



**Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot
Request for Proposals
Preparation and Delivery of Ecosystem Profile Update**

Opening date: 29 February 2016

Closing date: 15 April 2016

Location: CEPF, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Crystal City VA 22202, USA

1. Invitation

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a joint program of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International (CI), the European Union, the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank. CEPF is a global program that provides grants to civil society to safeguard the world's biodiversity hotspots. CI, as one of the global donor partners of CEPF, hosts the Secretariat of the Fund.

The CEPF Secretariat requires an organization to lead the preparation of the update of the Mediterranean Basin Ecosystem Profile – defined in the ensuing document. Qualified organizations or consortia are invited to submit a proposal by the closing date listed above, in compliance with this Request for Proposals (RfP) and the scope of work described herein.

The result of this request for proposals will be the issuance of a grant between CI and a single lead organization, which could work in turn with partners, as subordinates, if it so proposes.

Proposals must be submitted electronically to cepfgrants@conservation.org by the closing date listed above.

2. Background

CEPF invests with civil society in biodiversity hotspots. Investment consists of an approximately one-year design process, resulting in an Ecosystem Profile, followed by an implementation period of grant making to civil society organizations of at least five years. Since 2001, CEPF has invested in 24 hotspots to which each has been allocated approximately between \$5 million and \$12 million for granting.

The Mediterranean Basin biodiversity hotspot is the second largest hotspot in the world, covering more than 2 million square kilometers. It is the third richest hotspot in the world in terms of plant diversity. Rivaling the natural diversity in the hotspot, the cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic diversity of the region is spectacular. Many of the ecosystems reached equilibrium long ago with human activity dominating the landscapes. However, this delicate balance is in a precarious state, as many local communities depend on remaining habitats for freshwater, food and a variety of other ecosystem

services. Species populations in the hotspot have become increasingly fragmented and isolated as a result of infrastructure development, triggered in part by the tourism industry. The pressure on scarce water resources resulting from major water investments as well as climate change has recently become the most important pressure on nature. The increasing number and magnitude of water investments has caused irreversible damage to the fragile water cycle of small rivers basins in the hotspot.

CEPF has been making grants in the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot since June 2012, with 91 grants totaling \$10.1 million awarded to date. The current investment phase in the Mediterranean Basin concludes at the end of 2016. In January 2016, the CEPF Donor Council in its 28th session approved the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot for re-investment, with a new funding phase expected over the period 2017-2021.

CEPF grant making currently follows an ecosystem profile developed through an extensive stakeholder consultation process conducted in 2009-2010. The ecosystem profile presents a consensus-based investment strategy, with a level and scope of stakeholder buy-in that was, in many ways, unprecedented for the region. Much has changed, however, in the six years since the Ecosystem Profile for the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot was prepared:

- Although the biological priorities defined in the profile have generally stood the test of time, many research and studies have been undertaken in recent years (including through CEPF funding), leading to new data on species and habitats. This includes, but is not limited to, the comprehensive Red List assessments of freshwater species and identification of freshwater Key Biodiversity Areas, identification of Important Plant Areas in the Middle East and North Africa, and inventories of cave ecosystems in the Balkans. This great wealth of data should inform current understanding of geographic priorities for conservation investment.
- More significantly, the political situation has dramatically changed in the last few years in the Middle East and North Africa sub-regions of the hotspot, following the so-called 'Arab Spring'. These political changes have, in some cases, enabled the emergence of a nascent civil society, eager to engage in environmental protection and development, albeit often lacking capacities to engage efficiently in preserving the natural wealth of their countries. Conversely, conflicts have drastically affected the operating environment for civil society in Libya and Syria, with broader impacts for the entire region and beyond, while Tunisia and Egypt have undergone important political changes. The deteriorating security situation, exemplified by terrorist attacks in Tunisia and Egypt, is impacting the tourism industry and economic development.
- In addition, there have been major shifts in patterns of conservation investment, with several traditional funders of biodiversity conservation reorienting their programs to other priorities or leaving the region altogether, while new initiatives have been launched to support civil society. The level of donor coordination has improved, in particular thanks to the Mediterranean Donor Roundtable initiated by the MAVA Foundation and the Prince Albert II Foundation in 2012, paving the way for new collaborations.
- Finally, investments by CEPF and other funders have built a strong platform of conservation results, good practice, information and capacity that can be built upon.

There is a need, therefore, to update the ecosystem profile, through a participatory process, to create a platform on which funders interested in making grants to civil society groups working in the Mediterranean Basin over the next five years can share goals and strategies, take advantage of emerging opportunities, and align well with existing investments by governments and other donors.

A number of other funders have expressed an interest in participating to the update of the ecosystem profile to guide future investment in the Mediterranean Basin. It is intended that these funders, if their participation is confirmed, would be engaged throughout the process, to frame the work of the team updating the profile, and develop synergistic investment niches that avoid duplication and leverage the strengths of each organization. Moreover, it is hoped that this collaborative process may attract other funders interested in supporting civil-society-led efforts to conserve the region's biodiversity.

3. Summary description of the assignment

After an initial scoping exercise, the first major task will be a series of thematic studies to update the situational analysis of the region, through targeted consultations with practitioners in the conservation and development communities, from government, civil society and donor agencies. The findings from the thematic analyses will be validated at a series of national workshops, which will also provide an opportunity for stakeholders to identify and prioritize investment needs and opportunities. The results of these workshops will then be synthesized into an updated Ecosystem Profile document, which will be reviewed at a regional workshop, which will be the final opportunity for broad stakeholder input.

The updated *Ecosystem Profile for the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot*, will set out a situational analysis, based upon a review of biodiversity priorities, threats, policy environment, civil society context, and patterns of conservation investment by other funders, and present a stakeholder-agreed-upon geographic and thematic investment strategy. In this context, the updated Ecosystem Profile is both a **document** and a **process**. The organization that leads this effort will deliver the final document but must produce it in a way that ensures stakeholder consultation and agreement. A good Ecosystem Profile will begin building partnerships and momentum well before grant making begins.

In short, the updated Ecosystem Profile will be a snapshot of the hotspot in 2016 that describes the current state of, and threats to, biodiversity and the capacity of civil society to engage as a partner in conservation. The update will:

1. Secure broad-based scientific agreement on the biological priorities for conservation, based on the latest scientific information available;
2. Provide an updated description of the socioeconomic factors that drive threats to natural resources, including changes over the last five years;
3. Provide an overview of civil society as a partner in conservation, with focus on recent development on the civil society sector in countries of North Africa and the Middle-East;
4. Define the CEPF niche and investment strategy for a new phase of investment 2017-2022.
5. Define the baseline biological indicators related to biodiversity, threats, and civil society against which the grant portfolio will be monitored.

The CEPF Donor Council expects to review and approve the final Ecosystem Profile by the first quarter of 2017. At that time, the Donor Council will also approve a total amount to invest in the region over an investment period of at least five years. The amount that the Donor Council allocates is, in part, based on the arguments presented in the Ecosystem Profile. Based on this calendar and other elements of CEPF operations in the region, grant-making would begin soon thereafter.

a. Conservation Outcomes and Key Biodiversity Areas

All CEPF Ecosystem Profiles are built around the concepts of conservation outcomes and key biodiversity areas. Conservation outcomes are the entire set of conservation targets in a hotspot that need to be achieved in order to prevent species extinctions and biodiversity loss.

The CEPF funding niche and strategy will be based upon these outcomes, firstly to ensure that CEPF investments are directed at relevant projects, and secondly to enable measurement of the success of conservation investments.

Conservation outcomes exist at three scales representing: (1) the globally threatened species within the region, (2) the sites that sustain them, and (3) the landscapes necessary to maintain the ecological and evolutionary processes upon which those sites depend. In defining outcomes at the species, site, and corridor levels, CEPF aims to identify targets that are quantitative, justifiable, and repeatable. CEPF and other participating funders will not try to achieve all of these targets through their funding, but its investment niche and strategy will address a subset of them.

The existing Ecosystem Profile identifies 1,110 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA). The update of the Ecosystem Profile will be based on the existing list of KBAs and related data, but will also include additional data that was not available five years ago, such as data on Important Plant Areas (IPAs) and freshwater KBAs, and other recently available biological information.

The process of defining KBAs should follow the IUCN Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas, which will be provided to the team. It is possible that important conservation outcomes at site level be identified through methodologies other than the standard KBA (e.g. IPAs); these will also be taken fully into consideration in the profile. As a result, the updated Ecosystem Profile might present a series of Conservation Outcomes at site level that includes KBAs as well as sites identified through other prioritization methodologies.

The update of the Ecosystem Profile is not expected to include data about marine areas beyond national jurisdictions, but the inclusion of coastal areas is encouraged.

b. Scope of the Profile

The Ecosystem Profile is built around the biodiversity hotspot, which covers 26 countries. The Ecosystem Profile should address the entire hotspot. That being said, limited time, money, availability of data and, of course, eligibility of countries for future CEPF investment, prevents the profile from addressing every subject with equal depth for each country, and will prevent the team from engaging stakeholders equally in each country.

Given the preceding parameters, CEPF expects that:

1. The team will conduct extensive consultations with stakeholders in countries and territories currently eligible for CEPF support, as well as Egypt and Turkey, as presented in the table below. The profile document will address the situation in these countries in depth.

Balkan Sub-region	Bosnia and Herzegovina
	Macedonia (Former Yugoslavian)

	Republic of Macedonia – FYROM)
	Montenegro
	Albania
Turkey Sub-region	Turkey
Middle-East Sub-region	Jordan
	Lebanon
	Palestinian Territories
North Africa Sub-region	Morocco
	Algeria
	Tunisia
	Egypt
	Cape Verde

2. The update of the profile will consider Libya, even if stakeholder consultations there will have to be adapted to the security situation. If possible, some Libyan stakeholders will be invited to participate in meetings in Tunisia or in the regional workshop.
3. No in-country consultation is expected in Syria. The team will conduct a desk review of existing sources to discuss this country in the profile.
4. The hotspot includes a number of European Member States and other countries and territories that are not eligible to receive CEPF funding (due to not being clients of the World Bank), as presented in the table below:

European Members States	France
	Spain (including Canary Islands)
	Portugal (including Azores and Madeira)
	Italy
	Slovenia
	Croatia
	Greece
	Malta
	Cyprus
Other Countries	Monaco
	Andorra
	Holy Sea (City of Vatican)
	San Marino
	Gibraltar
	Israel

For these countries and territories, it is not expected that the team will conduct in-depth analysis for all chapters of the profile:

- As regards biodiversity outcomes for these countries and territories, the team should make use of existing readily available data to the extent possible, including:
 - o For species, the profile should consider the IUCN Red List when possible and include data about globally threatened species that occur in these countries and territories

- within the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, with focus on species which range extend to eligible CEPF countries;
- For sites: the profile should include data on sites identified under existing analyses, for instance Natura2000 sites, KBAs or IPAs already published (for instance in European part of Macaronesia through the BEST initiative). The profile will make clear the provenance of these data. No new analyses are expected for these countries and territories;
- For corridors, no specific analysis is expected on corridors in these countries and territories, but corridors spanning both CEPF eligible and non-eligible countries or territories could be included.
- As regards the Socio-economic/political chapters, the profile will only include brief paragraph summarizing the general situation in each country / territory, without any detailed analysis, as was done in the former Ecosystem Profile.
 - As regards Civil Society chapter, the profile will not present a detailed analysis of civil society in these countries but will, instead, include a section about general implication of civil society on conservation, and highlight organizations with international programs based in these countries that are participating in regional initiatives on the environment, or more generally opportunities for regional cooperation between civil society of CEPF eligible and non-eligible countries.

Applicants should be clear in their proposals how, and to what degree, they will conduct stakeholder consultations in each country.

4. Eligibility and Exclusions

CEPF will accept proposals from any qualified organization anywhere in the world, including non-government organizations, private consulting groups, and both public and private universities. Government-owned enterprises or institutions are eligible only if they can establish that the enterprise or institution (i) has a legal personality independent of any government agency or actor; (ii) has the authority to apply for and receive private funds; and (iii) is not able to assert a claim of sovereign immunity.

Organizations may choose to form a team, or consortium, for the purposes of submitting a proposal. If a consortium is submitting a proposal in response to this RfP, then one organization must be clearly identified as the lead. The lead organization will have final responsibility for submitting the consolidated proposal, and if successful, will be responsible for leading implementation, reporting to CEPF, receiving and disbursing funds, and coordinating the other members of the consortium.

The organization, or organizational members of a consortium, that prepares the Ecosystem Profile will **not** be precluded from bidding on grants during the subsequent implementation period.

5. Period of Performance

The period of performance is anticipated to be from 15 May 2016 through 30 April 2017.

6. Place of Performance

The place of performance is any relevant location within the Mediterranean Basin hotspot, Europe, or the locations of major international donors or agencies working in the region. The assignment will include travel to Brussels for meetings at project inception and to CEPF headquarters in Metropolitan Washington, D.C., USA to present a draft of the Ecosystem Profile to CEPF donors.

7. Budget

The total budget that CEPF will allocate for this award, inclusive of all taxes, management support costs, or other indirect costs, is US\$ 300,000.

8. Solicitation, Review, and Award

The CEPF Secretariat is responsible for the analysis of applications, selection of the top-ranked organization or consortium, and negotiation with the top-ranked organization or consortium leading to the award of a grant in accord with CEPF's grant-making procedures.

9. Supervision by the CEPF Secretariat

The selected team will report to the CEPF Secretariat. The Secretariat will provide both direct and ultimate guidance to the team.

10. Background documents

- a- [Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot Ecosystem Profile, 2010](#) (and [Version française](#))
- b- Ecosystem Profile Summary, [English version](#), [Version française](#), [Arabic version](#)
- c- Mid-Term Assessment Report
- d- [Annual Portfolio overview, 2013](#) (covering 2012 and 2013)
- e- Final draft of the Long Term Vision for the Balkans (attached)

11. Scope of Work

a. Ecosystem Profile Update – Detailed Document

The updated Ecosystem Profile will be drafted in English and adhere to the structure below. The team will prepare the final document in professionally edited English for the CEPF Donor Council. Upon approval of that document, the team will prepare a professionally edited French and Arabic translation.

Chapter	Approximate Page Length*
Chapter 1. Introduction	2
Chapter 2. Background	4
Chapter 3. Biological Importance of the Hotspot	20
Chapter 4. Conservation Outcomes Defined for the Hotspot	15
Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Context of the Hotspot	10
Chapter 6. Policy Context of the Hotspot	20
Chapter 7. Civil Society Context of the Hotspot	25
Chapter 8. Threats to Biodiversity in the Hotspot	15
Chapter 9. Climate Change Assessment	10
Chapter 10. Assessment of Current Conservation Investment	15
Chapter 11. CEPF Niche for Investment	2
Chapter 12. CEPF Investment Strategy and Programmatic Focus (including Logical Framework table)	25
Chapter 13. Sustainability	3
Total	166
References	tbd
Appendices	tbd

* Page count does not include tables or figures.

The updated Ecosystem Profile will be an original document, composed essentially of two sections. The first section consists of Chapters 1-10, which will address the whole of the hotspot. These chapters will form the basis for the prioritization and strategy, which will comprise the second section, consisting of Chapters 11-13. The second section will focus only on those sites and corridors that are prioritized, also referred to as the geographic priorities for CEPF investment.

Chapter 1. Introduction. This chapter describes the conservation imperative for the hotspot, introduces CEPF as a global program and gives a general overview of the hotspot. It describes the approach, conservation outcomes tool, and strategy development.

This chapter will be mostly based on the existing Ecosystem Profile, with updated text.

Map: This chapter will include a map of the hotspot.

Chapter 2. Background. This chapter describes the process behind the development of the profile, the stakeholder meetings, the donor consultations, and the partners involved.

This chapter will introduce the 2010 Ecosystem profile and describe the process used for update.

Table: Dates and participant lists for all stakeholder workshops.

Chapter 3. Biological Importance of the Hotspot. This chapter describes the geography, climate, and biological history of the hotspot. The chapter will provide a summary of species diversity, levels of endemism, and global threat status among major taxonomic groups in the hotspot. The focus will be on the taxonomic groups for which data on global threat status are available.

This chapter will be mostly based on the Existing Ecosystem Profile, with updated information as relevant. This chapter will also include a new section describing major ecosystem services, including freshwater flows, support to food production, support to cultural services, carbon sequestration, and disaster mitigation, among others, based on literature review.

Table: species diversity, endemism, and global threat in the hotspot, by taxonomic group.

Table: principal ecosystem services.

Chapter 4. Conservation Outcomes Defined for the Hotspot.

This chapter describes and summarizes the conservation outcomes for the hotspot. Conservation outcomes represent the quantifiable set of species (i.e., globally threatened species), sites (including KBAs), and higher-scale spatial units (i.e., corridors, landscapes) that are indispensable to conserving the global biodiversity values of the hotspot.

1. **Species outcomes** will be based on a comprehensive list of globally threatened species occurring in the hotspot, corresponding to categories critical (CR), endangered (EN), and vulnerable (VU) on the current IUCN Red List.

The species outcomes will be refined, using up-to-date Red List reports, and highlighting flagship and important species requiring a regional dimension to conservation.

2. **Site outcomes** will be based on a comprehensive list, with accompanying maps, of KBAs for the hotspot, comprising all sites that meet the criteria defined in the IUCN Standard on KBAs that can be identified based upon available information.

The site outcomes will be based upon the KBAs identified in the existing Ecosystem Profile. The KBA list will be enriched by new data made available since then, including but not limited to the [Freshwater KBA assessment](#) (IUCN, 2014), [Important Plant Areas of the South and East of Mediterranean](#) (IUCN, Plantlife and WWF, 2011) and updated information on Important Bird Areas available on [BirdLife's datazone](#) (BirdLife international, 2016). Consultations with experts and local associations, including with CEPF grantees, will be used to gather additional (and sometimes unpublished) data.

The section on Site Outcomes will be largely based upon the existing Ecosystem Profile, with additional sites based on new data and, in some cases, revision of site boundaries.

3. **Corridor outcomes** will be based on a comprehensive list, with accompanying maps, of higher-scale spatial units necessary to maintain ecological and evolutionary processes at the landscape scale. Within this context, the chapter summarizes the ecosystem services provided by the natural ecosystems of the hotspot and describes their social and economic value. The text relates the importance of conservation corridors to the provision of specific ecosystem services.

The Corridor Outcomes will mostly consist in a revision, in particular through consultations with local stakeholders, of the Ecosystem Profile section.

This chapter should also make specific links between Conservation Outcomes and relevant indicators in the CEPF Monitoring Framework, including CEPF indicators 1, 4, 5, 8, and 18.

Map: Conservation outcomes in the hotspot (including corridors)

Table: Sites of highest biological priority (name, island, protection status, size, current annual funding).

Table: Protected Areas in the Hotspot.

Table: Summary of Globally Threatened Species (species outcomes) in the Hotspot.

Table: Summary of Key Biodiversity Areas (site outcomes) in the Hotspot.

Table: Summary of Conservation Corridors (corridor outcomes) in the Hotspot.

Geo-referenced data sets: Data sets used as the basis for the above.

Data collected by the team for this chapter will be submitted to Conservation International's GIS and cartography experts, who will then use the information to prepare a *Conservation Outcomes* wall map. The team must submit the following as appendices to this chapter.

1. GIS layer of KBA polygons with attributes
2. GIS layer of conservation corridors
3. Species-site matrix (in Excel) listing KBA trigger species (and other features) for each KBA

CEPF advises that revision to Chapter 4 be drafted early in the process so that authors of subsequent chapters (e.g., on policy, on civil society) can tailor their work to be focused on the specific conservation outcomes.

Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Context of the Hotspot. This chapter provides an overview of the socioeconomic situation of the hotspot, an analysis of how this affects conservation outcomes, and how it could influence the strategic directions for CEPF actions. The chapter should provide information and analysis on population, including demographics, migration and distribution trends (e.g., urban versus rural; state to state), and ethnic and indigenous distinctions, if relevant. The chapter should also discuss relevant social and economic facts, including poverty and welfare distribution, economic activities as they relate to natural resource use (e.g., agriculture, energy, fisheries, mining, forestry, tourism), and linguistic/social/religious distinctions if they have relevance to civil society engagement and/or conservation. As relevant, there should be discussion of youth and underprivileged as either relate to conservation. There must be a distinct section on gender.

This chapter should not only include a general discussion of the private sector, but should be specific about the major actors and what they represent as either threats or partners in conservation.

It is important to note that the chapter is about the hotspot, not the whole of each of the Hotspot countries. (For example, the chapter should present demographic information for the portion of Egypt that lies in the hotspot, not the whole country.)

This chapter should also make specific links between the socioeconomic context of the hotspot and relevant indicators in the CEPF Monitoring Framework, including CEPF Indicators 9 and 10.

This chapter will be mostly based upon the existing Ecosystem Profile, but with a specific focus on recent social and economic trends and updated socio-economic data. An updated socio-economic

analysis, with some methodological variation, was prepared for the Balkan countries in 2015 during the Long Term Vision process, and could be used as a model for the other countries. While major data and trends should be presented, no in-depth analysis will be needed for EU Member States or other non-eligible countries.

Tables: Several tables as relevant by sub-region, including those on key human and development statistics, demographic trends, active population share in main economic sectors, ecological footprint, rates of land use change, or relevant information on economic sectors that affect natural resources.

Chapter 6. Policy Context of the Hotspot. This chapter reviews and analyzes policies related to the environment with special emphasis on natural resources management and biodiversity conservation. Given the scale and diversity of the hotspot, the chapter should provide a broad overview of the political situation in each of the four sub-regions (Balkans, Turkey, Middle East and North Africa), before going into detail about specific aspects of the policy context in particular countries that have a strong bearing on biodiversity conservation, whether in terms of presenting threats or opportunities, and thus have a bearing on the CEPF investment strategy and grant-making modalities. The chapter should provide:

1. Overview on governance structures, level of decentralization, political conflicts, and security issues.
2. Overview on public policies in relation to natural resources management (e.g., policies on protected areas, coastal zone management, tourism, forestry, agriculture, fisheries, urban development, infrastructures (in particular energy)).
3. Overview on the institutional framework for conservation, including description of the mandates and capacity of principal agencies and authorities, biodiversity action plans, major national laws, and international conventions.
4. Overview on other policies and regulations related to the financing of conservation, including taxes, protected area revenue streams, licensing for resource use, and the creation of trust funds.
5. Overview on national, provincial, or other economic development policies in relation in terms of their effect on biodiversity conservation. Include also an overview of the laws on local governance as they relate to the control of natural resource areas (e.g., forestry, agriculture).
6. Overview of political conditions and trends at national, provincial, or local scales as they relate to conservation (e.g., political parties, leadership, popular movements) as well as international issues (e.g., the countries' relationships with other major actors) and regional initiatives in the Mediterranean Basin (e.g. the EuroMed partnership, Barcelona Convention, etc.).
7. Overview on National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) of each country.
8. This chapter should also make specific links between the policy context of the hotspot and relevant indicators in the CEPF Monitoring Framework (Indicator 13) and/or establish some form of baseline data against which to measure future progress in relation to policy.

Chapter 7. Civil Society Context of the Hotspot. Civil society is the recipient of CEPF grants and as such, is CEPF's implementing agent. A central tenet of CEPF is that effective and sustainable conservation is better achieved with the engagement of civil society. This chapter must provide an extensive examination of primary and potential civil society actors and their potential direct or indirect role in conservation.

For the purposes of this chapter, CEPF defines civil society as all the national and international non-government actors that are relevant to the achievement of the conservation outcomes and strategic directions. This includes, at least, local and international conservation NGOs; economic and community development NGOs; scientific/research/academic institutions (including local universities); professional organizations; producer and sales associations; religious organizations; media; advocacy groups; outreach/education/awareness groups; and the parts of the private sector concerned with the sustainable use of natural resources.

The chapter should:

1. Describe the efforts of major conservation and development organizations working in the Mediterranean Basin.
2. Distill the efforts of smaller groups by various classifications or geographic locales.
3. Describe formal and informal networks of civil society actors and their work.
4. Analyze the capacity (human resources, technical, financial) of different types of groups as this varies by location (e.g., by country), or focus area (e.g., community development, terrestrial management, water resources).
5. Analyze the operating environment for civil society, in terms of legal framework, political space, funding availability, ability to register or convene a group, receive funding, report on income, or manage KBAs; and describe variations of these within sub-regions of the hotspot.
6. Describe gaps in the civil society framework (e.g., by location or issue) to inform whether the CEPF strategy will directly address these gaps or purposefully work around them.

This chapter should also make specific links between the civil society context of the hotspot and relevant indicators in the CEPF Monitoring Framework, including Indicators 20, 21, 22, and 23. CEPF Indicator 21, in particular, attempts to measure the “collective civil society capacity” at a hotspot, national, or appropriate sub-national scale. The profiling team should use a CEPF-provided measurement and descriptive tool to assess and define a baseline for this “collective capacity.”

Chapter 8. Threats to Biodiversity in the Hotspot. This chapter is a study on threats to biodiversity and their drivers in the hotspot. This chapter should include, at minimum, the following:

1. Assessment of the threats and root causes of threats that directly affect the conservation outcomes and the ecosystem's integrity, as well as a brief historic overview thereof.
2. Description of the possible solutions to overcome or at least mitigate the root causes of these threats.
3. Discussion of specific threats confronting specific species, sites, and corridors listed in the conservation outcomes chapter, to assist in the development of the CEPF strategy.
4. Description the principal actors involved and how these should change to support biodiversity conservation in the area (both threat actors and opportunity actors.)
5. Appropriate quantification or qualification of threats in order to establish some form of baseline data against which to measure future progress in relation to threat reduction.

This chapter should make specific links to CEPF Global Indicators 2, 3, 6, and 7.

This chapter will be based upon the existing Ecosystem Profile, with inclusion of new, emerging threats and updates on threats identified in the earlier analysis. National consultations and regional workshop will be used to gather additional information and prioritize threats.

Chapter 9. Climate Change Assessment. This chapter should be based on recent overviews and reports for the Mediterranean Basin. The team will be encourage to identify a few key documents and highlight the most important findings for this chapter, for instance based on documents prepared by regional institutions and civil society organizations in preparation of Paris's UNFCCC COP 21. No new analysis or specific original work, apart from synthesis, is expected for this.

The chapter should include:

1. Overview of hotspot's climatic history and how this has shaped the biota.
2. Overview of projected impacts of climate change on human populations and biodiversity.
3. Description of the potential climate mitigation and adaption opportunities in the hotspot, including adequacy of the protected area systems to promote resiliency.
4. Review of policy responses, including major climate change initiatives, the extent to which climate change analyses and policies are in place for adaption and mitigation, and their efficacy in integrating biodiversity considerations and potential future needs.
5. Overview of the role of civil society in advancing climate change adaption and mitigation to date and key bottlenecks to their constructive engagement and potential responses.
6. Recommendations for strengthening policies and approaches for adaptation and mitigation for conservation and ecosystem service resiliency, with emphasis on fostering civil society engagement.
7. Potential impacts of the human response to climate change on protected areas, natural areas and biodiversity (e.g., displaced populations due to sea level rise or droughts, increased dependency on natural resources).

Chapter 10. Assessment of Current Conservation Investment. This chapter considers "conservation investment" to be both investment directly in such elements as creation of protected areas and restoration of natural ecosystems, as well as investment in economic development activities and local governance that effect proposed conservation outcomes. As such, the chapter needs to discuss the work of traditional economic development funders and actors, or lack thereof, as it influences CEPF's niche for investment.

Further, the chapter needs to describe the work of the GEF small grants program in each country and funding by other funders (in particular the European Union) that have or are planning investments in the region.

This chapter should further include the following, at a minimum:

1. Detail major efforts that have been or are being undertaken for biodiversity conservation in the hotspot by national, international, bilateral, public, and private sector actors.
2. Quantify levels of funding already provided by those actors.
3. Qualify where and why existing activities and investments are deemed to be insufficient or ineffective.
4. Distinguish between funding for formal public sector agencies as opposed to civil society.
5. Provide specific detail on funding provided by CEPF's donors in relation to conservation.
6. Discuss the relevance/role of donor funds for other sectors as it relates to biodiversity conservation (e.g., infrastructure projects that include environmental impacts; public sector reform projects that strengthen the capacity or change the role of environmental management authorities; decentralization programs that change the role of local authorities in relation to natural resource management; education or health programs that affect local behavior).
7. Map relationships between donors.
8. Identify function and incipient sustainable financing mechanisms (e.g., trust funds, debt swaps).

9. Identify gaps in conservation funding with respect to the conservation outcomes.
10. Distinguish between funding provided for conservation in any of the eligible countries, as a whole, but not for the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot (such as desert parts of Algeria, non-Mediterranean portion of Bosnia and Hercegovina or Jordan etc.), and distinguish between funding provided for economic development, as a whole, but not for conservation.

This chapter should make specific links to CEPF Global Indicators 14, 15, 16, and 17.

This chapter will require an entirely new analysis, as data from the existing Ecosystem Profile is largely obsolete.

Chapter 11. CEPF Niche for Investment. Based on the preceding description of the conservation outcomes and investment context, this chapter identifies how CEPF investment will complement (and build upon) investments by other funders discussed in Chapter 10 and in relation to the needs and opportunities described in Chapters 4-9. The niche presages the Investment Strategy (Chapter 12) by implying the types of activities for which grant funding will be provided, the types of organizations to receive this funding, and the geographic focus of this work.

This chapter should take into consideration the achievements and lessons learned from the 2012-2016 CEPF investment phase, including but not limited to the results of the 2015 Mid-term Assessment. The CEPF niche itself may be substantively different to that in the existing Ecosystem Profile, if changes are justified based on the results of the stakeholder consultations.

Chapter 12. CEPF Investment Strategy and Programmatic Focus. Based on the niche for CEPF investment, this chapter recommends specific Investment Priorities grouped into broad Strategic Directions. These are areas where CEPF can add most value or complement existing investments in biodiversity conservation, justified in terms of the current context for conservation, past experience with conservation initiatives, and opportunities to complement and build upon current conservation investment.

CEPF will provide the profiling team with criteria for prioritizing KBAs for investment.

The CEPF Investment Strategy will include a Logical Framework which incorporates CEPF's global indicators and relevant indicators specific to the hotspot in relation to the strategic directions and investment priorities. It is a distillation of CEPF's objectives for its grants in the hotspot and is used throughout the five-year investment period as a portfolio monitoring tool. The logical framework is a negotiated and realistic set of outcomes in relation to the amount of money allocated by the Donor Council and other participating funders.

Targets in the logical framework should be framed by the Aichi Targets of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the targets of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

Table: CEPF strategic directions and investment priorities for the hotspot.

Table: Priority KBAs and corridors in the hotspot.

Map: Priority KBAs and corridors in the hotspot.

Table: Logical Framework with top-level objectives, targets, means of verification, and important assumptions and lower-level intermediate outcomes, intermediate indicators, means of verification, and important assumptions.

This chapter should take into consideration the achievements and lessons learned from the 2012-2016 CEPF investment phase, including but not limited to the results of the 2015 Mid-term Assessment. The investment strategy itself may be substantively different to that in the existing Ecosystem Profile, if changes are justified based on the results of the stakeholder consultations.

Chapter 13. Sustainability. This chapter describes how the proposed strategic directions will result in sustainable conservation outcomes.

References. Include complete citations for all references in the profile.

Appendices. Suggested appendices include:

1. IUCN Red List species and priority species in the hotspot. (CEPF Global Indicator 1.)
2. All KBAs and Site Outcomes in the hotspot, number of hectares, and protection status. (CEPF Global Indicator 4 and 5.)
3. All corridors in the hotspot.
4. Biological prioritizations (i.e., scoring or ranking) of species, sites, and corridors.
5. Ecosystem services and their contribution to economic development in the hotspot.
6. List of relevant civil society groups in the hotspot.
7. Major current external and internal investments in conservation in the hotspot.
8. Baseline list of policies and laws requiring enactment or improvement as evidence of change. (CEPF Global Indicator 13.)
9. Baseline list of financing mechanisms in existing – or identified gaps – with assessment of available US dollars for funding. (CEPF Global Indicator 14 and 15.)
10. Baseline assessment of civil society capacity per qualitative CEPF measuring tool. (CEPF Global Indicator 21.)
11. Baseline list of existing networks or partnerships – or identified gaps – requiring improvement as evidence of change. (CEPF Global indicator 22.)
12. Baseline assessment of “responsiveness to emerging issues” per qualitative CEPF measuring tool. (CEPF Global Indicator 23.)
13. Additional baseline data to monitor the hotspot for CEPF Global Indicators in terms of threats to biodiversity, status of human well-being, and economic development.

b. Ecosystem Profile – Executive Summary Document

The Executive Summary will be 30 to 40 pages in length, inclusive of maps and tables. It will be drafted and presented in English, concurrent with the first formal draft detailed Profile presented to the Working Group. It will be revised when presented to the Donor Council and revised as a final version to parallel the final Profile. The final version must then be translated into French and Arabic. Whereas the detailed ecosystem profile is intended for managers and as a reference document, the Executive Summary is intended for executives and host-country decision-makers.

c. Ecosystem Profile – Communication Document

The team will suggest changes in the text of the 16-page booklet "[Ecosystem Profile Summary](#)" to reflect the changes in the Ecosystem Profile. The team will provide a translated version in Arabic and French of the final text, once approved by CEPF.

d. Ecosystem Profile Process

CEPF intends that the drafting of the Ecosystem Profile document be much more than a research and writing project. Rather, it is a process of engagement and consensus-building among host-country agency partners, donors, and civil society actors with the result being a document that has broad-based support. In order to accomplish this, the selected team is expected to propose and complete the following:

1. Participate in 1-2 day briefing/launch meeting with CEPF Secretariat personnel, most likely to be held in Brussels.
2. Participate in one-day scoping meeting with representatives of CEPF's global donors in Brussels.
3. Convene regular management meetings of principal authors and contributors to the document and process.
4. Determine and then convene, either in person or virtually, an appropriate senior advisory body or set of advisors. Ideally, this will include one or more GEF Operational Focal Points from hotspot countries (named at http://www.thegef.org/gef/focal_points_list), leading members of international and local civil society, the private sector, and selected donor representatives. The team could consider engaging with members of the current CEPF Mediterranean Basin Advisory Committee.
5. Engage directly, either in person or in writing, with GEF Operational Focal Points in order to secure their endorsement of the Profile.
6. Organize and hold a series of stakeholder *national* consultation meetings in each eligible country within the hotspot, or sub-regional meetings if this is deemed preferable, that seek local inputs into the CEPF investment strategy and that build a common vision for conservation in the hotspot. (Proposals should specify the locations and themes of planned meetings, the approximate dates, and expected participants.)
7. Organize and hold a final *regional* consultation meeting with key senior stakeholders that presents the draft geographic and species priorities, Strategic Directions, and Investment Priorities.
8. Under the guidance of the CEPF Secretariat, prepare a full draft of the Ecosystem Profile for review by the CEPF donor's Working Group.
9. With the CEPF Secretariat, revise the draft to respond to Working Group comments.
10. Send one individual to Washington, D.C. to present the final draft Ecosystem Profile to the CEPF Working Group.

The Profile Team must consider that stakeholders extend beyond traditional conservation actors – that is, environmental NGOs, research institutions and universities, government agency protected area authorities, and donor representatives with an individual conservation remit – to include the major development or private sector actors.

e. Timeframe, Milestones, Deliverables, and Payment Schedule *(to be finalized upon grant award)*

This timeframe below, up until the submission of the first draft, is illustrative and should guide applicants. After the submission of the first draft, applicants should view the timing and actions as static and defined by the formal review and revision process required by the CEPF Working Group and Donor Council. The timeframe, milestones, and deliverables will become a formal part of the grant agreement with the selected applicants.

Payment will occur upon inception, quarterly thereafter, and upon completion, subject to the submission of deliverables and acceptance by CEPF.

Applicants should propose a payment schedule, per the below, that reflects the cash demands implied in their budgets.

Invoice	Date	Deliverable	Amount (USD)
1	15-May-16	No deliverable / agreement signature	<i>tbd</i>
	5-June-16	1. Electronic announcement of the CEPF process 2. List of key participant stakeholders and draft stakeholder analysis 3. Draft schedule of planned stakeholder workshops	
	30-Jun16	4. Draft list of globally threatened species in Mediterranean Basin (KBA trigger species) 5. Draft analysis of threats to biodiversity 6. List of members of Senior Advisory Group or presentation of advisory scheme 7. Final schedule and agenda for all stakeholder workshops 8. Launch of Profile update process organized in Brussels; list of participants and bulleted list of recommendation and feedback	
2	30-Jun-16	Invoice for period of May-June 2016	<i>tbd</i>
	1-Aug-16	9. Draft revised analysis of conservation outcomes	
3	30-Sep-16	Invoice for period of July-September 2016	<i>tbd</i>
	30-Nov-16	10. First draft of the Ecosystem Profile update – Chapters 1 to 10 – presented to CEPF Secretariat 11. Summary proceedings of all stakeholder and Senior Advisory workshops and regional workshop (i.e., date, location, agenda, final participant list, photos, and 500 word summary or bulleted list of stakeholder feedback or major outputs)	
	31-Dec-16	12. Full draft of Ecosystem Profile update submitted for CEPF Secretariat review, including draft Niche and Strategy based on Regional workshop	
4	31-Dec-16	Invoice for period of October-December 2016	<i>tbd</i>
	31-Jan-17	13. Ecosystem Profile 30-page summary (English, French, Arabic) 14. PowerPoint presentation to CEPF Technical Working Group in Washington, D.C.	
	20-Feb-17	15. Revised Ecosystem Profile per comments at Working Group presentation, in English	
	28-Feb-17	16. Final Ecosystem Profile (English)	
5	30-Mar-17	Invoice for period of January-March 2017	<i>tbd</i>
	15-April-17	17. Final contact list of all individuals consulted for the Ecosystem Profile (i.e., name, position, organization, telephone, electronic mail, geographic location)	
	15-April-17	18. Revised text of the Ecosystem Profile 16-page Summary brochure	
	30-April-17	19. GIS layer of KBA polygons with attributes 20. GIS layer of conservation corridors 21. Species-site matrix (in MS Excel) listing KBA trigger species and other features for each KBA 22. Final Ecosystem Profile (French)	
6	30-May-17	Invoice for period of April-June 2017	<i>tbd</i>
Total			<i>tbd</i>

12. Provision of Facilities

CEPF will make available all relevant materials and documentation for completion of this work. These will include but are not limited to sample ecosystem profiles, sample agendas for stakeholder consultations, and lists of contacts.

CEPF will link the profiling team with the Regional Implementation Team (RIT) for the current CEPF investment phase in the Mediterranean Basin, which would be in a position to provide:

- List of contact persons, including CEPF grantees
- Additional materials and detailed reports from the national consultations that took place during the Mid-Term Assessment
- Project Progress and Final Reports

While the RIT will be in a position to support the profiling team or give advice on specific issues, the attention of bidding organizations and consortia is drawn to the fact that the involvement of the RIT in the Ecosystem Profiling process will necessarily be limited due to other responsibilities. In order to minimize demands on the RIT's time, all requests for assistance from the RIT will be channeled via CEPF Secretariat (Mediterranean Basin Grant Director).

13. Personnel

Writing the Ecosystem Profile and leading the process requires a team of experts with a broad set of skills. Based on past experience, CEPF requires the following.

A **Team Leader** who has multiple years of experience designing and managing multi-faceted conservation programs, particularly in the Mediterranean Basin; demonstrated ability to lead teams of experts, facilitate stakeholder-driven processes, and coordinate with donors and government counterparts to develop an outcomes-based conservation strategy; and can write and synthesize a complex document similar to an ecosystem profile.

An expert in **Conservation Outcomes** who can lead or synthesize the process of identifying key biodiversity areas and conservation corridors, and as appropriate, understanding these in the context of other conservation, economic, and social development priorities in order to develop an outcomes-based strategy.

An expert in **Socio-Economics and Policy** who can lead or synthesize the analysis of the broad enabling environment in which conservation will take place, including demonstrated knowledge and experience of Mediterranean policies on protected areas, forestry, agriculture; local government and national government control over natural resources and decision-making; the role of civil society in natural resource management and the limiting factors on civil society in general; and the economic priorities within the Mediterranean Basin.

If not captured in the above, **other experts** will provide skills in geographic information systems, protected area design and policy, terrestrial species, climate change, capacity building, and civil society engagement.

As noted above, the final Ecosystem Profile document should be prepared in professional quality English. As such, if the proposed personnel do not otherwise have these capabilities, applicants should include, by position title if not name, an appropriate allocation for a professional editor and/or translator.

14. Instructions for the Preparation of Proposals

Proposals must be submitted in English.

If a consortium of organizations is submitting a proposal, the proposal should reflect the inputs and capabilities of the entire consortium. Subsequent to evaluation and prior to grant award, CEPF may require some of the documents detailed below from each consortium member.

Applicants are advised to read this section carefully in conjunction with Section 15 (Evaluation Criteria) in order to understand the relative weighting CEPF will use in evaluating proposals.

Proposals should be submitted electronically to **cepfgrants@conservation.org** by the closing date listed on the first page of this solicitation. Files should be submitted in MS Word, MS Excel, PDF, or other standard format. The budget file requested below must be submitted in a functioning Excel spreadsheet.

a. Cover Letter

Applicants should include a cover letter to their proposals listing all documents submitted. The cover note should clearly list the name of the organizational chief executive, and, if different, the name(s) of all parties with the ability to legally bind the organization and the name(s) of all parties whom CEPF should contact for clarifications and negotiations. The cover note should also provide complete mailing address, street address (if different), electronic mail address(es), and telephone and fax numbers.

b. Organizational Capabilities (no page limit)

Provide documentation showing evidence of the ability to complete the tasks described in the scope of work. This should include, at a minimum:

1. Basic organizational information, including: year organization established, total permanent staff globally and in the Mediterranean Basin, and organizational history and mission statement.
2. Relevant experience in the countries of the Mediterranean Basin.
3. Experience managing multi-disciplinary efforts that are based on applied conservation science.
4. Experience managing stakeholder consultations.
5. Experience preparing programmatic design documents.
6. Experience conducting key biodiversity analyses or other appropriate science-based priority-setting exercises.
7. Experience working with donors, governments, communities, the private sector, and other stakeholders on conservation and development issues, including building alliances and networks of stakeholder groups to achieve conservation goals.

c. Technical Approach (maximum 3 pages)

Applicants should demonstrate their understanding of the conservation outcomes and KBA analysis process as applied to the Mediterranean Basin.

Applicants should also demonstrate their understanding of potential stakeholders in the hotspot; that is, both participants in the design process as well as the members of civil society that would make up the bulk of grant recipients during implementation.

Applicants should propose a tentative plan for the stakeholder consultation process, including, to the extent possible, locations of workshops and how these might be arranged geographically, thematically, or by types of participant (e.g., conservation science, civil society, local government, private sector).

d. Curricula Vitae of Key Personnel

This work effort will be taking place over a very tight time-frame and a primary basis of selection will be the expert personnel who are immediately available to begin work. Applicants must identify, by name, the team leader and at least two or more additional experts who will lead this process. Applicants must provide curricula vitae for these individuals with the proposal. Proposals lacking curricula vitae may be considered non-responsive. Individual team members are expected to have, collectively, extensive experience in Mediterranean Basin and expertise in applied terrestrial conservation science, agricultural policy, civil society strengthening, local governance and decentralization, and the socio-economic and political conditions of the Mediterranean countries.

Collectively, the team must demonstrate fluency in spoken and written English and French. Proficiency in Arabic is an asset, for consultation in North Africa and Middle-East.

e. Work Flow and Team Structure Diagrams

Provide as appropriate, work flow diagrams (e.g., Gantt charts), team structure diagrams, or any other visual element better explaining how technical activities will take place, when they will take place, and who will be responsible for leading them.

f. Consortium Description

If a consortium of organizations is applying, applicants should explain the contractual arrangements that will be made between the lead applicant and subordinate partners.

g. Budget

Please refer to the attached budget template in Excel.

Concurrent with the release of this RfP, CEPF is providing each of the applicants with a budget template in Excel displaying thirteen primary line items: salaries/benefits, professional services, rent and storage, telecommunications, postage and delivery, supplies, furniture and equipment, maintenance, travel, meetings and special events, miscellaneous, sub-grants, and indirect costs. Each of these has various sub-items. Applicants must use this template, or provide an Excel file that summarizes to the line items and their sub-items. If a consortium of organizations is applying, each organization should have a parallel budget on a separate Worksheet, all of which feed into the lead applicant's Worksheet.

As noted above, the final Ecosystem Profile document should be prepared in professional quality English and French. As such, if the proposed personnel do not otherwise have these capabilities, applicants should include an appropriate budget for a professional editor and/or translator.

The Excel file provided must be functioning and not “locked” in any way. Worksheets should show all calculations, including unit costs, total units, and totals through the life of the activity.

CEPF allows for management support costs (also called “indirect costs” and which must reflect actual shared costs) up to a maximum of 13 percent of the direct costs. Management support costs must be justified with supporting documentation, such as audited financial statements. CEPF does not allow the application of a fee, profit, tax, or any other cost that could not otherwise be accounted for directly.

Provide a brief companion narrative if the budget is not otherwise clear. The companion narrative should explain any individual worksheet cells, budget elements, or assumptions that are not self-evident in the Excel file or otherwise explained in the proposal. (For example, an applicant’s approach to stakeholder consultations will make certain assumptions about the number of travelers whose costs are borne by this grant and the location and duration of consultations.)

This Excel file we have provided includes three Worksheets. Worksheet 1 is a summary that is based on Worksheet 2. The third Worksheet is a proposed deliverable schedule (i.e., a set of fixed obligations) for the life of the agreement.

h. Financial Questionnaire

Note to applicants: See attached Financial Risk Assessment.

All applicants, including members of a consortium, will need to complete a financial questionnaire as part of their full application. The questionnaire itself requests further documentation about your organization, including financial statements, auditor statements and registration/incorporation certification.

i. Anti-Terrorism Screening

The highest rated applicant will subsequently be required, per United States law, to complete forms demonstrating compliance with anti-terrorism statutes.

15. Evaluation Criteria

CEPF will make a best value determination of technical proposals in relation to proposed budgets. The least-cost budget will not necessarily be ranked the highest for evaluation purposes.

a. Technical Evaluation

CEPF will use the scorecard below for the technical evaluation of proposals. The scorecard shows the questions that reviewers will use and the relative weighting of each category. Applicants should ensure that each of these points is adequately addressed in either their Proposal Files (discussed in Section 12) or Financial Questionnaire (discussed in Section 13.)

Mediterranean Basin Ecosystem Profile Proposal Technical Proposal Scorecard

1	Organizational Experience	Points: 30
1.1	Do the applicant and its partners have relevant experience in terrestrial conservation science?	
1.2	Do the applicant and its partners have relevant experience in analyzing civil society, policy, and socioeconomic conditions in terms of designing a conservation program?	
1.3	Do the applicant and its partners have relevant experience in the Mediterranean Basin or the region?	
1.4	Does the lead organization demonstrate experience managing programs of similar size, scale, and complexity as that of the Ecosystem Profile Team?	
2	Personnel	Points: 50
2.1	Does the applicant propose a clear and viable personnel plan, including names, resumes, position titles, job descriptions, level of effort, work location, and reporting lines of authority?	
2.2	Does the applicant submit the name and resume a single, dedicated team leader, and does this person have the appropriate technical skills/experience and appropriate managerial skills/experience?	
2.3	Does the applicant propose, by name and resume, personnel other than the team leader, and do these people have appropriate technical skills/experience and appropriate managerial skills/experience?	
2.4	Do the proposed team members have, individually or collectively, the language skills necessary to operate effectively in the hotspot?	
2.5	Does the applicant propose a plan for recruitment and/or mobilization of “to be determined” personnel, including job descriptions, job qualifications, and curricula vitae of personnel from the applicant’s organization who will perform relevant duties while recruitment is pending?	
3	Proposed Technical Approach	Points: 20
3.1	Does the applicant demonstrate a clear understanding of the KBA methodology and conservation outcomes as these relate to the Ecosystem Profile for the Mediterranean?	
3.2	Does the applicant demonstrate a clear understanding of civil society in the Mediterranean Basin and the role it will play in both the production of the Ecosystem Profile and the eventual recipient of CEPF grants?	
3.3	Does the applicant propose a clear plan for engagement of stakeholders at multiple levels, in multiple locations, and across multiple disciplines to both produce the Ecosystem Profile document and ensure a collaborative process that serves as the foundation for a future grants program?	

b. Cost Evaluation

CEPF will consider each cost proposal in relation to the level of quality and output suggested in the technical proposal. Cost proposals will thus be considered in terms of their realism and the items below, but will not be given a numeric score. CEPF will select the applicant which presents the best value for the required product and services.

Mediterranean Basin Ecosystem Profile Proposal Cost Proposal Scorecard

4	Budget	
4.1	Is the budget within the limit named in Item 6?	
4.2	Are all costs mathematically justified through the clear presentation of unit costs, total units, and total costs?	
4.3	Are all unit costs, total units, and total costs appropriate in relation to the proposed technical and managerial activities?	
4.4	Are proposed unit rates in accord with market rates in the region?	
4.5	If the applicant claims indirect costs, does it clearly show the base of application and is this distinct from any previously enumerated direct costs; does the applicant provide an explanation of how the indirect cost rate has been determined (e.g., historical averages, audited financial statements, precedent contracts); and does the applicant provide supporting documentation with its financial questionnaire?	
4.6	Does the budget relate clearly and directly to the proposal?	
4.7	Are the costs budgeted for stakeholder consultations sufficient and realistic?	

Annex 1. Criteria for KBA Prioritization for CEPF Investment

1. **Biological priority.** The KBA is ranked as a high relative priority for biological importance, based on the criteria of irreplaceable and vulnerability set out in Langhammer et al., *Identification and Gap Analysis of Key Biodiversity Areas* (2007).
2. **Degree of threat.** Threats pose a risk, in the short-to-medium-term, to the existence of habitats and ecosystem services vital to priority species and local people.
3. **Funding need.** Given the existing level of conservation investment by national and international donors, an important funding need exists for CEPF investment to address.
4. **Management need.** Given the existing management plans, staffing and infrastructure, and mechanisms for community engagement, an important management need exists for CEPF investment to address.
5. **Civil society capacity.** Civil society groups working in or near the KBA have the potential to act as effective local stewards and champions of the KBA and its trigger species.
6. **Operational feasibility.** Operational obstacles (e.g., insecurity, drug cultivation, legal prohibitions) do not preclude effective CEPF engagement.
7. **Alignment with national priorities.** The KBA is recognized as a biodiversity priority in relevant national strategies.
8. **Opportunity for landscape-scale conservation.** The KBA provides opportunities to achieve landscape-scale conservation through linkage to large KBAs or KBA clusters

Attachments

1. CEPF Global Monitoring Framework
2. Budget template
3. Financial Risk Assessment form
4. Anti-Terrorist screening form
5. Mid-Term Assessment Report
6. Long Term Vision for the Balkans, Final Draft - Executive Summary

END OF CALL FOR PROPOSALS