CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International-Programs and Science

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Defining and Monitoring Conservation Outcomes in Northern and Southern Mesoamerica

Implementation Partners for this Project:

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): September 1, 2005-August 31, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): November 2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

No guidance for reviewing is necessary. It is hoped that this report fully reflects the project timeframe and its ultimate successes and shortfalls. Due to unanticipated circumstances only very minor input was provided by the project manager and coordinator unfortunately.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose**: Conservation outcomes defined, baseline indicator data collected and strengthened regional capacity through partnerships with governments, key NGOs and other stakeholders.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
1. Number of governments, conservation NGOs and other key stakeholders who have committed to supporting the implementation of outcomes definition and monitoring.	KBAs have been presented and distributed to over **50** government agencies, NGOs and other key stakeholders across Central America and Mexico. However the commitment, particularly that of governments, cannot be quantified. Only data sharing agreements were signed with NGOs across the region. Unfortunately due to slow progress engaging CCAD technical committees, no Memorandum of Understanding has yet been signed. Only a verbal commitment of adoption of KBAs and Indicators in the framework has been given to date.
2. Number of countries with outcomes (species, site, corridor) defined and indicator baseline disseminated.	Species and site outcomes have been defined for Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Panama, Costa Rica and Honduras. Baseline results for 3 indicators (Red List Index, Number/% of KBAs with protection status, and change in forest extent in KBAs) have been disseminated to key stakeholders in each country. No Biodiversity Conservation Corridors have been fully defined in these 8 countries. For more details please see section *'Were any outputs*

	unrealized?'
3. Number of countries for which the project has delivered a gap analysis	KBAs have been provided to the six countries originally envisioned in the project, plus El Salvador and Honduras. They have been shared through official mechanisms across the region (through CCAD). Additional dissemination has already taken place in Guatemala, Belize, El Salvador, and Costa Rica, and in Chiapas State in Mexico.
4. Percent of indicators with baseline data (for all of Mesoamerica) collected, analysed and disseminated.	All indicators have been collected and analysed. Dissemination has taken place through the official channels to all Central American countries but Belize (through CCAD), where it has taken place with partners that will disseminate results through more formal channels at a later date.
5. Percent of future funding needs identified.	A meeting with CCAD's technical committee, CTBio, took place in June 2007 in Managua. The KBAs had a time slot in the official agenda, and the entire package of results, maps and information was shared with the committee at the end of the project. Funding needs for further biodiversity and threat mapping, completing habitat extent and change analysis across Southern Mesoamerica, and conducting protected area management efficiency studies were presented to CCAD technical committees.

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

Species and site outcomes have been comprehensively mapped across all 8 countries in Mesoamerica and baseline on state (Red List Index), pressure (deforestation rates) and response (protection status) indicators calculated for Southeast Mexico, Belize and selected priority areas in Guatemala. Furthermore wide-spread capacity building was achieved and it is hoped that such biodiversity analysis, GIS and remote sensing capacity will remain in-country to ensure future refinement of conservation priorities and long-term monitoring of habitat change and fragmentation effects and both protection status and effectiveness studies.

Meeting the objectives of the dissemination strategy has only been partially successful. Project outputs have been inserted into the Regional Strategic Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation Program (PROMEBIO). Results most notably have contributed to Outcome 2, Strategic Activities 1.3 (*Evaluate the current status of conservation of ecosystems and species in the region*), and 1.4 (*Identify gaps in the status of conservation of ecosystems and species established by the regional biodiversity*).

Despite this, no formal commitments have been made by governments to adopt the key biodiversity areas as principle units for informing current and future biodiversity conservation investments. Further work post-project is necessary to ensure key biodiversity areas become an additional authority for conservation planning decision making across Mesoamerica.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Please see sections '***Project execution'*** & ***'were any project outputs unrealized?***'

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

***Project Outputs**:*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Conservation targets defined and recommendations provided for improved management.	**SUMMARY:** Species and sites (key biodiversity areas) have been defined for Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador and protected area gap analysis results have been presented to key stakeholders in each country. Little progress has been made in defining biodiversity conservation. For more details, please see section *'Were any outputs unrealized?'* National protected area gap analyses have been conducted for all countries across Mesoamerica, but work to prioritize KBAs based on species threatened status has yet been done to strengthen them. If capacity is available we anticipate the prioritization work to be completed over the next year. In the meantime the 98 AZE (Alliance for Zero Extinction) sites identified across Mexico and Central America represent the highest priority targets for conservation investment at the site level (whether new protection, expansion or improved management). Note that there are 63 AZE sites identified in Mexico. However only 51 are shown on the map and therefore used in this analysis. Twelve AZE sites currently have insufficient locational information and were omitted from the analysis.
1.1. Key steps completed for establishing outcomes definition and monitoring program.	**80%** of key steps for establishing a sustainable outcomes definition and monitoring program have been completed. Comprehensive dissemination has been successfully conducted with the two principle objectives of feeding baseline results into fundraising and partnership building strategies that contribute to sustainable data collection and analysis and wider national and regional adoption of conservation planning and monitoring framework.
1.2. Key steps completed for definition (or refinement) of species outcomes Northern and Southern Mesoamerica.	The definition of species targets has been completed in all **8** countries across Mesoamerica. Species definition was however based on the 2006 Red List. While the 2008 Red List has been released, this was during the time of project dissemination. Species and site targets therefore need to be refined to reflect the most up to update threatened status of species.
1.3. Key steps completed for definition (or refinement) of Key Biodiversity Areas in Northern and Southern Mesoamerica.	All key steps for defining key biodiversity areas have been complete and the results have been very well received across northern and southern

	Mesoamerica. A total of 442 KBAs have been identified across northern and southern Mesoamerica using the 2006 Red List. 220 KBAs across Mexico and 222 KBAs across Central America. (Please refer to the large-format KBA maps and the World Biodiversity Database). It is hoped that results will be formally published for further dissemination. KBAs have been presented and distributed to over **50** government agencies, NGOs and other key stakeholders across Central America and Mexico. Three maps were produced: 1) KBAs of Mexico, (2) KBAs for southeast Mexico and Central America, and (3) forest cover change within KBAs in southeastern Mexico, Belize, and portions of Guatemala. These were accompanied by CDs housing all the background data. Throughout June, July and August 2009, the project results were presented to stakeholders in Mexico and all countries in Central America but Honduras where the current political conditions prevented getting partners together. KBAs were presented in El Salvador at the beginning of June, with 50 participants present representing 20 organizations, including the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN). The media were also present, with interviews given for local radio and TV. Interviews were conducted through our local partner Salvanatura. Furthermore at least two articles where published in local newspapers. The dissemination strategy then visited Nicaragua, where the technical committee of CCAD met and granted us time to formally present key project findings to the Central American governments. All member states, excluding Belize and Mexico (the latter are currently observing only). Next stop was Guatemala (15th June) with a meeting jointly hosted with the ministry. The meeting simultaneously presented hydrographic KBAs, eco-regions and maps of indigenous towns. Press coverage was also a success at this meeting. Next there was a presentation given in Belize, but only a small one. Unfortunately there was no coordination with Jan Meerman, a key in-country stakeholder. 10-15 participants attended and agreement was made to ensure coordination with Jan Meerman for further dissemination of the Belize KBAs and forest extent and change findings. In partnership with InBio, KBAs were presented in Costa Rica in July. **35** participants representing **20** institutions attended. This included representatives of the SINAC, an institution responsible for incorporating such data into national policy making. Finally for Central America, similar presentation in Panama was made on the 19th August and again there was much media interest. For Mexico three different presentations were given, in Tuxtla Gutiérrez, the City of Mexico, and finally in Cancún. Great media

	coverage was also generated at the Tuxtla Gutiérrez, and Cancun. For Mexico City there was no press cover, but the call was realized by the Secretariat of the Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) and dissemination was conducted in its offices.
1.4. Key steps completed for definition (or refinement) of biodiversity conservation corridors in Northern and Southern Mesoamerica.	A CBC hosted workshop to define biodiversity conservation corridors across northern and southern Mesoamerica took place in December 2008. However, little progress in data collection and analysis has been made since then. Output 1.4 has not been fully achieved. Please see section *'Were any outputs unrealized?'*
1.5. Number of countries with species, site and corridor outcomes defined.	Species and sites have been defined for all **8** countries across Mesoamerica. Only very little progress has been made in defining biodiversity conservation corridors however. Please see Output 1.4 for more detail.
1.6. Number of countries that have received reports on recommendations for new conservation units (protected areas, community managed reserves, etc), improved management of existing conservation units, and research priorities for filling information gaps.	All **8** countries in Mesoamerica have received project gap analysis findings in the form of maps and indicator baseline statistics. No national KBA booklets have yet to be developed due to project capacity and resource constraints. Maps and CDs have been widely circulated and active discussions have resulted only.
Output 2: Baseline data on the status of biodiversity (as well as threats and actions affecting the biodiversity) collected and disseminated.	Red List Index (status) and change in protection status (actions) analyses have been completed for all **8** countries across Mesoamerica. Forest change and fragmentation (threats) have only been conducted for Southeast Mexico, Belize and portions of Guatemala.
2.1. Number of stakeholders involved in biodiversity monitoring network (providing/using data, consultations, data analysis, etc)	IRBIO (Zamorano University), CCAD, TNC, the Dutch Environment Agency and CI-CBC participated in a CCAD led meeting in November 2007. The meeting began with discussion for establishing a regional monitoring network and data sharing agreement. There is ongoing development of the regional monitoring system by the Central American countries through CCAD (Regional Strategic Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation Program). As a result the project's biodiversity monitoring network building strategy shifted direction. Through meetings with CCAD technical committees the project team has attempted to insert its regional monitoring conceptual framework (i.e. key biodiversity areas, status indicators) and baseline results into the PROMEBIO monitoring program.
2.2. Percent of biodiversity indicators for which baseline data is reported for all of Mesoamerica.	**60%** of biodiversity indicators for which base-line data is reported. Red List Index and protection status of KBAs have been calculated and reported across all 8 countries in Mesoamerica. Habitat extent and change and fragmentation within KBAs has only been so far completed for Southern Mexico, Belize and portions of Guatemala however. For more details please refer to the section *'Were any outputs unrealized?'* Formal dissemination & publication of

	baseline results has not been achieved beyond distribution of map products, CDs and presentations given at meetings. Ideally these should be complemented by a peer-reviewed journal outlining deeper interpretation of deforestation rates within areas of high biodiversity value, and a KBA booklet tailored to all stakeholder needs.
2.3. Number of institutions (including NGOs, governments, universities) to which the findings from this project have been presented.	Meetings and small workshops have been successfully conducted in all countries except Honduras (due to the political situation). More than **20** key partners have now been exposed to the project outputs. KBA maps and CDs with data, results and map products were distributed to over **50** stakeholders present at these meetings. For selected countries results were picked up by the media to communicate results to a wider audience. Through direct engagement with government agencies it is hoped that KBAs will feed directly into national level decision making and gap analysis processes.
Output 3: Sustainable fundraising strategy developed and implementation initiated.	
3.1. Key steps completed for establishing a sustainable fundraising strategy.	The project team agreed that the best strategy for pursuing sustainable funding would have to involve full integration with CCAD focal points as means to leverage identified funding sources (i.e. World Bank, NASA). Meetings with CCAD technical committees were conducted in November 2007 and ongoing dialogue continued until project close.
3.2. Number of stakeholders contributing to fundraising efforts.	Through CCAD mechanisms CI continually collaborated with the Dutch Environment Agency, TNC and Zamorano to identify future funding needs and opportunities. Beyond adoption of baseline results and biodiversity indicators by the PROMEBIO there has been little fundraising success however.
3.3. Number of resources (financial, material and personnel) identified (e.g. an organization provides data or human resources to the project to reduce the amount of external funding that needs to be raised).	IBAT and Sea World and Busch Gardens Conservation Fund contributed $190,000 in order to complete species and site outcomes definition work in Mexico and Central America (Honduras and El Salvador). Furthermore a Conservation Leadership Program (CLP) Internship of $25,000 contributed to work on KBAs and IBAs across Mexico. The project also established negotiations with CONABIO to share gap analysis information but little progress has been made since.
Output 4: Strategy developed to fill knowledge gaps and build capacity in biodiversity science in the region.	
4.1. Number of courses held to build capacity in biodiversity science.	Training of ECOSUR staff in remote sensing was successfully conducted in February 2006 by CI-Regional Analysis team. IBA and KBA identification and delineation training was conducted at the 1st Symposium for the Biology and Conservation in Antigua, Guatemala. CI and Birdlife introduced the KBA and IBA concepts to the partners, as well as how to operate

	and utilize the World Biodiversity Database (WBDB).
4.2. Percent of Northern Mesoamerica countries with biodiversity knowledge mapped.	Knowledge related to vertebrates and plants was mapped during the meeting at Zamorano. This exercise led to a first draft of KBAs.
4.3. Number of agreements made with academic and research institutions to pursue research complementary to CEPF's interests.	Agreements and grants were given to 6 organizations/Institutions to conduct Outcomes definition work in Mexico, Guatemala, Belize, Panama, Costa Rica and Nicaragua (INBIO, AUDUBON, BTFS, ECOSUR, COCIBOLCA and WCS).
Output 5: Grant making for CEPF supported.	
5.1. Percentage of LOIs and proposals evaluated by the Biodiversity Unit within six weeks of submission.	6 proposals for Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Costa Rica, and Belize (WCS, ECOSUR, INBIO, BTS, COCIBOLCA, and AUDUBON-PANAMA) were evaluated.
5.2. Number of key applicants receiving support with the design of projects to be submitted to CEPF	By December 2006, 6 proposals were submitted to CEPF; BTSF, WCS, AUDOBON-Panama, ECOSUR, COCIBOLCA, INBIO received the support of the CEPF regional team in the process. Three out of six proposals were signed by end the end of 2006 while the other agreements were finalized in January, 2007.
5.3. Number of CEPF projects requestion Biodiversity Unit support that are receiving it.	6 projects submitted and approved by CEPF for conducting outcomes baseline work. The amendment for extension of time for the 6 projects also submitted and approved by CEPF.
5.4. Percentage of Biodiversity Unit's technical and financial reports submitted on time to CEPF	90% submitted on time

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

The project has been successful in creating a comprehensive layer of areas important for biodiversity conservation investment. This analysis should inform the strengthening of existing protected areas and the expansion of national protected area networks. For Southern Mexico, Belize and selected areas in Guatemala, these key biodiversity areas were complemented by studies of extent and change in forest cover between 1990-2000-2005. These combined data layers will support near-term decision making for NGO partners, governments and the private sector (through IBAT), as well as serve as critical national monitoring baselines as part of the Regional Strategic Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation Program (PROMEBIO).

Another major success of this project is the scientific and conservation planning capacity that has been built in partners across 6 Mesoamerica countries. The Mexico and Central America CBC Biodiversity Unit provided excellent technical support to partners sub-granted to conduct outcomes definition work. Furthermore, CI HQ regional analysis team provided training and ongoing support to two partners (ECOSUR and BTFS) funded by CEPF to lead rigorous efforts to complete forest extent and change (1990-2000-2005) work across Southeast Mexico and Belize. It is hoped that the resources and time put into such capacity building will instill some sustainability in the use of these methodological and analytical priority setting and monitoring approaches.

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

Biodiversity Conservation Corridors were not fully defined for Mesoamerica during the project. Given lack of agreement on the criteria that should be used to identify biodiversity conservation corridors, and the lack of time to do a thorough analysis of connectivity

requirements of area-demanding threatened species, the team decided to focus efforts on identifying site- and species-scale conservation targets, while at the same time recognizing that some species will require conservation interventions at a scale beyond sites. Consultants were already faced with a daunting challenge to have all KBAs identified, delineated, and have consensus behind them in the short time-frame, so rather than take effort away from the KBA identification process, corridors were largely left for another analysis.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

The major lesson taken from this project is the essential need to maintain strong lines of communication among all involved. This is key for such a complex and wide reaching grant. Communication should come in the form of monthly teleconference meetings (between project staff & the in-region CEPF Coordination Unit), in addition to grant-writer quarterly performance reporting. This includes both project partners and the donor. While excellent communication was maintained between the project team and the project partners throughout data collection and analysis, the project fell short in its communication with CEPF staff in Arlington and the CEPF coordination Unit established in-region. This unfortunately resulted in two project negatives; 1) in-completion of the Guatemala forest cover and change analysis (see Project Execution), and 2) only limited government engagement and endorsement of project results. There is no doubt that ongoing and transparent dialogue with CEPF would have resulted in better preparation of project shortfalls and the ability to adapt accordingly with their support.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

The Mesoamerica CEPF project was designed differently to previous outcomes definition and monitoring projects and this yielded both successes and challenges. Two major successes were the quality of data delivered and the capacity built within national partners. 6 proposals for conducting outcomes definition were submitted to CEPF from BTSF, WCS, AUDOBON-Panama, ECOSUR, COCIBOLCA, and INBIO. Once work to compile, analyze and map data for defining national networks of key biodiversity areas got underway, excellent technical support was provided by the project's biodiversity, GIS and remote sensing team. Progress did prove to be far slower than anticipated, but it is hoped that good capacity and conservation planning expertise was built and maintained in country. Furthermore, delivering finalized sets of key biodiversity areas through a network of sub-grantees resulted in excellent coverage and a high level of local and national knowledge being incorporated. In short the quality of the data ended up being excellent.

As mentioned above, by sub-granting much of the data collection and analysis work out to national partners, progress was very slow indeed. The grant opened in September 2005 and it wasn't until January 2007 that all proposals were signed by CEPF in Arlington. Given the geographic complexity of Mesoamerica, project technical support also proved challenging. 4 no-cost extensions are proposed and accepted by CEPF to ensure refinement of the first drafts we done properly. CEPF granted much needed flexibility throughout the project.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

At the inception of the project it was anticipated that forest cover and change analysis for Southern Mesoamerica would be conducted by NASA. This included all of the country of Guatemala. Under this assumption the project team and CEPF agreed that CI and partners (El Colegio de la Frontera Sur and the Belize Tropical Forest Studies) would only lead the forest extent and change analysis for Southern Mexico and Belize. Assuming that NASA would complete Southern Mesoamerica, we would have baseline forest cover mapping done for 7 Central American countries and southeast Mexico.

Once the project was underway, the project team was notified that NASA would not be completing the analysis for Southern Mesoamerican states. For Guatemala specifically there was a wall-to wall national product developed but this was incompatible with the methodologies and subsequent classification work done by CI, ECOSUR (Southern Mexico) and the Belize Tropical Forest Studies (BTFS). Using available project money however, portions covering some KBAs in Guatemala were re-analyzed by CI staff, but these are non-contiguous and there was not enough time (or funding) to fill these spatial gaps. A key partner, Victor Hugo Ramos (WCS) did complete parts of Northern Guatemala using a very compatible methodology.

The information presented in the maps is top quality and allows for good interpretation and decision making for Southeast Mexico and Belize, but it is insufficient for Guatemala due to such glaring data gaps explained above. We continue to look for ways to complete the change detection analysis for Guatemala. Victor Hugo Ramos and Edwin Castellanos from Universidad del Valle de Guatemala have expressed interest in completing a national product, however communication has been rather sporadic and the two main constraints continue to be time and financial resources. There has been a request for technical support from CI but discussions remain slow and CI is not in a position to move this forward at a quicker pace.

A key lesson the project team has learned from this experience is that there must remain strong communication between project staff (both field and HQ), the CEPF coordination Unit and CEPF staff in Arlington (see 1st section under 'Lessons learned from the project). CEPF consolidation funding was available and some of this could have been allocated to CI and/or a Guatemala partner to complete the forest extent and analysis work and deliver a national product on time. CEPF remained unaware that the final product for Guatemala would be incomplete so were never in a position to consider using consolidation funds to complete the Guatemala map.

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Sea World and Busch Gardens Conservation Fund contributed $193,978 in order to complete species and site outcomes definition work in Mexico and Central America (Honduras and El Salvador). Furthermore a (CLP) Internship of $25,000	Regional/Portfolio Leveraging	$10,000	Funding from Sea World and Busch Gardens allowed for filling of data gaps and achieving greater geographic coverage of the KBA analysis.

contributed to work on KBAs and IBAs across Mexico.			
Conservation Leadership Program	Regional/Portfolio Leveraging	$25,000	A CLP internship contributed $25,000 for work on defining KBAs and IBAs across Mexico.
Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT)	Regional/Portfolio Leveraging	$180,000	Funding from IBAT allowed for filling of data gaps and achieving greater geographic KBA coverage. IBAT funds enabled KBA analysis to be conducted for all of Mexico, El Salvador and Honduras, areas that were not covered under the CEPF grant.

Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:

- ***A*** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- ***B*** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- ***C*** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- ***D*** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

Post-project work continues but this remains limited given capacity and expertise constraints. However four objectives stand out as priorities to focus on in the near future:

- Ensure forest cover and extent data gaps are dealt with for Guatemala. CI's remote sensing staff remain in dialogue with Victor Hugo Ramos - the best expertise in Guatemala,
- Continue to promote key biodiversity areas as principle conservation units for expanding networks of protected areas, community managed reserves, improving management of existing conservation units, and informing research priorities for filling information gaps. It is particularly important to promote them through government led gap analysis work, in particular national Programmes of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA).
- Through working with partners conduct a thorough analysis of connectivity requirements of area-demanding threatened species to define a first draft of biodiversity conservation corridors across Mesoamerica.
- A comprehensive study of protected area coverage relative to biodiversity significance has been completed, but this should not be regarded as a measure of conservation success in itself. Tracking protected area coverage only serves as a signal of commitments to safeguarding those areas representing high biodiversity value. Deeper studies of progress in implementing protected area management planning, local community engagement activities, enforcement and governance capacity building, financing and infrastructure are therefore necessary for understanding the true management efficiency of Mexico and Central America

protected area networks. Furthermore, measurement of both the legal status and ongoing management of protected areas must be complemented with ongoing monitoring of species, habitats and ecological processes in order to truly argue the effectiveness of Mesoamerica protected area networks in contributing to the achievement of national, regional and global biodiversity conservation objectives.

Further work on this project will remain challenging as only limited biodiversity, GIS and remote sensing expertise currently resides within the Mexico and Central America CBC. Subsequently no commitments can be made for achieving the above immediately following project close. Maintaining momentum will require continued support of partners where good capacity has been built. A particularly important 'vehicle' for furthering this work is the PROMEBIO. This program is directed at bringing together and strengthening institutions to enable them to generate information, interpret it and make it available to various users, thus contributing to two tasks: providing current information for decision-making on the sustainable use of biodiversity, and providing appropriate compliance with international commitments on biodiversity issues. PROMEBIO may prove to be an exceptionally important platform for integrating national and institutional efforts, thus CI and partners must consider continued participation. It should be noted that all three indicators that baseline has been established for directly correspond with regional measures agreed upon under the PROMEBIO – 1) Species in danger of extinction, 2) Surface area of declared protected areas, both land and coastal marine, 3) Coverage of forest ecosystems, and 4) size of ecosystem patches.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: William Crosse
Organization name: Conservation International
Mailing address: 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA, 22202
Tel: 703-341-2400
Fax:
E-mail: wcrosse@conservation.org