding is through its Ecosystem Profiles and other strategic documents, and convening of stakeholders/grantees around specific topics. CEPF has limited ability to influence the mainstreaming of conservation goals within ministries, other than via strengthening trusted national NGOs invited to provide such advice. CEPF is prepared to support the establishment of trust funds and, via its Secretariat and RITs, find donors willing to provide capitalization.

5.4. Actions to achieve targets for enabling policy and institutional environment

CEPF has, at best, an indirect ability to influence the legal environment for conservation and civil society: CEPF can support grantees to study and advise on these topics, but places limits on their ability to engage in lobbying. Establishing wholesale education and training systems is beyond CEPF's control, but RITs and grantees could advise donors and the public sector on the types of skills needed. As with species and sites, CEPF's ability to influence enforcement is limited by volume. Nevertheless, understanding enforcement to be a continuum – education, prevention, interdiction, arrest, and prosecution – CEPF and other donors are well-placed to support education and prevention efforts. In terms of influencing the private sector, until now, CEPF's core constituency (i.e., local organizations with limited histories of receiving international funds) has rarely engaged in this work. However, large international conservation organizations engage with the private sector as standard operating procedure now. In theory, CEPF could make grants to NGOs with the capacity to do this work.

5.5. Actions to achieve targets for responsiveness to emerging issues

CEPF, through funds to civil society, and other donors, through funds to public sector agencies, are well-placed to make grants to monitor species, sites, corridors, and reservoirs of natural capital, and to monitor threats. CEPF can train civil society organizations to be better adaptive managers, but scale requires that donors support public sector agencies in this. Influencing the public sphere – press freedom, the level of discussion – may be beyond CEPF's ability to address.

6. Financing Plan

CEPF has dedicated $9.8 million to fourteen countries in the Eastern Afromontane over five years. Even assuming a regular distribution of priorities and appropriate grantees, this is only $140,000 per country per year. In reality, countries like Kenya and Uganda, with no priority KBAs, and DRC South Sudan, with low capacity, may receive less. Regardless, intuitively, we know there are gaps in current and future funding. The table below attempts to estimate the cost to finance Technical Framework.

Table 5. Cost to Finance the Technical Framework

Action and Assumption	Estimated Cost over 15 Years
1.1. Species assessments: $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
1.2. KBAs identified (largely complete): $10,000/KBA x 142 KBAs	$1,420,000
1.3. Reservoirs of natural capital identified: $300,000/reservoir x 3 reservoirs/country x 7 countries (note nominal basis for estimated cost)	$6,300,000
1.4. Conservation plans (based on understanding of existing grants): $100,000/KBA x 142 KBAs	$14,200,000
1.5. Best practices: $25,000/year/KBA x 15 years x 142 KBAs	$53,250,000
2.1. Conservation community (indirect support): $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
2.2. Organizational capacity: $200,000/organization x 5 organizations x 7 countries	$7,000,000
2.3. Partnerships: $500,000/network x 3 networks/country x 7 countries	$10,500,000
2.4. Financial resources (indirect support): $500,000/country x 7 countries	$3,500,000
2.5. Transformational impact: beyond CEPF control	$0
3.1. Public sector funding: beyond CEPF control	$0
3.2. Civil society funding: $1 million/year/country x 15 years x 7 countries	$105,000,000
3.3. Donor funding: beyond CEPF control	$0
3.4. Mainstreaming of conservation goals (indirect support) : $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
3.5. Long-term mechanisms: $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
4.1. Legal environment for conservation (indirect support): $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
4.2. Legal environment for civil society (indirect support): $1 million/country x 7 countries	$7,000,000
4.3. Education and training: beyond CEPF control	$0
4.4. Enforcement (education and prevention only): $10,000/year/KBA x 15 years x 142 KBAs	$21,300,000
4.5. Business practices: $500,000/change agent x 3 change agents/country x 7 countries	$10,500,000
5.1. Biodiversity monitoring: $100,000/year/country x 15 years x 7 countries	$31,500,000
5.2. Threats monitoring: $50,000/year/country x 15 years x 7 countries	$15,750,000
5.3. Natural capital monitoring: $10,000/year/country x 15 years x 7 countries (note nominal basis for estimated cost)	$10,500,000
5.4. Adaptive management for CSOs included in 2.2; for public agencies, beyond CEPF control	$0
5.5. Public sphere (indirect support): $10,000/year/country x 15 years x 7 countries	$10,500,000
Total	**$343,220,000**

The number above is astounding. However, it is for seven countries over fifteen years. Per country per year, the total cost is only $3.26 million, which is hardly unusual for bilateral aid in the sector.

7. Relation to the Ecosystem Profile and Further Implementation

As described in the introduction, the Ecosystem Profile for the Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot includes specific Strategic Directions on mainstreaming conservation into policy, better management of KBAs, and on sustainable financing, matching in concept the ideas presented in this Technical Framework; theoretically, there is no disconnect between the Ecosystem Profile and the Technical Framework. Certainly, this allows the RIT and Secretariat to direct grant-making in a way that nominally works toward the targets in the Framework, presented in Table 4. On the other hand, the RIT and Secretariat face practical limits. Under current spending authority, CEPF has a remaining $2.8 million through August 2017 to work in all fourteen countries in the hotspot, not just the seven of the Albertine Rife and Eastern Arc Mountains.

The mid-term assessment process in the hotspot is now underway and the team doing preliminary data collection and stakeholder surveys is using the five graduation criteria, among others, as a measurement tool. Further, the RIT will gather its senior advisory committee outside Nairobi from July 22-24 to discuss portfolio performance and whether changes to the strategy are necessary. This document will be one input to that meeting.

8. Annexes

8.1. Major regional bodies, ministries, and agencies

Regional
East African Community
Lake Victoria Basin Commission
Lake Victoria Fisheries organization

Burundi
Ministry of Water, Environment, Land Management and Urban planning
Geographic Institute of Burundi
Ministry of Finance, Planning and economic Development
Ministry of Water, Environment, Land Management and Urban planning
Ministry of Water, Energy and Mines
National Institute for Environmental and Nature Conservation
Ministry of Environment, Territorial Development and Cooperation

Kenya
Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources
National Environment Management Authority
Water Resources Management Authority
Ministry of Tourism
Kenya Forest Service
Kenya Wildlife Services
Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Rwanda
Ministry of Natural Resources
Rwanda Environment Management Authority
Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Rwanda Development Board- Conservation
Ministry of Infrastructure- Water Transport
Rwanda Natural Resources Authority
Ministry of Finance and Planning and National Development
Forestry and Terrestrial Ecosystems Management Department

Tanzania
Vice President Office -Environment
Ministry of Water
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives
Ministry of Finance and Planning
Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries (MLF)
Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourisms
Ministry of Works
Wildlife Division

TANAPA
Tanzania Forestry Services Agency
Ministry of Energy and Minerals

Uganda
Ministry of Water and Environment (Uganda)
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities - Tourism Department
Uganda Wildlife Authority
National Forestry Authority
National Environment Management Authority
National Planning Authority

8.2. Participants and informants in this process

Planning and Advisory Group

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Dr. Julius Arinaitwe	Birdlife (Nairobi)	Julius.Arinaitwe@birdlife.org
2	Ms. Mine Pabari,	IUCN	Mine.PABARI@iucn.org
3	Hon Jessica Eriyo	EAC	jeriyo@eachq.org; jeriyo@yahoo.com
4	Ms. Nancy Chege	UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme for Kenya	nancy.chege@undp.org
5	Dr. Eldad Tukahirwa		eldad.tukahirwa@cantab.net
6	Dr. Francis Sabuni	Eastern Arc Mountains Conservation Endowment Fund	eamcef@easternarc.or.tz;
7	Mr. John Salehe	AWF	jsalehe@awf.org; jysalehe@gmail.com
8	Dr. Sam Kanyamibwa	ARCOS	skanyamibwa@arcosnetwork.org

Burundi

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Nduwimana Philbert	CADE	cadenvironment@yahoo.com
2	Ndayikengurukiye Eric	SECTORAL CHAMBER OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM	ndayikeric@hotmail.com
3	Gahimbare Alice	FLORESTA BURUNDI	gahimbare@yahoo.com
4	Masabo Philippe	FCBN	Fcbm06@yahoo.fr
5	Kagari Jeaclim	PENTENARIAT NATIONAL DEV'T EAN	kaganijoachim@yahoo.fr
6	Rugeminyange Charles	ABN	rugecharles@yahoo.fr
7	Rushemeza Joan	OBPE	Rushemezaj1@yahoo.fr
8	Rufuguta Evaliste	MEEATU PF RAMSAR	erufuguta@gmail.com
9	Nikobagomba Nestar	OBPE	nestarnikobagomba@yahoo.fr
10	Ngendakuriko Christian	BNA	angemte@yahoo.fr
11	Gahungu Christopher	MACEP/SIMPEA	gachristopher@yahoo.fr
12	Nshimimana J Donatria	PES	jeandonatiea@yahoo.com

	Name	Institution	Contact
13	Ntibakivayo P Clovar	MINAGRIE	mufozizoog@yahoo.fr
14	Wakana Ferdinand	MEM/DGIHA	wakanaferdinand@yahoo.com
15	Sabushimike Mamert	AAN	lanatwebwwndi@yahoo.fr
16	Nikiza Alexis	APRN/BEPB	Nikiza07@yahoo.fr
17	Aimee Bienvenue Ntokiro	ARCOS	anzokira@arcosnetwork.org
18	Theophole Ndarufatiye	MWELUP	257 22 22 06 26
19	Mr. Mohamed Feruzi	Office for the Protection of Environment	inecndg@yahoo.fr

DRC

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Altor Musema	IGCP- Goma	amusema@igcp.org
2	Roy Buhendwa	CAFEC	r.buhendwa@wwfcarpo.org
3	Dominic Bikahwa	Strong roots	bikaba@gmail.com

Kenya

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Leah Wanguru Mwangi	KIjube Environment Volunteers	keenvo@yahoo.com
2	George Gachagua	Kiambu County	Buildvent_9@yahoo.com
3	Leah Gichuki	Kenya Forest Working Group	Leah.Gichuki@eawildlife.org
4	Geoffrey Mwachala	National Museums of Kenya	gmwachala@museums.or.ke
5	Paul Matiku	NatureKenya	matiku@naturekenya.org
6	Dr. Alice Kaudia	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	alice.kaudia@gmail.com
7	Prof. Geoffrey Wahungu	National Environment Management Authority	P.O. Box 67839-00200,
8	Erustus Kanga	Kenya Wildlife Service	ekanga@kws.go.ke
9	Bonafce Kiome	HIVOs	bkiome@hivos.or.ke
10	Benjamin Aijuka	EAGC	baijuka@eagc.org
11	Emily Masawa	PREPARED	e.masawa@gmail.com
12	George Sikoyo	LVBC	sikoyo@lvbsec.org
13	Polycarp Ngoje	PREPARED	Polycarp@ssg-advisors.com
14	Brian Ochami Otiende	EAC	botiende@eachq.org
15	Gideon Galu	FEWSNET	
16	Lillian Ndungu	RCMRD	indungu@rcmrd.org
17	Julius Ngaina	WMO	jngaina@gmail.com

Rwanda

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Deo Tuyisingize	DFGFI/KRC	deotuyisingize@yahoo.com
2	Jean Claude Dusabimana	RWANDA BIODIVERSITY MEDIA GROUP RBNG	jclaude@gmail.com
3	Prsosper Uwingeci	RDB/VNP	prosper.uwingeli@rdb.rw
4	Rugyerinyange Louis	RDB/NNP	louis.rugeri@gmail.com
5	Ngonga Telephina	RDB	telepline.ngonga@gmail.com
6	Mpayana Raphael	CONSERVATION FORUM PRIVATE	rmpayana@gmail.com
7	Sehene j Chrysostome	RECOR	jcsehene@rwandaenvironment.org 0788438506
8	Makambo Wellord	IGCP	wmakambo@igcp.org
9	Emmanuel Bugingo	TGO	emmanuel@gorillas.org
10	Bana Mediatrice	WCS	mbana@wcs.org
11	Mukakamale Daucilla	ARECO	mukakamali@yahoo.com
12	Claudian Nsabagasani	ARCOS	cnsabagasani@arcosnetwork.org
13	Faustin Karasira	RDB	faustin.kabasira@rdb.rw
14	Tony Mudakirwa	RDB	antrime.mundakirwa@rdb.rw
15	Peter Katanisa,	Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA)	Tel: + 250 788414201
16	Dr Rose Mukankomeje	Rwanda Environment Management Authority	dgrema@gmail.com
17	Emmanuel Kamanzi	Energy Department, Ministry of Infrastructures	Tel: + 250 788434109
18	Dr. Emmanuel NKURUNZIZA	Rwanda Natural Resources Authority	emmanuel.nkurunziza@rnra.rw

Tanzania

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Dr. Mbwabo	Division of Forestry	
2	Mr. Florian Mkeya	Tanzania Forestry Service	mkeyafm@tfs.go.tz
3	Dr. Julius Ningu	Director of Environment , Vice President's Office /GEF Focal Point	jkningu@yahoo.com
4	Charles Meshak	Tanzania Forest Conservation Group	tfcg@tfcg.or.tz
5	Nehemiah Murusuri	National Coordinator	nehemiah.murusuri@undp.org
6	Idrisa Yahaya	Head of Environment Unit	Email: ykatela@yahoo.com
7	Juma Mgoo	Director of Division, Wizara ya Maliasili na Utalii	Tel: +255 22 286 4249
8	Benjamin Ngatunga	Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute	Tel: +255 22 2650043
9	Rodgers Kakuhenzire	International Potato Centre	r.kakuhenzire@cgiar.org
10	Dorothy Mfikwa	WEMA consult	dorothy@wemaconsult.com

Uganda

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Andy Plumptre	WCS	aplumptre@ws.org
2	Eric Coull	WWF	ecoull@wwfuganda.org
3	Priscilla Nyandoi	UWS	uws@uws.or.ug
4	Annette K. Bitarakwate	UTB	annettekamusiime@tourismuganda.info
5	Arthur Mugisha	IUCN	arthur.mugisha@iucn.org
6	Sostine Namanya	NAPE	sostine@nape.or.ug
7	Kabi Maxwell	NFA	kabimaxwell@yahoo.com
8	Edith Kabasiime	CARE	ekabesiime@co.care.org
9	Joan Birungi	Wetlands Management Department	Joanmaik10@yahoo.co,
10	Abubaker Wandera	GEF SGP	Abubaker.wandera@undpug
11	Richard Kapere	UWA	rkapere@yahoo.com
12	Kitts Mabonga	ACE	damabonga@gmail.com
13	Ben Kozare	UWS	uws@uws.or.ug
14	Faith Arinda	FDI	faitharinda@yahoo.com
15	Paul Mafabi	MWE	pmafabi@yahoo.com
16	John Tumuhimbise	Ministry of Energy and Minerals Development	P.O Box 7270, Kampala
17	Michael Opige	NatureUganda	michael.opige@natureuganda.org
18	Edson Nuwamanya	Fauna and Flora International	edison.nuwamanya@fauna-flora.org
19	David Mutekanga	Uganda national Academy of Sciences	davidmutekanga@unas.or.ug
20	Salvatrice Musabyeyezu	IGCP	smauabyeyezu@igcp.org
21	Robert Bitariho	ITFC	bitariho@itfc.org
22	Karl Schwarz	Tullow Uganda Operations Pty Limited	Karl.schwarz@tullowoil.com
23	Andy Plumptre	WCS	aplumptre@ws.org

Regional Workshop

	Name	Institution	Contact
1	Mark Mwine	Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust	davidmwine@yahoo.co.uk
2	Dr. Benjamin Ngatunga	Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute	bpngatunga@yahoo.co.uk
3	Dancilla Mukakamari	Association Rwandaise des Ecologistes (ARECO)-Rwanda	arecorwa@yahoo.fr
4	Daniel Rothberg	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund	drothberg@cepf.net
5	Nina Marshall	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund	nmarshall@cepf.net
6	Janvier Murengerantwari	Burundi Office for the Protection Environment (OBPE/INECN)	janviermurengerantwari@gmail.com
7	Alexis Nikiza	APRN/BEPB	nikiza07@yahoo.com
8	Fredrick Mitina Mngube	Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC)	mngube@lvbcom.org
9	Julius Arinaitwe	BirdLife Africa Partnership Secretariat	Julius.arinaitwe@birdlife.org
10	Alex Muhweezi	Future Dialogues International (FDI)	Alebamu@gmail.com
11	Maaike Manten	BirdLife Africa Partnership Secretariat	Maaike.manten@birdlife.org
12	Dr. Ian Gordon	BirdLife Africa Partnership Secretariat	igordonicipe@gmail.com
13	Abu Baker Wandera	GEF/SGP - Uganda	Abubaker.wandera@undp.org

	Name	Institution	Contact
14	Wellard Makambo	International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP)	wmakambo@igcp.org
15	Muyang Achah	African Wildlife Foundation (AWF)	machah@awf.org
16	James Mwang'ombe	Kenya Forest Service (KFS)	mwangombejames@yahoo.co.uk
17	Didas Muhumuza	Tullow Oil	Didas.muhumuza@tullow.com
18	Dr. Geoffrey Mwachala	National Museums of Kenya (NMK)	gmwachala@museums.or.ke
19	Thomas Musandu	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	tmusandu@yahoo.com
20	David Kuria	Kijabe Environment Volunteers (KENVO)	davekenvo@hotmail.com
21	George Gachagua	Kiambu County – Department of Water, Environment & Natural Resources	Buildvent_9@yahoo.com
22	Jaco Venter	Conservation International (CI)	jventer@conservation.org
23	Caroline Njoki	Future Dialogues International (FDI)	njokizimmer@yahoo.com
24	Mark Mwine	Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust (BMCT)	davidmwine@yahoo.co.uk