

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

*Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions, below.*

<b>Organization Legal Name</b>	BirdLife International
<b>Project Title</b>	Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team: Programmatic Functions (Nature Alliance for the Mediterranean Basin)
<b>CEPF GEM No.</b>	61625
<b>Date of Report</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> April 2018

**CEPF Hotspot: Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot**

**Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 4**

**Grant Amount: \$1,114,080**

**Project Dates: 1<sup>st</sup> June 2012 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

**1. Implementation Partners for this Project (*list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project*)**

**i) The Regional Implementation Team**

BirdLife International's Regional Implementation Team (RIT) was made up of staff based in the BirdLife Secretariat offices in Cambridge, UK and Amman, Jordan. It also had two sub-grants responsible for carrying out duties in the North Africa and Balkan sub-region, led by BirdLife Partners:

- **North Africa: La Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux - LPO/BirdLife France (LPO)**  
LPO's role was to support BirdLife in the delivery of all components under the Regional Implementation Team contract for the North African sub-region, covering countries: Algeria, Cape Verde, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. The contract consisted of providing the Programme Officer for the sub-region as well as strategic support from senior members of staff, communications support for the francophone countries and monitoring of the travel budget for site visits.
- **Balkans: Društvo za opazovanje in proučevanje ptic Slovenije - DOPPS/BirdLife Slovenia (DOPPS)**  
DOPPS's role was to support BirdLife in the delivery of all components under the Regional Implementation Team contract for the Balkan sub-region, covering countries: Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, FYR Macedonia and Montenegro. The contract consisted of providing the Programme Officer for the sub-region as well as strategic support from senior members of staff and monitoring of the travel budget for site visits.

## ii) CEPF grantees and project partners

The RIT supported 91 civil society organizations (CSOs) (non-government, academic, private sector) as grantees, who implemented the grants which formed the portfolio. It was through these grants that the targets for the Mediterranean Basin portfolio were achieved. The RIT supported CEPF to determine the projects to fund, worked with the grantees to complete their proposals, monitored the active projects and supported the grantees through implementation. For small grantees, the RIT also had the additional responsibility through the Small Grant Mechanism to contract the grants directly with the small grantees, and therefore supported this additional capacity development need.

## iii) Other key implementation partners

Throughout the 5-year programme there were numerous other organizations in the region which contributed to the portfolio. This occurred through:

- Individual grant projects where key stakeholders were involved in activities such as governmental agencies, local municipalities, local CSOs, businesses and donors. It also occurred
- The Hotspot Advisory Committee made up of several donors and important regional stakeholders which provided strategic advice to CEPF, and helped identify opportunities for collaboration (see Annex 1).
- The Mediterranean Donors Roundtable, led by the CEPF Grant Director with the RIT supporting where required. This round table comes together once a year with representatives from Oak Foundation, Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM), Adessium Foundation, Fondation Mava pour la Nature, Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, Fundación Biodiversidad (Spain) and Thalassa Foundation.
- Synergies with other programmes such as the Programme Petites Initiatives (PPI-OSCAN), funded by MAVA and FFEM and implemented by IUCN MEDPO, which supports local civil society organizations in North Africa. This partnership allowed for synergies between the two programs – in particular with PPI supporting the continuation of actions initiated through CEPF support.
- The CEPF Donor representatives, where the RIT and CEPF Secretariat worked heavily to engage with GEF Focal points in all countries, first to secure their endorsement of the Strategy, but also to up-date them on the progress of CEPF investment, this led to important and useful contacts. The exchange of information and experience on local civil society actors proved very useful – and several donor representatives have provided advice and reviews on project proposals.
- Several Professional Service contracts were made to advisors for the programme and to organizations for specific work on mid-term and final assessments, as well as national workshops throughout the course of the programme.

## Conservation Impacts

### **2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF investment strategy set out in the ecosystem profile**

BirdLife was appointed to lead the RIT to implement the CEPF investment strategy in the Mediterranean Basin, as articulated in the Ecosystem Profile (2010). The RIT was responsible in delivering Strategic Direction 4 of the Ecosystem Profile: *Provide strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment through a regional implementation team;* which

includes two Investment Priorities, 1. *Build a broad constituency of civil society groups working across institutional and political boundaries toward achieving the shared conservation goals described in the ecosystem profile*; and 2. *Act as a liaison unit for relevant networks throughout the Mediterranean, harmonizing comparable investments and channeling funding opportunities to priority areas that require support*.

The RIT coordinated all activities required within Strategic Direction 4, applying local knowledge, expertise and insights while representing CEPF in the Mediterranean, including managing the Small Grant Mechanism. Through these activities, the RIT was able to ensure that projects funded by CEPF delivered on the targets set within each of Strategic Directions 1, 2 and 3 of the Ecosystem Profile (see Annex 2).

Through the Programme Officers, CEPF was able to work on-the-ground within the countries of the hotspot, providing technical expertise on the key issues affecting biodiversity in the region, as well as providing cultural and socio-economic insights which influenced how to practically implement the investment. The overarching aim of building the capacity of civil society in the region was achieved through hands-on approaches, encouraging peer-to-peer collaboration, and engaging with stakeholders on multiple levels from local communities to governments. The RIT also helped identify gaps and opportunities for sustainable conservation projects which would emerge throughout the course of the investment and help magnify the outcomes of grantee projects.

Lessons learned from grantees and other conservation programmes were shared with the CEPF Mediterranean network via social media, documents and workshops. The RIT also inputted to the update of the Ecosystem Profile (2016-7), contributing knowledge on Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and species, and sharing contacts of key stakeholders within the region to get involved in the consultation process.

### **3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

The RIT provided strategic leadership and effective coordination that helped civil society and local partners design and implement 106 grants (53 small grants, 53 large grants), totaling \$8,875,783, in 12 countries of the hotspot (grants listed in Annex 3).

The RIT coordinated the grant-making process in the hotspot by communicating the CEPF investment to regional stakeholders, disseminating the opportunity for funding on multiple platforms in multiple languages (French, Arabic, Serbo-Croatian and Albanian), explaining eligibility and how to apply, conducting application reviews and deciding on the projects to contract. With active grantees the RIT carefully guided and advised on project implementation, monitored project outputs and grantee capacity, and ensured projects were in-line with CEPF policies and procedures. The RIT also created and maintained the Small Grant Mechanism for the hotspot – granting local and grassroots CSOs directly and improving their capacities.

An important element of the RIT was forging synergies with other partners and networks, creating alliances within countries and trans-boundary projects, as well as enabling international exchanges. Grantees were encouraged to engage with local communities and governments to ensure sustainability and well-executed conservation actions. Grantees were also connected with donors and other initiatives so that potential additional funding and training opportunities were maximized.

The portfolio achieved concrete conservation results which are outlined in the Final Report on the Logframe which demonstrates achievements of CEPF's portfolio targets from 2012 – 2017 (see Annex 2).

Investment Priorities, 1. *Build a broad constituency of civil society groups working across institutional and political boundaries toward achieving the shared conservation goals described in the ecosystem profile;* and 2. *Act as a liaison unit for relevant networks throughout the Mediterranean, harmonizing comparable investments and channeling funding opportunities to priority areas that require support.*

#### **Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal*

*The civil society in the Mediterranean develops a common vision and works collectively towards conserving natural ecosystems and maintaining the livelihoods of people dependent upon natural resources, in the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot.*

#### **4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion**

Long-term impacts require that civil society is playing a key role in conservation action. The Mediterranean is a large and complex hotspot, with capacities differing within each sub-region as well as on the national and even site level. The CEPF programme contributed to the growth of local civil society through funding CSOs as well as the direct support from the RIT. CSOs gained training and experience in managing projects, developing their organizational strengths and technical knowledge.

The main focus of the CEPF strategy in the Mediterranean Basin was at site level, either through the improvement of management and support to the creation of protected areas, piloting new methods of conservation or through working with nature users and landowners for the promotion of sustainable, biodiversity-friendly practices. The RIT supported grantees to integrate biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation, working towards the improvement of livelihoods of people dependent on these natural resources.

CEPF grants also resulted in the increased knowledge of the biology of threatened species and improved data about the range and occurrence of species; both are indispensable to conservation planning and action. Monitoring of species was also a focus of funding, as a scientific management tool for conservation action.

Through the Small Grant Mechanism the RIT was able to reach out to much smaller grassroots organizations, teaming them up with other larger organizations for mentoring, training them on project management processes, encouraging them to join networks and work with local communities, and giving them the tools to work on sites which may otherwise be overlooked.

The promotion of collaborative action has set the building blocks for long-term impacts. The RIT initiated national and transboundary partnerships, facilitated knowledge exchange, encouraged community engagement, creation of networks and provided the platforms for CSOs to engage with decision makers and governments.

Achievements with policy and advocacy work will have lasting impacts, where grantees working toward the improvement of policies have demonstrated the crucial role of civil society in informing and influencing decision-making, as well as showing how their efforts complement national biodiversity targets.

The synergies created with regional donors, organizations and initiatives through the Hotspot Advisory Committee and Donor Round Table gave immediate results in terms of leveraging and collaboration, and has set a solid model for cooperative and harmonizing work in the region.

### **Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each short-term impact from Grant Writer proposal*

- 1. Key stakeholders recognize CEPF investment in the Mediterranean as a key initiative and opportunity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the region.*
- 2. Leveraged donor funding, at least equivalent to CEPF grant funding, towards the vision in the Ecosystem Profile.*
- 3. A strengthened regional conservation network comprising a broad constituency of civil society organizations working across institutional and geographical boundaries towards achieving shared conservation goals*

### **5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion**

1. Key stakeholders recognize CEPF investment in the Mediterranean as a key initiative and opportunity to sustain the unique biodiversity of the region.

- The RIT engaged civil society in the 12 eligible countries of the hotspot, explaining the Ecosystem Profile and CEPF investment opportunity. With multi-language outreach through online and offline approaches, and regular country visits by Programme Officers, CSOs were engaged through newsletters, social media, conferences and workshops. Overall 394 Letters of Inquiry (227 for Large Grants and 167 for Small Grants) were received, through 9 Calls for Proposals, with a wide distribution of engagement. With 106 grants made to a variety of NGOs, universities, individuals and private sector companies, the opportunity reached to grassroots, national and international organizations.
- By establishing the Hotspot Advisory Committee the RIT became a conduit for technical knowledge between key organizations and donors in the region who are working on similar issues, allowing initiatives to align and become more effective. Progress was made on sharing contacts and networks to widen the reach of the programme.
- The donor roundtable allowed for strategic discussions between donors, identifying gaps and forging synergies between different programmes. Regional donors were aware of the CEPF priorities and niche, proving successful through portfolio and project level funding.
- National CEPF donor representatives such as the EU, World Bank and the GEF Small Grant Program were engaged and meetings held to discuss practical insights on granting in the countries of implementation, and disseminating information on the CEPF investment to their stakeholders was achieved.
- Meetings with government representatives in each country, on a national and local level, has made significant impact on the portfolio and project levels. RIT actions to gain endorsement from GEF Focal Points began from the start of the programme, and regular follow-up ensured implementation could occur in 12 countries of the hotspot. The RIT

met representatives face-to-face, and invited representatives to key events in the investment such as the Mid-term and Final Assessment meetings, and during the Long-term Vision Process for the Balkans. The RIT held meetings with local municipalities to assist with project-level communications and understanding the CEPF impact on local areas. The RIT also supported and encouraged grantees to involve governmental bodies in their projects where relevant, leading to better communications and sustainability of projects.

- Local communities, community leaders and businesses were met by the RIT through supervision missions and country meetings to understand how grantees involve them in projects and how CEPF projects can benefit and work with them.

## 2. Leveraged donor funding, at least equivalent to CEPF grant funding, towards the vision in the Ecosystem Profile.

- The RIT supported CEPF in implementing additional funds of \$1.129 million from the MAVA Foundation in 2014 for coastal conservation projects (SD1).
- An estimated 38 grantees leveraged additional funding for implementation of their projects, amounting to \$4.205 million, i.e. close to 50% of the total amount granted by CEPF (estimated as recorded through self-declaration of the grantees).
- The RIT worked with CEPF to identify and support CEPF grantees with co-funding opportunities, where CEPF secured funding from Global Environment and Technology Fund (GETF) and Prince Albert II Monaco Foundation to support follow up projects.
- The Hotspot Advisory Committee was created to monitor and evaluate progress and offer insight on the implementation of the different Strategic Directions, as well as forge synergies with other key stakeholders and donors working on similar themes.
- The RIT supported CEPF's involvement in the Mediterranean donor roundtable where relevant, an important platform to understand strategies, align common themes and discuss gaps in conservation.
- The RIT took part in the preparation and implementation of the North Africa Programme de Petites Initiatives pour les Organisations de la Société Civile d'Afrique du Nord (PPI-OSCAN) implemented by IUCN and funded by FFEM/MAVA – in particular to coordinate support to small, local organizations.

## 3. A strengthened regional conservation network comprising a broad constituency of civil society organizations working across institutional and geographical boundaries towards achieving shared conservation goals.

- Steps have been made in forming a regional network, however the geographies and language differences have been a challenge here, with more progress being made on the sub-regional level or the site-level (within countries or transboundary), with 8 formal networks created, and 11 supported in total.
- Coalitions and more informal networks have been created within countries through CEPF grants and RIT facilitation, especially in Albania, Montenegro and Tunisia (full detail can be seen in Components 2 and 3). Project exchanges and peer-to-peer capacity building proved hugely successful for the immediate project and also for building up lasting partnerships between organizations. These alliances have also been formed around sites or species, where CEPF grants have been used to bring CSOs together, improve communication and collaborate on conservation action.

- Many transboundary partnerships have been formed, especially in the Balkans, where the close geographies, and the same threats and needs, mean that sustainable impacts must contain input and action across borders.
- International partnerships were important ways to connect partners on similar issues. Initially North-South partnerships were assumed to be possible and of most benefit, however on implementation is evolved more on a South-South or East-West basis between projects and other initiatives e.g. Cape Verde-Tunisia, Algeria-Lebanon, Montenegro-Morocco. The RIT helped connect projects, funding exchanges and project managers to attend conferences to share their knowledge and meet other CSOs tackling the same issues.
- The RIT helped strengthen the network by funding 91 CSOs in 12 countries, giving 81% of grants to national/local CSOs so that they can begin building or develop their conservation activities. With 72% of organizations increasing their capacity, advances have been made through giving grantees the experience of managing a CEPF project and all aspects that entails, as well as having the RIT support throughout. The capacity of CSOs in North Africa was a particular challenge, however by creating synergies with other initiatives (through the Advisory Committee for example) the RIT helped improve capacities by funding grantees to attend other capacity building workshops, and attending conferences to broaden their network. facility more opportunities for grantees to meet.
- Providing the platforms for cross-institutional conversations was an important role of the RIT to facilitate. The RIT's Mid-term and Final Assessment national workshops brought groups together from CSOs and governments to discuss key national issues, promote knowledge sharing, and communicate how the CEPF priorities relate to national and local priorities. From project design to implementation the RIT encouraged and supported grantees to integrate different project stakeholders into their activities.
- The formation of the Advisory Committee and donor roundtable have brought donors and other regional actors together to discuss overarching issues and the CEPF strategy on the portfolio level. Having this platform has helped to connect projects, bring pools of contacts and networks together, communicate at more events and have a wider outreach of CEPF activities and lessons learned.

## **6. Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impacts**

### Successes

#### i) Operational successes:

- The RIT structure: Having the core team of Programme Officers and RIT Manager in place for the full term of the programme ensured that knowledge was built upon, systems adapted faster and processes evolved. This of course is difficult to predict, however through the careful management of team members (within BirdLife and external sub-grantee partners), the experienced team remained in place as the programme progressed, meaning that more capacity could be given to exploring areas such as monitoring and communications. Having the Programme Officers close or in their sub-region was extremely important, and despite budget limitations they were proactive in finding opportunities to attend events in the region to save funds, and so they visited countries more than was initially foreseen.

- Communications: through the development of multi-lingual newsletters and social media, as well as videos and the final lessons learned brochure, the RIT reached out to a wide community of conservationists, public, donors and businesses.
- National and regional events: the continued presence of CEPF over the 5 years in each country allowed for a thorough understanding of CEPF's goals and also a frequent platform for national CSOs to come together and discuss common issues. These annual RIT-led workshops and events e.g. mid-term and final assessments, strengthened communication between multiple stakeholders, shared lessons learned and facilitated partnerships.

#### ii) Portfolio successes:

- Synergies with other initiatives and donors: the impact of collaboration with other programs working on environment with civil society, such as the GEF Small Grant Program, FFEM's Programme de Petites Initiatives (PPI), and through the Advisory Committee, all had positive outcomes and helped build a wider network of conservation practitioners and best practices. In particular the relationship with MAVA strengthened through the Advisory Committee and Donor Round Table, leading to them to significantly fund the portfolio for coastal projects (SD1) as well as contributing to the Ecosystem Profile update (along with Prince Albert II Foundation), showing how important it is to involve donors frequently in many different aspects of the programme.
- Impact of projects: Grantees had greater success than anticipated in many projects due to careful planning, innovative approaches and proving their expertise to key decision makers e.g. ICZM processes in Tunisia and Montenegro. The RIT played an essential role in supporting grantees to design their project ideas and implement their projects, giving advice on these key areas as well as fostering partnerships with key organizations or institutions.
- Sustainability through networks: Through the new networks created and others developed through CEPF, there's greater opportunity for information exchange, sharing best practices and testing new ideas. The networks are diverse, from research and exchange of experience to coordination of actions at site level.
- Initiating project partnerships: Supporting collaborative approaches between organizations and communities at the site level, and the exchange of experience and mentoring between NGOs of the region proved a very successful model for strengthening organizational capacities.
- Contribution to long-term processes: during this period the RIT contributed to a number of other CEPF-led processes in the region such as the Long-term Vision in the Balkans and update to the Ecosystem Profile.

#### Challenges

##### i) Operational challenges:

- Managing the RIT: The multi-year and complex programme constantly evolved over the 5 years, with different challenges occurring throughout its development. Implementing



the work of the RIT across 12 countries covering a vast area, with differing languages (English, French, Serbo-croatian and Albanian), diverse cultural backgrounds and political systems, was at times challenging. This was made harder as most RIT staff were working in different offices (including two sub-grant organizations). However it was achieved through careful and frequent communication, and clear roles and responsibilities of all staff. Face-to-face meetings were essential to build up the team, including time with CEPF Secretariat staff, so the budget for this proved difficult at times. The CEPF Grant Director and Grant Manager were crucial sources of information and support in implementing the programme. The ability to connect with other RITs from different hotspots was also a huge benefit – sharing tools, processes and lessons is essential as many of the deliverables and challenges faced are similar. With so many deadlines, processes and complex procedures happening throughout the programme implementation it can be difficult to have strategic discussions, so in future more time should be allocated to plan strategically with the CEPF Secretariat and to exchange ideas from other hotspots.

- Policies and procedures: understanding the many CEPF policies and procedures was not only difficult and time consuming for many BirdLife and RIT staff on the level of implementing the RIT and Small Grant Mechanism contracts, but also in terms of communicating and training grantees on these aspects so that they could adequately adhere to them. They also changed on a fairly regular basis and it was not always clear what was the newest version or what tools to use. Toward the end of the 5-year programme CEPF introduced new communication tools to update RITs of changes and some guidance documents which helped for some grants which had not closed.
- Monitoring processes for the RIT:
  - Monitoring the granting of the portfolio: The RIT created a Dashboard to monitor the funds being granted. As the data from the CEPF database (GEM) was not fully accessible to the RIT it made the Dashboard difficult to update - support was often required by the Grant Director and the manual way of entering data made it open to human error. As grant amendments became frequent, the additional manual way of recording amendments and de-obligations led to some errors and the lack of real-time data made it hard to monitor and report on.
  - Monitoring results for the portfolio logframe: with no set process in place for assisting RITs to collate impact results, the RIT struggled to develop and implement their own ways to monitor projects against the portfolio logframe and CEPF targets. With the Grant Director's help the Monitoring Tables were created and evolved, and eventually adopted by CEPF for other hotspots, however this took significant time and effort which was needed elsewhere.
  - Consistency of data collection: in some places the terminology/guidance was different on grantee forms so when analyzing the data it was uncertain if the stated data was the same e.g. in-kind or co-funding statistics. Also it was difficult to collate some statistics when the terms were not defined e.g. what is a 'network', and how to define a local community.
  - Managing all documents: With many different documents required at different stages, and some taking a lot of time to produce from the grantee, the RIT struggled to keep on top of all the admin. A Monitoring Worksheet was created by the RIT to help keep track of what was required by each grantee, as this would have been the case for all hotspots a standard tool would have been useful.

- Storage of key documents: The RIT would upload CSTTs etc. onto GEM, however CEPF occasionally and urgently would need all the documents in one place, this led to a lot of time downloading, collating and uploading the documents in one place, taking up significant time.
- RIT training: Some RIT staff were new to the monitoring tools used (METTs, CSTTs) and even though some training was given it was often in annual meetings or supervision missions which tackled a myriad of other issues and so it was hard for the team to take it on board.
- Monitoring processes for grantees:
  - Capacity of grantees: for a lot of grantees, especially small grantees, it's the first time completing monitoring forms and so significant time was spent training grantees on forms and ensuring data was accurate, impacting on other work for the RIT and grantee.
  - The volume and complexity of monitoring tools: taking into account the progress and financial reports, as well as CSTTs, Impact Reports (and potential safeguards and METTs), a single grantee can have many forms to complete, which can be complex or require input from other people. This takes time and has led to delays in project funding and therefore implementation.
  - Changing monitoring documents: The method of recording data changed over time with different forms used by CEPF, and sometimes this would happen during the course of a project, so the RIT had to explain to grantees how to use different forms and why they've changed, taking time.
  - Language of documents: for small grantees in particular having to complete complex documents which were not in their first language was a challenge. The RIT translated all the CSTTs, which were then used by other hotspots, but this took a lot of additional time of the RIT.
- Capacity building of grantees: the level and quantity of support required to grantees was underestimated, with some organizations and individuals requiring significant time. Programme Officers needed to adapt their techniques to support CSOs in various stages of development, and processes and forms were continually evolving (and translated) to make them more user-friendly, especially the Small Grant Mechanism documents.

## ii) Portfolio Challenges

- Political change, economic uncertainty and post-conflict instability: As the Arab Spring emerged as the CEPF investment began, many elements presented in the Ecosystem Profile became very difficult to tackle. Spreading grant making across multiple eligible countries, with flexibility in terms of timing and scope of calls for proposals, maximized CEPF's ability to take advantage of opportunities, while minimizing the risk of failing to meet portfolio-level targets due to political or security problems in particular countries. Despite these changes however, key challenges remained:
  - The operating environment for CSOs in some hotspot countries required significant flexibility during implementation to allow for impactful investment. In Algeria, for example, the law limits the activity of NGOs, which can only work in the district where they are established. In this investment phase NGOs working at CEPF priority sites were scarce, while several established NGOs were unable to apply for CEPF funding, because no priority sites had been identified in the district where they were established. In conjunction with Algeria's late endorsement of the ecosystem profile and complex administrative arrangements regarding international funding, the

- situation led to a limited CEPF investment. To mitigate this constraint on CEPF implementation, the Mid-term Assessment included a recommendation to CEPF to open calls for proposals for all sites within the Mountains, Plateaus and Wetlands of the Algerian Tell.
- In Libya, the political and security situation prevented NGOs from working in the single priority corridor that had been identified in the country: the Cyrenaic Peninsula. This led to CEPF, after the Mid-term Assessment, deciding to accept projects from the western part of the country (i.e. west of Tripoli, where the security situation is more stable), and to adopt a flexible approach to supporting civil society.
  - Transferring funds to Libyan grantees also posed an issue. The security issues and bank processes in Libya made payment transfer impossible for many months, with the BirdLife finance team repeatedly trying many ways to transfer the funds with much support from BirdLife regional offices, regional contacts and the North Africa Programme Officer. The Libyan grantees gave regular updates when electronic communication was possible on their side. Due to the complexity of issues and delays, the Libyan small grants were amended to reduce their activities and close early. An update on the Libya situation was reported to the World Bank by CEPF in June 2016.
  - Project activities needed to be adapted in some grants e.g. in Lebanon some areas which were originally stable when investment began became dangerous to enter as they were close to the Syrian border, and therefore some projects needed to be adapted e.g. a national flower study which required fieldwork and identification of plants had to rely on a desk-based study for some KBAs which posed a security risk.
  - The rapid growth in tourism in North Africa that was anticipated by the original ecosystem profile did not occur, primarily because of security concerns, although growth was rapid in the Balkans and Cabo Verde. The European tourism market was in flux during the first phase, influenced by political and economic developments in the EU and the countries of the hotspot as well as globally. The phase 1 investment strategy included an investment priority to influence the European tourism market but this proved hard to achieve and is now of less immediate relevance in some areas.
- Capacity of civil society to implement the investment strategy:
    - Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and integrated river basin management (IRBM) are complex concepts, which are poorly understood by many local CSOs, with little good explanatory material available in local languages. Starting with a site-focused approach and using this as a platform for engagement with wider planning and policy issues was shown to be an effective way of approaching the issue.
    - CSOs generally found it difficult to initiate or influence ICZM planning processes because these are the preserve of national governments, which, especially in North Africa, were not open to CSOs playing a leading role.
    - Timing is key to success, and this requires CSOs to be opportunistic. In several cases, there were no opportunities for CSOs to engage in ICZM or IRBM processes e.g. if there was no on-going government-led ICZM process at the priority sites. The need for opportunistic engagement in government-led processes that have their own timeline is not always compatible with CEPF-funded projects, which have a lead time of 6 to 12 months.
    - Geographic priorities were not always accurate or clearly defined for the strategic direction, other than at the landscape scale. There was a need for better definition of sites for threatened species to facilitate identification of threats and potential mitigating actions, and maximize the impact of interventions on biodiversity

conservation. Investments in Cape Verde or Jordan were also limited in scope, with only a few projects in each country which limited the possibilities of mutually supportive initiatives.

- Mainstreaming private sector: the opportunity for CSOs to include and influence businesses on their projects was small, and the RIT also struggled to engage with businesses as was intentioned in the Ecosystem Profile. It was addressed in Advisory Committee meetings and in donor conversations to gather advice, and the mid-term assessment, however through these discussions the reach of the RIT was deemed minimal, instead the CEPF Sec may have better impact (as with the donor community), to make any significant movement on this.

#### **7. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

- BirdLife International has expanded its network and reach throughout the RIT, creating synergies through the Advisory Committee, partnerships through grantees, and contacts in governments and ministries to help foster engagement on the issue of biodiversity conservation.
- The relationship between BirdLife International and its sub-grants LPO and DOPPS has been strengthened in this period, with capacity building of RIT staff, the sharing of knowledge between organizations and widening the network for all parties with new contacts and experts from a variety of fields.
- BirdLife has increased its capacity as a grant-making mechanism through the small grant programme. Through the creation and development of tools and systems the wider BirdLife teams from the RIT to Finance and Legal, became more effective in grant-making.
- RIT staff have increased their capacities in proposal reviewing, budget management, grant making and project monitoring. Managing a multi-faceted programme with many stakeholders was a huge learning curve for many staff, and many skills have been learnt and improved.

#### **Project Components and Products/Deliverables**

##### **Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

*List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer*

#### **8. Describe the results from Component 1 and each product/deliverable**

##### **Component 1: Communicate the CEPF investment in the hotspot.**

*1.1 All civil society organisations and other key stakeholders active in biodiversity conservation in the 15 eligible countries aware of CEPF investment within four months of start of project.*

Which such a large hotspot it was necessary to use a variety of tools and tailor communications carefully. This was carried out through the RIT's global and sub-regional structure - the Programme Officers for each sub-region (the Balkans, Middle East and North Africa (including Cape Verde)) were critical in carrying out national-level communication as well as language translations, and hotspot-level communications were created on the global level.

The RIT began communicating the CEPF investment within the eligible countries of the hotspot as soon as the Programme Officers were in place, September 2012. The engagement strategy was rolled out to stakeholders in all 12 countries as soon as they became eligible (see Table 1).

Table 1. Eligible Countries and GEF Focal Point Endorsement Dates

Mediterranean Countries	CEPF Eligibility	Endorsement Date	Comments
Albania	Yes	2011	
Algeria	Yes	November 2013	Became eligible in 2013 following GEF focal point endorsement and was not included in first Calls for Proposals
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Yes	June 2011	
Cape Verde	Yes	December 2011	
Croatia	Yes – until July 2013	December 2011	The adhesion of the country to European Union made it ineligible from July 2013.
Egypt	No	-	Formal GEF focal point endorsement has not been secured. Security situation in 2010-2013 prevented potential investments.
Jordan	Yes	October 2011	
Lebanon	Yes	January 2012	
Libya	Yes	October 2012	Security situation has reduced CEPF investment in the country since mid-2013
Macedonia	Yes	September 2010	
Montenegro	Yes	October 2010	
Morocco	Yes	April 2012	
Palestinian Territories	No		Not eligible due to World Bank restrictions
Syria	No	2011	GEF focal point endorsement received but investments impossible due to security reasons.
Tunisia	Yes	2011	
Turkey	No	-	Formal GEF focal point endorsement has not been secured - therefore preventing CEPF investment.
France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Slovenia, Greece, Monaco etc.	No	-	Not eligible as EU member States, or not World Bank client

The RIT created a communication strategy which ensured all major stakeholders in the Mediterranean were aware of the CEPF investment and how to apply for small or large grant. This evolved over time as the RIT gained more experience with how to communicate to the different stakeholders (see Activity 3.1). Examples of how this was implemented are below:

#### i) Materials and tools

A range of online and offline materials and communications platforms were used to spread the word about CEPF such as newsletters, the website and social media (see Activity 1.2 and 1.3). These evolved over time as the RIT became more aware of other communications tools or methods in the different sub-regions and countries, and what worked with the different audiences. In some countries, especially those in North Africa, it was much harder to reach out and so a variety of methods were used e.g. workshops, radio and TV.

Email updates were used to communicate to the contact list, explaining CEPF and advertising Calls for Proposals. These evolved into the newsletters which continued to direct people to information on CEPF and detail on grantee projects (see Activity 2.1 and 2.2).

Press releases were prepared for every call for proposals and key milestone in the programme, and translated to the different languages for the regions (French, Arabic, Montenegrin and Albanian). From these press releases many articles were created in the region, with over 100 press articles on the CEPF reported across the Hotspot in the first year alone.

A variety of communication materials were developed depending on the need of the audience and stage in the investment. Initially the focus was on outreach and explaining what CEPF was, and helping CSOs apply for funding. It then became about showcasing the grantee projects and sharing results and lessons learned. The RIT played an important role in translating all forms (application forms, guidance notes) and information documents (leaflets, brochures and presentations) into the relevant languages. Further detail on how grantees were supported to understand the Ecosystem Profile is covered in Activity 4.2.

The formation of the Hotspot Advisory Committee was key tool for disseminating CEPF information, where the members would feedback information about the programme back to their own networks such as Calls for Proposals and key events.

## ii) Country visits

The RIT carried out numerous country visits throughout the investment (see Stakeholder Engagement Sheet). At the beginning of the investment the RIT visited the eligible countries at least once per year, but normally 2-3 times visiting different areas explaining the CEPF investment. It was important to travel outside key cities to engage with smaller grassroots organizations and visiting different KBAs to understand the challenges at the sites and the stakeholders around them.

Where the CEPF Grant Director could visit a country, it was made more likely that meetings with high-level government or donor representatives would be arranged e.g. GEF focal points (see Stakeholder Participation Sheet). These were crucial opportunities to share the CEPF Investment Strategy and discuss national-level issues and priorities. The Ecosystem Profile was shared and was used by several donors and governmental agencies as a reference document. For example, the EU Delegation in Albania used the KBA definition to design list of priority sites for their program to support environmental civil society. The documents have also been considered as a basis for the Natura2000 process in Montenegro and Bosnia & Herzegovina.

Project meetings with different stakeholders such as transboundary projects, were used by the RIT, when attending, to introduce the programme e.g. A meeting and study visit at Skadar and Prespa lakes, organized under the CEPF Small Grant Mechanism, was used to further develop the list of contacts and introduce the CEPF investment strategy to the Balkans region (30 attendants from a variety of civil society, governmental and private sector organizations were present in Skadar and 50 in Prespa lake).

### iii) Conferences and events

International conferences were utilized frequently to introduce the CEPF investment, develop a list of contacts for the region and distribute materials e.g. Adriatic Flyways Conference, BirdLife International World Congress, Mediterranean MPA Forum.

Meetings with journalists in Jordan (2013) and Spain (2015) were attended to widen the network of conservation media organizations, where press releases were provided to them to pass the CEPF investment details to the local and national media.

The RIT presented the CEPF investment at the European Commission Info Point in June 2016 and provided content for a new factsheet

[http://www.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/CEPF\\_MedBasin\\_Factsheet.pdf](http://www.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/CEPF_MedBasin_Factsheet.pdf)

### iv) RIT-organized meetings

Meetings and workshops organized by the RIT began immediately into the investment, and were used to introduce CEPF to different audiences and update them on what the CEPF programme was. These RIT-led meetings were also often used as training workshops to practically explain the application process and how to complete the different forms. Presentations and handouts were produced to accompany the meetings and help participants understand the programme (in local languages). Local stakeholders involved in biodiversity conservation on a national level, including government officials, local municipality representatives, NGOs and universities were invited to these events and a broad spectrum was normally achieved. And although the private sector were invited to these events it was very difficult to engage with them on this level, with more progress made on the individual grant level.

The Mid-term Assessment in 2015 was a key event which enabled further outreach to stakeholders through the national and regional meetings. The RIT prepared the presentations and accompanying documents for the 9 meetings in their relevant languages (Arabic, French, Albanian) which included detail on what CEPF was, its strategy in the Mediterranean, and the achievements to-date. Importantly the mid-term process also allowed feedback to the RIT through the Stakeholder Survey and National Workshop reports, so the RIT could understand where more focus was needed on communications and how the RIT could adapt their processes.

The update to the Mediterranean Ecosystem Profile was happening in the second half of 2016 and presented a good opportunity to showcase achievements of phase 1 and those lessons learned fed into the Ecosystem Profile update process.

To complement the regional Final Assessment meeting in November 2016, the RIT undertook a series of National Conservation Outcome workshops for the 11 eligible countries of the hotspot during 2017. These were primarily held to share the achievements of the CEPF investment within each country, the lessons learned and exchanging of experience between CEPF grantees and other stakeholders. The workshop participants included the CEPF grantees of the country in question and other relevant people that could contribute to the workshop goals, especially governmental representatives to discuss the national conservation priorities.

### v) Global CEPF communications

The RIT assisted the CEPF Secretariat to display the *34 Wonders of the World Exhibit* in many Med countries: France, Montenegro, Lebanon and Cape Verde, which helped spread the CEPF

information wider and to different audiences e.g. shown on national TV in Cape Verde and advertised online in Lebanon <http://www.spnl.org/the-34-wonders-of-the-world-outdoor-exhibition-sghar-batroun/>.

The RIT supported CEPF communications team by giving details of the Mediterranean investment for Annual Reports, ad-hoc presentations and reports which were seen globally e.g. climate change related projects for their COP report in 2015. These types of documents were useful in engaging with high-level stakeholders such as government representatives and donors.

### *1.2 CEPF Mediterranean Webpage developed.*

Throughout the investment there were actually 3 main ways the RIT engaged with stakeholders using the web. The website was a key tool, however it was found that social media was increasing more important for sharing news, and other innovative interactive tools were also being made online to help people understand projects (the Storymap), so the RIT created a number of platforms on the web to capture the interest of the public, donors, CSOs and other key stakeholders. They are explained below:

#### *i) The RIT website*

The CEPF Mediterranean website was created within a month of the formation of the RIT, containing all the necessary pages for news updates, information on the profile and investment strategy, Call for Proposal announcements and guidelines, RIT contact details and useful documents: <http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med>.

The website was updated with the global rebrand of BirdLife International in August 2013, so the look and functionality of the site was greatly improved. A Google Map of eligible KBAs was created and inserted into the website so applicants and stakeholders could explore the hotspot and check their areas for eligibility.

In 2015 the website was adapted to tag more news articles into a new tab called 'News' <http://www.birdlife.org/news/tag/cepf-med>. And as covered in Activity 3.4, the website was updated again in 2016 to update the various pages with new documents and links, and include new tabs for '[The Hotspot](#)' and '[the Team](#)'. In early 2017 the website was refreshed further to improve usability and mainly add and highlight the Lessons Learned resources. A new tab was created for the [Best Practices](#) pulling in information from the 'Together' brochure; documentaries and videos created by grantees and the RIT were collated into a new [Video](#) tab, plus new text and documents were added to the [Resources](#) section.

In 2016 a temporary page was added to the website to include information on the Ecosystem Profile update, with the Ecosystem Profile microsite embedded. It was carried out this way to reduce confusion and ensure stakeholders had all the information within the same website.

Documents and useful links were added to the website throughout the investment for applicants or other stakeholders to find out more about the CEPF Mediterranean investment.

#### *ii) The Mediterranean Storymap*

Mediterranean Storymap was published in 2015 showcasing the CEPF investment, explaining how it works and the work grantees are doing. The RIT created the Storymap as an additional



tool to direct people to who need to understand more about the CEPF Med programme, explore where CEPF funds are going through maps, learn who grantees are and what they are doing and read the success stories so far:

<http://birdlife.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=0370696a3e124396bf4954f5febf09cc>

An email in Arabic, French and English was sent to all contacts to announce the Storymap in November 2015. An article to advertise the new Storymap was written <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/mediterranean-basin-story> and shared on social media and in the newsletter in multiple languages e.g.

<http://legacy.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/MED-Newsletter-Spring2016-EN.pdf>

### iii) Social Media

Alongside the website an important web-tool was social media – Facebook and Twitter. During the communication strategy discussions in 2012-3, it was clear that stakeholders in North Africa and the Middle East particularly, communicated mostly via social media.

Therefore in early 2013 the RIT created a [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#) page to engage with stakeholders and share news as it happens within the hotspot (also relevant to Activity 1.3). It was a key area to display stories from grantees, share conservation best practices, announce Calls for Proposals and other fundraising opportunities, and showcase new grants. Posts were added in English, French and Arabic where relevant. The hashtags #CEPFmed and #MedSpecies hashtags were created to encourage followers and share stories.

The BirdLife International social media platforms were also used to help spread the CEPF messages further. Stories were advertised on BirdLife's Facebook page (approx. 300,000 followers) and Twitter (approx. 60,000 followers) Articles were also announced in email updates to the main BirdLife International email distribution list of over 4,000 subscribers.

#### Regular activities:

- Sharing Calls for Proposals e.g. small grants for North Africa in Arabic:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/638320856192692226>
- Sharing newsletter updates e.g. the Arabic Spring 2015 newsletter:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/567372742207758336>
- Sharing grantee updates and successes on Facebook:
  - Guard training for the Moroccan Fishing Federation:  
[https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/471260919716742?notif\\_t=like](https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/471260919716742?notif_t=like)
  - Ecosystem Services report in Albania:  
[https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/514195932089907?notif\\_t=like](https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/514195932089907?notif_t=like)
  - Ecotourism and local partnerships in Tunisia:  
[https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/518300881679412?notif\\_t=like](https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/518300881679412?notif_t=like)
- Sharing news on grant activities on Twitter:
  - New snail species discovered in Macedonia:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/585384927685976068>
  - 1 million square meters of land is now protected! #Lebanon  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/788295769430294528>

- Pelican census results!  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/781800699483021312>
- Libyan scouts article: <https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/616209011873030144>
- Congratulations to Albaforest for winning Energy Globe Award for #IRBM in #Albania! <https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/751047339373191169>
- Education and awareness in Lebanon:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/619117706374201344>
- Announcements by partners in the region were shared, improving relationships with other initiatives e.g. MedPan, MEETnetwork, MedCoastDay, AlbaniaTravel
- Sharing useful information :
  - Manual on applying CBD Guidelines on biodiversity and tourism development  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/618058447649644544>
- International Days were used to promote CEPF grantee work e.g. International Day for Biological Diversity, World Wetland Day, World Women's Day, World Forest Day e.g.  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/844523605123829761> and  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/862217422706794496> and  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/635775105776373760>

#### Key event activities:

- Mid-term: Increase participation in the mid-term assessment – asking for people to complete the Stakeholder Survey, and updating them on the national meetings:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/563625628722008065>
- Mid-term: Sharing news of the Regional Meeting:  
[https://www.facebook.com/pg/CEPF.MED/photos/?tab=album&album\\_id=456168534559314](https://www.facebook.com/pg/CEPF.MED/photos/?tab=album&album_id=456168534559314)
- Final Assessment and national workshops:  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/868066840886554625> and  
[https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/778337395675758?notif\\_t=feedback\\_reaction\\_generic&notif\\_id=1495797807154814](https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/778337395675758?notif_t=feedback_reaction_generic&notif_id=1495797807154814)
- Celebrating 100 grants: in 2016 a new banner was created for Facebook and Twitter and linked through to the Storymap  
<https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/photos/a.129814567194714.25671.128132060696298/602113856631447/?type=1&theater>
- Ecosystem Profile update: The RIT supported the Ecosystem Profile Update Team in sharing news on the EP update to Med stakeholders on their social media platforms  
<https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/666310843545081>;  
<https://twitter.com/CEPFmed/status/791927011958595585>

#### *1.3 CEPF investment strategy covered on internet and at other targeted media.*

The RIT produced many online and offline materials to raise awareness about CEPF in the Mediterranean, and translated them to key languages where relevant to reach a wider audience (see the communication strategy in Activity 3.1).

The Programme Officers also encouraged grantees to share their news stories and project updates with their local and national media, the RIT then collected this information and shared it with CEPF.

## I. RIT produced material:

### i) Website articles

#### Project articles written:

- January 2017: The Endangered Treasure of Ulcinj: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/endangered-treasure-ulcinj-%E2%80%93-documentary>
- July 2016: Pelican Hotline project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/pelican-hotline>
- July 2016: Cape Verde project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/winning-hearts-and-minds-cape-verde>
- February 2016: Dragonflies in the Balkans project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/how-can-dragonflies-help-balkan-country-european-union>
- February 2016: Monk seal project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/emergency-conservation-mediterranean-monk-seal-lebanon>
- May 2015: Dalmatian Pelican project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/drama-dalmatian-pelican-conservation>
- April 2015: Montenegro saltpan project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/bird-paradise-montenegro-now-safe-developers>
- February 2015: Communities tackling soil erosion in Albania project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/working-four-villages-end-soil-erosion-entire-river-basin>
- February 2015: Responsible hunting areas project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/everyone%E2%80%99s-agreed-new-grip-handling-hunting-lebanon>
- February 2015: Cave salamander project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/scientific-breakthrough-reveals-evidence-%E2%80%99human-fish%E2%80%99-locked-away-cave>
- October 2014: Flamingoes in Tunisia project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/firsts-flamingos-tunisia>
- October 2014: Algerian National Park project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/resurgence-national-park-algeria>
- October 2014: Barbary Macaque conservation project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/reconnecting-forest-endangered-barbary-macaque>
- October 2014: Ulcinj Salina project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/ulcinj-salina-montenegro-%E2%80%93-potential-disaster-sustainable-tourism>
- October 2014: Hima in Lebanon project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/spnl-promotes-empowerment-women-using-hima-system>
- October 2014: Albanian Marine Protected Areas: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/using-sea-conservation-marine-protected-areas-albania>
- July 2014: Transboundary collaboration project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/cross-border-cooperation-cepf-lake-skadar-and-its-pelicans>
- May 2014: Plants in Lebanon article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/growing-hope-plants-lebanon>
- April 2014: Libyan civil society project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/update-libya-%E2%80%93-emerging-conservation-despite-crucial-times>
- March 2014: Commercial development in Salinas project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/commercial-development-threatens-ulcinj-salinas-montenegro>

- February 2014: Illegal bird hunting project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/cepf-grant-bring-hunting-lebanon-under-control>
- February 2014: Green fodder project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/cepf-green-fodder-project-benefits-villagers-and-biosphere-reserve>
- August 2013: Bat conservation project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/bats-balkans-%E2%80%93-there-biodiversity-underground-too>
- July 2013: Sustainable tourism through ICZM project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/sustainable-tourism-through-integrated-coastal-zone-management-projects-albanian>
- July 2013: Invasive species project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/invasive-species-and-sea-bird-population-fieldwork-continues-cape-verde>
- June 2013: Freshwater KBA project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/freshwater-biodiversity-workshops-pave-way-further-research-mediterranean-basin>
- May 2013: Sustainable Management Models project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/sharing-sustainable-management-models-and-further-collaboration-balkans>
- March 2013: Management planning with local communities project article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/management-planning-local-communities-jordan>

Feature articles (sub-regional or multi-project, also featured in the World Birdwatch magazine):

- April 2017: Balkan freshwater biodiversity feature story: <http://www.birdlife.org/drin-river-balkan-waterways>
- February 2015: Turtle conservation collaboration article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/atlantic-mediterranean-turtle-conservation-overcoming-similar-challenges>
- February 2015: Libyan civil society article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/libya%E2%80%99s-civil-society-celebrates-its-wetland-wildlife-and-looks-future>
- May 2014: Civil society in Algeria feature article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/understanding-and-supporting-civil-society-algeria-cepf-med-update>

Portfolio-level articles:

- January 2017: Together brochure article: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/mediterranean-basin-together-nature>
- November 2016: Final Assessment and Ecosystem Profile article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/future-conservation-mediterranean>
- June 2016: Conservation under the Spotlight article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/mediterranean-biodiversity-conservation-under-spotlight>
- November 2015: Mediterranean Storymap article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/mediterranean-basin-story>
- July 2015: Mid-term Assessment article: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/conservation-investment-and-support-mediterranean-reaches-important-mid-term>
- February 2014: Hotspot Advisory Committee article: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/meeting-challenge-change-around-mediterranean>

Call for Proposal articles (some links are no longer available):

- July 2015: CFP for small grants in North Africa: <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/news/small-grants-available-protect-critical-coastal-ecosystems-north-africa>
- November 2013: CFP for small grants for communications: <http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/grants-conservation-and-communications-projects-mediterranean>
- February 2013: CFP for large grants: <http://www.birdlife.org/europe-and-central-asia/news/large-grants-available-protect-critical-ecosystems-libya-and-algeria>
- November 2012: CFP for small grants: <http://www.birdlife.org/middle-east/news/update-small-grants-also-available-mediterranean-hotspot-conservation-apply-now>
- November 2012: CFP for large grants: <http://www.birdlife.org/community/2012/11/critical-ecosystems-in-need-of-letters-birdlife-international-and-cepf-invite-new-letters-of-inquiry-for-mediterranean-hotspot-conservation>

As language is a key element of the hotspot, importantly from 2014 many of these articles were also translated into French by sub-grantee LPO and posted onto their website for further outreach and were linked from the French newsletters e.g. <https://www.lpo.fr/actualites/la-societe-civile-de-la-libye-celebre-sa-biodiversite-et-regarde-vers-l-avenir> (see Activity 2.2). This was carried out for all calls for proposals – with the documents translated, articles and news updates reported in the local language too.

Similarly, most of the articles were also translated into Arabic by the Middle East Programme Officer, linked to from the Arabic newsletters and social media, and posted on the CEPF Med website, e.g. Turtle conservation story, <http://bit.ly/1gMtSNm>, call for small grants in North Africa: <https://bit.ly/1O3f4UX>, article on Libyan civil society <https://bit.ly/1BtG4KJ> (see Activity 2.2).

The RIT also supported the Ecosystem Profile Update Team in translating key news about that process in 2016 e.g. <https://www.lpo.fr/actualites/la-conservation-de-la-biodiversite-mediterraneenne-sous-les-feux-des-projecteurs> and sharing it with regional news agencies e.g. Lebanon: <http://bit.ly/2jq7l97>

#### ii) Visual media

- Together for Biodiversity: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VJ0Of7G5j4Y&sns=fb>
- Video Interview: Japanese-Tunisia exchange to share knowledge of community-based tourism <https://youtu.be/yy2KoU1Kazw>
- Documentary: Biosfera 1: Protecting the desert islands (Cape Verde): <https://youtu.be/A4gNht0tK8>
- Documentary: Saving the huge Dalmatian Pelicans of Skadar Lake: <https://youtu.be/UzUMW0zg1iw>

#### iii) Printed materials

- Ecosystem Profile Summary brochures were translated into [French](#) and [Arabic](#)
- The ‘Together’ lessons learned brochures were created and translated into [English](#), [French](#) and [Arabic](#)
- BirdLife’s World Birdwatch magazine: CEPF Mediterranean articles were featured in the magazine, where between 8-9000 copies are printed, with main audiences being worldwide conservation organizations and their staff members, major donors, policy

makers, World Bird Club/Rare Bird Club members (traditional 'birds' audience), BirdLife Partners (a 'birds' and 'birds+' audience).

Articles:

- March 2012: Introduction to CEPF in the Med.
- March 2014: Feature featuring North Africa grants <http://issuu.com/birdlife-international/docs/worldbirdwatchmarch2014cepf>
- June 2014: Short article on CEPF grantee project in the Balkans.
- September 2015: Spice of Life: <http://legacy.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/CEPF-BirdLife-WBW-Sept-2015.pdf>
- December 2016: Feature from the Together: Lessons Learned brochure.
- March 2017: Balkan's wild waterways feature.
- June 2017: North Africa green shoots of spring feature.
- L'Oiseau magazine: LPO (BirdLife France) the RIT sub-grantee wrote these French CEPF articles for their magazine which is distributed within France and overseas in Francophone countries (approx. 30,000 copies printed per edition, and available to buy online):
  - N°128: Autumn 2017: INTERNATIONAL CEPF. La sittelle kabyle, unique espèce d'oiseau endémique d'Algérie
  - N°127: Summer 2017: INTERNATIONAL CEPF. L'ibis chauve, une espèce emblématique en danger
  - N°124 : Autumn 2016 : CEPF-Med plus de 100 projets en 5 ans
  - N°111: Summer 2013: International. Le CEPF et les oiseaux : un partenariat naturel
  - N°110: Spring 2013: CEPF. Tukururu ? Vous avez dit tukururu
  - N°109: winter 2012: Rencontre avec Gilles Kleitz. Le CEPF et la LPO « quand le développement se met au service de la biodiversité et vice-et-versa »
  - N°108: Autumn 2012: CEPF. Le Bassin méditerranéen sous haute surveillance

#### iv) Other targeted media

- Television: The CEPF investment was aired on television in all 3 regions: Middle East: 15 minute TV interview was conducted on prime time Jordanian TV in 2013; North Africa: 1 interview was aired on a local Tunisian TV station in 2013, 1 with Ennahar Chain in Algeria in 2014; Balkans: 2 announcements for the small grants CFP were released in Montenegro on both national and private TV stations in 2013. A workshop with 8 NGOs from Boavista Island was hosted in Cape Verde in September 2015, and covered on national TV (TCV).
- Radio: Local radio were used to communicate the CEPF investment. They were in: Jordan and Tunisia in 2012; Algeria to promote the Algeria and Libya Call for Proposals in February 2013; in Libya on regional radio on 17 February 2013; 1 on regional radio of Annaba, Algeria in May 2013; 1 on September 4<sup>th</sup> 2014 and again in 2015 in Tunisia;

## II. Externally produced material, with RIT support.

These are some examples of how the CEPF investment was covered by external organizations, which the RIT assisted by giving information or participating in the article/video.

#### i) Magazines

- Terre Sauvage, 2013: The North African Programme Officer accompanied a journalist and CEPF Grant Director to Tunisia to assist with a CEPF grantee focused supervision

mission that resulted in a feature within Terre Sauvage's 300th Anniversary edition:  
[http://legacy.cepf.net/news/press\\_releases/Pages/Terre-Sauvage-Publishes-Its-300th-Issue.aspx](http://legacy.cepf.net/news/press_releases/Pages/Terre-Sauvage-Publishes-Its-300th-Issue.aspx)

- Eko Hercegovina, 2014: Eko Hercegovina, a local magazine from Bosnia and Herzegovina, focusing at Neretva river delta area, offered its platform to collect and present CEPF investments in the Mediterranean basin. Articles from 11 countries were collected by the RIT and prepared in English and Croatian (language spoken in the area where the magazine is issued) languages. The magazine was prepared in PDF version and 1,000 hard copies that were distributed to the grantees, their partners and major stakeholders across Mediterranean: September 2014:  
[https://issuu.com/tomodalmatin/docs/web\\_eko\\_hercegovina\\_7](https://issuu.com/tomodalmatin/docs/web_eko_hercegovina_7)

#### ii) Videos

- Video of the CEPF-RIT team during the Supervision Mission in the Balkans in March/April 2014 by KAWKA Production.  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jUtYnoi2v\\_8&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jUtYnoi2v_8&feature=youtu.be)
- Video about the Long-term Vision in the Balkans (2016) by KAWKA Production:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xqmOV-POXHc>

#### iii) News articles examples:

- 2016: A supervision mission in Morocco by CEPF Chief Executive and Grant Director, and RIT Programme Officer covered in Arabic news:  
<http://www.midelpress.com/?p=8247>, and also on Facebook by a grantee:  
[https://www.facebook.com/pg/Association-Marocaine-pour-IEcotourisme-et-la-Protection-de-la-Nature-1397144863860446/photos/?tab=album&album\\_id=1740096322898630](https://www.facebook.com/pg/Association-Marocaine-pour-IEcotourisme-et-la-Protection-de-la-Nature-1397144863860446/photos/?tab=album&album_id=1740096322898630)

### III. Grantee project communications.

These are some examples of how the CEPF investment was covered by grantees, through recording their project activities or distributing the project outputs. The RIT encouraged or supported this process, and wrote it into grant agreements where relevant.

#### Major achievements:

##### i) Global coverage online:

- National Geographic article: <https://blog.nationalgeographic.org/2015/12/22/skater-lake-joining-forces-to-save-the-last-breeding-colony-of-dalmatian-pelicans-in-montenegro/>
- Smithsonian article: <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/how-floating-nests-may-save-one-worlds-largest-water-birds-180957439/>
- BBC Earth article: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/earth/story/20160303-the-plan-to-save-the-giant-pelicans-of-skadar-lake>
- New Scientist article: <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22830501-000-meet-the-weird-amphibian-that-rules-the-underworld>
- Science article: <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/06/crime-solving-technique-maps-underground-lair-slovenian-dragon>

ii) Global TV and Film successes:

- Grantee film shortlisted in International Green Culture Festival:  
<https://vimeo.com/199813240> and <http://greenculture.world/green-culture-expedition-2016-part-two/>
- BBC Earth published Lake Skadar film: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p03cnhvx>

Communications material produced through projects:

i) Grantee project video examples:

- Ecological importance of the Moroccan Atlas Mountains (also in French):  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q7JY6MRqA9I>
- Skadar Lake - The Living Med: <https://vimeo.com/149577283>
- Echoes from the Drin (Parts 1-3), Part 1 example: <https://youtu.be/liJL5M7Qjr4>
- Ulcinj Salina – Montenegro: [https://youtu.be/\\_I70zkFIVsA](https://youtu.be/_I70zkFIVsA)
- Explore Albania: <https://youtu.be/li64zRF7Y1g>
- Lebanon Biodiversity Hotspot: <https://vimeo.com/196581816>
- Black Gold - Lebanon's Goat Grazing: <https://youtu.be/dal9s2CzKFY>
- Responsible Hunting: <https://youtu.be/EktfUJIGehc>
- Projet Suivi des oiseaux d'eau en Afrique du Nord pour la Conservation des Zones Humides: <https://bit.ly/2xu9kpM>
- Iris sofarana: <https://vimeo.com/174819997>

ii) Other media output examples:

- Mobile application for Androids and iOS:  
<https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.omar.lef> and  
<https://itunes.apple.com/lb/app/responsible-hunting/id1032369115?mt=8>
- Project newsletter: <http://medwet.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/THE-BALKANS-WETLANDS-GAZETTE-3.pdf>
- Regional North Africa newsletter with multiple CEPF stories:  
[http://legacy.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/IUCN\\_Med\\_Flashnews.pdf](http://legacy.cepf.net/SiteCollectionDocuments/mediterranean/IUCN_Med_Flashnews.pdf)

Grantees communicating their project activities

i) TV interviews and news:

- TV interview with Montenegro grantee discussing large grant on River Moraca:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l3jy5AG9SFo>
- News report with Albanian grantee discussing nature-based tourism:  
<https://t.co/SC1olASIY8>
- News report with Tunisian grantee project on Kuriat island conservation:  
<https://www.facebook.com/charfeddine.bs/videos/1138077212870845/>

ii) Radio coverage examples:

- 2016 May: Notre Grand Bleu, Tunisia (Express FM): <https://soundcloud.com/haroun-ouanes/ngb-express-fm>
- 2017 May: Grantee interview on RTCI radio in Tunisia  
[https://www.facebook.com/pageofficielleRTCI/videos/1448333021866286/?hc\\_ref=ARTQjdGdxzXCy4qjKA8R\\_yZh0Rxp85229vipXFLUZII\\_eVqtguWAN9IG5CkwT\\_kPfa](https://www.facebook.com/pageofficielleRTCI/videos/1448333021866286/?hc_ref=ARTQjdGdxzXCy4qjKA8R_yZh0Rxp85229vipXFLUZII_eVqtguWAN9IG5CkwT_kPfa)
- Grantee interview on regional radio in Toubrouk in Libya in 2015.



- Radio interview on RTCN with AAO in Dec 2015

iii) Website article examples:

- Jordan article: <http://www.jordanzad.com/index.php?page=article&id=213194>
- Lebanon article: <http://www.lbeforeum.org/arabic/?p=884>
- Montenegro article: <http://www.birdwatchingmn.org/en/news/487-vinogradari-iz-kajona-morace-u-posjeti-vinarijama-peljesca>
- Algeria article: <https://www.liberte-algerie.com/est/la-proposition-de-creation-du-parc-national-de-babor-tababort-fin-prete-263385>

## 9. Repeat point 8 above for each Component in your approved proposal

Component 2: Promote information exchange and facilitate development of partnerships across the hotspot, throughout different sectors and at local, national and international levels.

### *2.1 Contact and distribution list of key stakeholders in the region.*

A contact list was created at the start of the investment and updated throughout the 5 years. It was broken down into each region and categorized according to countries so emails could be sent in the relevant language for that country.

The list was regularly updated with contacts such as local and municipal governments, private sector, local, national and international NGOs, donors, journalists, universities and other civil society organizations in the region. By the end of the investment 1,383 contacts were recorded.

### *2.2 At least two updates sent monthly to the distribution list on key developments and at least four updates entered to the website by partners on their key achievements.*

In 2012 at the start of the investment, 5 updates were made to the contact list, all translated into the regional languages (French, Arabic and Montenegrin), including a main announcement of the CEPF RIT in the hotspot, the Large and Small Grant Calls for Proposals, deadline reminders for the CFPs, announcement of Libya becoming eligible and the announcement of technical review groups being formed.

After the communications strategy discussions in 2012-3, it was decided that the updates would become an e-newsletter, looking more formal and interesting for readers. An e-newsletter was created for the hotspot called the RIT RADAR. It was live for its first Issue in June 2013 and contained updates on the portfolio activities, key announcements and grantee achievements. It was reformatted in Q1 2014 to make it more attractive and user friendly for readers by containing different media links (YouTube, documents and web-links) and contained more information on active grants than before. The overall click-through rate was 6.3% (above the industry average rate of 2.6%). It was decided at this stage to send the newsletter on a quarterly basis instead of monthly, to avoid being seen as spam and to ensure it had quality content.

In October 2014 the newsletter included some stories in French with the support of RIT sub-grantee LPO, and published on their website for a larger audience. From Q1 2015 the newsletter was produced in French, Arabic and English. All issues can be seen here:

- June 2013: <https://bit.ly/2J6sHGT>
- July 2013: <https://bit.ly/2smCr9x>

- March 2014: <https://bit.ly/2J9Zhb6>
- June 2014: <https://bit.ly/2soubG7>
- October 2014: <https://bit.ly/2Hbg8lC>
- Spring 2015:
  - English: <https://bit.ly/2syOuA5>
  - French: <https://bit.ly/2JfPQtZ>
  - Arabic: <https://bit.ly/2J6gHFf>
- Summer 2015:
  - English: <https://bit.ly/2HaW74T>
  - French: <https://bit.ly/2J0KLWZ>
  - Arabic: <https://bit.ly/2LNnPs9>
- Spring 2016:
  - English: <https://bit.ly/2J4BxoB>
  - French: <https://bit.ly/2kHlVwN>
  - Arabic: <https://bit.ly/2sqfQD>
- Summer 2016:
  - English: <https://bit.ly/1J19LFJ>
  - French: <https://bit.ly/2kHlVwN>
  - Arabic: <https://bit.ly/2sqfQD>
- Winter 2017:
  - English: <https://bit.ly/2kDfk6y>
  - French: <https://bit.ly/2Ls07jZ>
  - Arabic: <https://bit.ly/2M2kQMp>

A key email update was sent in 2015 for the Mid-term Assessment. An email in Arabic, French, Montenegrin and English was sent to all contacts to take part in the mid-term Stakeholder Survey. As a result of this mass emailing and social media outreach in the different languages it received 116 responses. The report can be found [here](#).

The RIT also created and sent an email announcement to Med stakeholders in the contact list about the CEPF Call for Proposals for the Ecosystem Profile update in February 2016 on request of CEPF. Further updates on that process were incorporated into normal updates in 2016-7 as it was aligned with the final assessment processes, and to ensure up-to-date and thorough communication with stakeholders.

### *2.3 Partnerships established in all priority corridors covering different sectors.*

Promotion of collaborative action was at the core of the CEPF approach in the region over the five years of implementation. Formal and informal partnerships were established and supported by the RIT in a number of different ways:

#### *i) Formal partnerships within grants*

Through the Call for Proposal documents and advice to applicants writing LOIs, the RIT emphasized the importance of partnerships, particularly co-ordination with local and national organizations and other stakeholders in the area within the project. For some themes it was also extended to be cross-border, multi-country or regional in scope, encouraging applicants to submit LOIs with a wide consideration of projects already undertaken and using the expertise of experts in other local or international organizations.

Where the partnerships weren't already identified, partnership-building was initiated by the RIT and Grant Director in the response letters to applicants, either suggesting a partner or asking them to seek out a potential organization. This would be done especially where either 1) the CEPF-RIT team determined in the LOI review that a local actor would be better undertaking specific activities such as community engagement, or 2) where it was felt specific technical expertise was required to tackle more complex aspects such as international organizations supporting with advocacy (see Activity 2.4).

Fostering partnerships at the proposal stage had to be done carefully however, considering past history, the different strategies and expectations, and if a partnership was not suitable than another solution would be sought. The RIT was often the steward in this process, and supported communications where relevant. Post-LOI partnerships were avoided as it was always best to form partnerships at the initial LOI design stage, so all partners could plan the full project as a team collaboration, fully understanding the process and outcomes, however in some cases it was still the best option to ensure a project's success.

Naturally over the 5 years the RIT became more aware of key issues within Strategic Directions, challenges faced by grantees and the capability of organizations. Through the various country visits and stakeholder interactions, potential collaborations would be identified by the RIT, and then the Programme Officers investigated these with the different partners at the grant proposal stage or even once a grant had begun, in case it could still be incorporated.

Through the ongoing promotion of this method through the RIT in various calls for proposals and meetings, it was clear that NGOs themselves began adopting a more strategic approach in establishing long-term partnerships, and would apply with these already explored and in place.

Partnerships were an important tool for capacity building and peer-to-peer mentoring was used by the RIT in a number of grants and explained more in Activity 4.3. The RIT also played an important role in establishing cross-border partnerships within projects – communicating the opportunity and different ways it could work within projects. This opened doors to many collaborations between CSOs in different countries e.g. in the form of sub-grants or exchanges (see Activity 3.2).

Examples of key partnerships:

- In Lebanon Saint Joseph University were encouraged to partner with other grantees involved in projects targeting Important Plant Areas including Al Shouf Cedar Society, the Arts and Sciences University of Lebanon and Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon, and other key international stakeholders like PlantLife International.
- In Cape Verde a small grantee formed a partnership with a hotel chain to ensure the correct ecotourism practices were used to protect loggerhead turtles on nearby beaches.
- In Lebanon a partnership was facilitated between the municipality of el-Fekha, the Ministry of Agriculture, hunting groups and CEPF grantee the Lebanese Environment Forum to adopt and promote the responsible hunting practices.
- In Jordan, a partnership was established between grantee Jordan Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Jordan Valley Authority to mainstream Mujib reserve boundaries (buffer zone and transitional areas) into national land use plan.
- In Montenegro a partnership was initiated in Bojana Delta where there were three CEPF grantees implementing their activities, so the RIT ensured alignment of activities

between the grantees, supported by governmental representatives from the ministry, municipality, environmental agency and local business representatives.

## ii) Facilitating partnerships and networks

Networks are an important building block to forming partnerships around existing work, exchanging experience and setting building blocks for future work. CEPF supported the creation of 8 official networks, and supported 3 additional, already created networks. The networks are diverse, from research and exchange of experience to coordination of actions at site level. The networks facilitated collaboration and exchange of experience among conservation organizations at the national level, or on specific issues (integrated coastal zone management, illegal hunting, river basin management, etc.).

The RIT would be aware of a number of different meetings and conferences happening nationally and regionally, and always encouraged grantees, especially in the same country, to participate in these to help exchange information (see also Activity 3.2). Also if a grantee was holding their own project event, local/relevant grantees were encouraged to join. If required the RIT would make a contract amendment to include travel budget to allow grantee staff to attend meetings.

The RIT also encouraged grantees to build upon previous work, and give them the opportunity through project amendments or new grants to reach out further. In the Balkans for example, in 2016 small grantee the Society for Cave Biology succeeded in extending the network of speleobiologists and nature conservationists that they established during the implementation of their first CEPF small grant in 2013. This network called informally “Trans-boundary alliance for the conservation of subterranean fauna” was extended with an additional 6 institutions from Albania, meaning it covered members from the majority of West Balkan countries. As the network continued to exist from the first small grant project and then grew larger in the second small grant, there are good reasons to believe that the partnership now goes far beyond the project and will lead to many new and longer collaborations to improve the understanding of underground biodiversity.

### Examples of facilitation:

- Sub-regional level: In May 2014 after the Balkan supervision mission, a mailing group was created named CEPF Balkans. Its purpose was to better connect CEPF grantees (at the time ca. 40 grantees performing 29 large and small grants) from the Balkans, encouraging the sharing of information and experience regarding project activities and related issues. This was maintained and it improved communication and collaborations between grantees.
- Site-level networks: Due to the large numbers of applications in the Neretva River Delta in Bosnia and Herzegovina (covering three priority KBAs – Neretva river, Hutovo blato and Trebižat tributary) a couple of meetings were convened by the CEPF Programme Officer to discuss the key issues. An outcome of the meetings was establishing an informal mailing list of approx. 15 local NGOs which were recipients of CEPF small and large grants and their partners. This mailing list was then used and developed as part of a CEPF large grant for the Drin Alliance initiative.
- Thematic-level: The RIT encouraged the organizers of a workshop on the IUCN Red Listing for Lebanese plants to invite all CEPF active grantees to this training workshop and discuss similar issues in their projects.

- Trans-boundary-level: In Montenegro and Albania the RIT and Grant Director initiated a project partnership through another process. Through the Small Grant Mechanism a workshop was funded by the RIT in 2012 to aid partnership building in the Skadar Lake KBA (covering both Montenegro and Albania). CSOs were brought together identifying priority investment needs, defining mutual interests and investigating opportunities for future partnerships and projects by stakeholders. After further large proposals were received, it resulted in a large grant with national organizations as sub-grantees carrying out activities in their part of the lake.

#### iv) Hosting events

The Mid-term Assessment national workshops in 2015 brought CEPF grantees within their countries in a one table discussion to evaluate the CEPF investment and encourage information exchange and collaboration. In Algeria, it was the first time since the Arab Spring where this had happened, and so building a network of CEPF grantees where future partnerships may be built. The regional meeting allowed for discussions on particular topics, enabling stakeholders from different sub-regions to meet and discuss, allowing the potential for future partnerships.

The Final Assessment national workshops and regional meeting in 2016 also provided the opportunity for national and regional themes to be discussed, and common themes to bring organizations together.

#### v) Synergies with other initiatives

The structure of the RIT with global and sub-regional staff meant that it was easier to see all opportunities and link grantees up with them. Many different programmes and initiatives operating in the region provide a perfect place for networking and sharing experiences, and ultimately forming partnerships between organizations.

The Hotspot Advisory Committee was essential in seeing what other networks existed thematically and geographically, and providing the contacts and information to link up with them. One example being where a number of CEPF Med grantees (Global Diversity Forum, IUCN, Green Home, Zahera Souidi, University St Joseph), joined the [1st Mediterranean Plant Conservation Week](#) led by IUCN in October 2016, which helped strengthen contacts and involved discussions around IPAs and KBAs. Advisory Committee members also provided direct linkages e.g. with Conservatoire du Littoral, coordinator of the Small Island Initiative, also gave technical input to LOIs as well as advice to active grantee projects, becoming an important partner to many projects.

The North Africa Programme Officer and CEPF Grant Director were part of the PPI-OSCAN advisory committee which helped identify key issues, make contacts and build up the CEPF network in the sub-region. It led to some CEPF grants gaining technical support or being invited to workshops for that programme.

Engaging with partners such as MedPan, Medwet, PAP/RAC and PPI-OSCAN have helped the CEPF-RIT team identify capable organizations, other strategies and contacts to enable better cross-regional partnerships. These key organizations and others were a part of the Final Assessment meeting in Morocco 2016 and contributed to the assessment of Phase 1 and the new investment strategy.

## *2.4 North-south partnerships established facilitating knowledge exchange at the international level.*

Catalyzing partnerships amongst different sub-regions within the hotspot proved to be an effective approach to share best practices and share lesson learned amongst CSOs dealing with common themes. The RIT played an important role in facilitating such partnerships across the hotspot by having proactive Programme Officer coordination so sub-regional linkages were identified, and communicating clearly to grantees in workshops and in the Calls for Proposals that this type of partnership is encouraged. By looking at issues in a more holistic way, grantees had a better understanding of the conservation challenge facing the hotspot and are in a better place to implement coordinated actions.

Regional projects under Mediterranean Hotspot were used by the RIT to establish partnerships amongst grantees; e.g. large and small grantees in Jordan and Lebanon taking an active role in the discussions of the IUCN freshwater KBA assessment for the region. The regional mid-term workshop also provided a platform for grantees across Mediterranean sub-regions to share experiences and foster partnerships between grantees sharing the same conservation challenges. Questions were also asked to the participants about collaboration and how CEPF can support networking and North-South collaboration. Action points were discussed with the Advisory Committee (see also Activity 2.3) and further cross-regional partnerships were established.

The North-South element was not always as effective as other international partnerships where cultural, language, thematic or geographical aspects were more relevant, such as South-South, or West-East exchanges.

### Examples:

- Tunisia and Cape Verde: Exchange visit took place between Notre Grant Bleu in Tunisia and Biosfera 1 in Cape Verde during August 2016 to enforce a partnership for marine protected area conservation:  
[https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/637027446473421?notif\\_t=like%C2%ACif\\_id=1472566819724551](https://www.facebook.com/CEPF.MED/posts/637027446473421?notif_t=like%C2%ACif_id=1472566819724551)
- Libya and Jordan: the RIT facilitated a new partnership between Libyan and Jordanian grantees through an exchange visit in May 2016 between the Libyan Wildlife Trust and Oxygen from Libya and 3 national grantees in Jordan. The Libyan NGOs learnt about protected area management and ecotourism issues on-the-ground in Jordan.
- Algeria and Lebanon: An exchange visit took place between small grantee from Algeria (Zahera Souidi) and a large grantee from Lebanon (USJ) for plant conservation.
- Montenegro and Morocco: The grantee Center for Protection and Research of Birds of Montenegro implemented a study visit to relevant grantees in Morocco to exchange experience about Integrated River Basin Management practices in North Africa versus the Balkans in September 2015.
- Montenegro and Albania: an exchange trip was organized to visit the Karaburun area in Southern Albania to exchange knowledge on sustainable tourism, especially the activities involving local communities  
<http://www.cdm.me/ekonomija/turizam/upoznavanje-sa-vrijednostima-morskog-zasticenog-podrucija-karaburni-sazan>
- Algeria and France: A partnership was built between AREA-ED in Algeria and Tour Du Valat in France in 2015, to give technical support on wetland conservation.

- North Africa-Jordan: Cross regional South-South cooperation occurred through a study tour on Protected Areas management in May 2014, in collaboration with the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature and IUCN.
- Bosnia and Herzegovina and other hotspots: The Society for Cave Biology working on a small grant focusing on research and protection of a cave amphibian in Bosnia and Herzegovina, established a strong network of experts and conservationists from Slovenia and the Balkans, as well as Asia and the Americas through CEPF Grant Director support.

### Component 3: Results and lessons learned documented and disseminated through a replication strategy.

#### *3.1 Replication strategy developed within five months of start of project and implemented for the full five year investment period.*

A communications workshop was held with the RIT and BirdLife International's communications team to collect the information needed for a communication and replication strategy in December 2012.

A Communication and Replication Strategy was developed in early 2013. A set of issues that needed to be tackled in the replication strategy were defined, a set of objectives in order to solve these issues were created, all related target groups were identified and all key messages that need to be communicated with target groups were defined. Two main outcomes of this initial process was the creation of the CEPF Mediterranean e-newsletter and Facebook page (see above).

The communications were regularly reviewed and actions taken to improve processes. The restructuring of the RIT in 2014 meant that LPO became more engaged with Francophone communications. Skypes with LPO were held at least every 6 months or for ad-hoc communications projects.

The Communication Strategy was reviewed in January 2015 at the LPO office in France. The Head of Communications from BirdLife international and RIT Manager attended, and met with the LPO team to discuss the whole Med strategy and the role of LPO in the francophone communications. The Strategy was updated and shared with the whole team.

The Mid-term Assessment in 2015 was also used as an opportunity for CEPF grantees to feedback thoughts and ideas on communications through the national workshops. Specific sessions were held to find out more about their capacity building needs and how the CEPF-RIT teams can improve their communications. In December 2015 the Communications Officer joined the Annual Team meeting in Slovenia to discuss these suggestions and issues, and worked on a plan for 2016, including the actions around disseminating lessons learned (resulting in the [Together](#) brochure).

The RIT regularly shared grantee project updates and RIT stories with the CEPF communications team, and supported communications with the grantees for CEPF articles, for example: <https://www.cepf.net/stories/developing-ecotourism-serve-biodiversity-tunisia>

*3.2 At least a third of grantees participate in an exchange visit to at least one other CEPF project representing common challenges and priorities of two partners.*

Applicants were encouraged by the RIT to include exchange visits into their proposals where relevant. With limited time and budgets, the RIT played a key role in helping grantees find new ways of meeting similar organizations, as outlined below.

i) Project to project meetings

Over 30 meetings happened where grantees (and project partners) within the same country were introduced by the RIT and encouraged to meet in order to discuss similar aspects of their projects – such as site or species approaches. This peer-to-peer interaction was important for capacity building of smaller organizations, especially where small grantees visited large grantee offices to see their procedures and set-ups, and also their on-the-ground conservation work (see Activities 4.3). Many of these meetings resulted in partnerships and networks further down the line, especially as in the Balkans, geographies and common transboundary issues meant that organizations often met through RIT-led meetings or CEPF-project meetings, improving understanding, relationships and trust between the organizations (see Activity 2.3). International exchange meetings were also important to help grantees see the similarities between countries and how to tackle the same challenges (see Activity 2.4).

ii) Regional and international events.

Regional and international events are a good opportunity for exchanges, which the RIT Programme Officer encouraged or ensured grantees would attend by adding in travel budget to their project. These were more common-place in the Balkans, and the Programme Officer also attended where possible.

Examples are:

- 2013: An international meeting in Bosnia and Herzegovina was organized by a grantee EuroNatur, was used as an opportunity for many grantees to meet and exchange information. WWF (LG 63316) and EuroNatur (LG 62733), BIO.LOG (SG 3), CKS (SG 13), ICB (SG 45), IAC (SG 35) and HEU BUNA (SG 81) <http://www.euronatur.org/Karst-Workshop-Livno.1534.0.html>.
- 2014: A conference on Green Belt initiative, October 2014, Slavonice, Czech Republic (grantees met: EuroNatur (LG 62733), IUCN (LG 63088), CZIP (LG 62735), MES (LG 63813), Green Home (LG 63088))
- 2014: A conference on the Adriatic Flyway initiative, November 2014, Durrës, Albania (grantees met: PPNEA (LG 62721), INCA (LG 63090), URI (LG 63851), ASPBM (LG 65618), CZIP (LG 62735), EuroNatur (LG 62733), WWF (LG 63316), MES (LG 63813, SG 91))
- 2015: IUCN organized a Little Sidney event, 28th to 30th May, 2015, Donau Auen NP, Austria which some Balkan grantees attended (similar to the above, Many grantees used these two opportunities to meet and exchange information also regarding the actions that are funded by CEPF.)
- 2016: Protecting Lakes Regional Conference, this opportunity was used for exchange visit between different CEPF grantees, namely REC, CMCC, MES, Naše ptice and other sub-grantees.



iii) RIT-organized/facilitated events.

The regional Mid-term Assessment meeting in Montenegro in 2015 provided a platform for a number of grantees from across the Mediterranean to visit an important project funded by CEPF to CZIP in Montenegro, with lessons learned shared on the overcoming the major challenges to the KBA. All grantees present also presented their projects and lessons learned encountered during implementation, generating information exchanges, this also occurred at the Final Assessment Regional Meeting in 2016 in Morocco.

The Mid-term Assessment national meetings, as well as the Final Assessment's Conservation Outcome workshops were a special opportunity to exchange ideas and build partnerships between organizations on national level. These discussions were more focused on national issues and sites, and so discussions were targeted and led to informal networks forming.

In addition to these, the RIT also instigated/hosted meetings around specific topics or areas where a neutral or donor-led meeting would lead to open discussions around a common challenge. One example of this was a meeting organized in November 2014 in Shkoder, Albania. A number of organizations working at Skadar lake and surrounding KBAs gave the opportunity to exchange information and work on future plans.

The RIT supported in organizing a side-event, conducted by grantee Association de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources during the MedPAN Forum in Tanger, Morocco November 2016. Different CEPF partners were invited in order to enforce partnership between grantees; 6 CEPF grantees attended including 2 from another CEPF Hotspot programme in Madagascar, related links: <https://twitter.com/CommunityCEPF/status/803679599691337729> Tunisie, Notre Grand Bleu: [http://www.medmpaforum.org/sites/default/files/pres.se2\\_nibani.pdf](http://www.medmpaforum.org/sites/default/files/pres.se2_nibani.pdf)

*3.3 At least ten publications documenting lessons learned and good practice developed during CEPF projects published by grantees by end of project.*

i) RIT-produced documents

Two main Lessons Learned reports were published from the Mid-term Assessment process in 2015 – the National Assessment report "[Grantee voices from the Med](#)" and [Stakeholder Survey report](#). These were widely distributed and actions for the RIT were analyzed and actions taken in the following years as highlighted in this report.

A [Storymap](#) (see Activity 1.2) was created in 2015 to incorporate information on CEPF grants, so applicants could get inspiration and learn about the projects. The project showcase covered topics from new scientific techniques, identifying species, transboundary cooperation, and managing multi-stakeholder reserves.

The RIT produced a lessons learned brochure toward the end of the investment based on a number of key CEPF grants - "*Together – Local solutions for nature conservation. Lessons from the Mediterranean*". This was distributed initially at the Final Assessment Regional Meeting in November 2016, then translated into French and Arabic, and distributed widely in early 2017 by being handed out at the 11 Final Assessment national Conservation Outcome workshops. The brochure contains 8 case studies of CEPF projects, each a factsheet on its own or for information as part of the group. The PDF versions were advertised on social media and the website, and as part of the lessons learned package the factsheets were incorporated into the RIT website's 'Best Practices' page (see Activity 3.4).

The Together brochures:

- English: <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/together-brochure-initial-cepf-investment-1>
- French: <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/together-brochure-initial-cepf-investment>
- Arabic: <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/together-brochure-initial-cepf-investment-0>

## ii) Grantee-produced documents

Many CEPF projects produced lessons learned materials as part of the project deliverables, introducing good practice models and other practical methods which could be replicated. The RIT would share these models on social media or the newsletter.

Some examples are here:

- A document on sustainable forest management of Jablanica mountain was produced by MES (63813) in Macedonia, proposing measures for sustainable management of the area that is crucial as a water-reservoir for the Drin river. The document is a best-practice example that could be replicated throughout of the Drin water basin and beyond.
- In the framework of the PPNEA led project (62721) in Albania a document “Tourist product for the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) of Narta Lagoon, Butrinti and Vlora Bay” was created to provide a basic information and guidelines for further development of specific tourist product and services for the three KBAs, as a base for designing and implementing further tourist activities in their area.
- The Small Grantee BIO.LOG (#03) from Bosnia and Herzegovina produced a study “Priority KBAs for protection of biodiversity in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Protection of endangered dragonfly species” that aims at identification of important areas for selected (Natura 2000) species of dragonflies in Neretva delta area in Bosnia and Herzegovina and their conservation.

## iii) Lessons learned face-to-face sessions

At the Mid-term regional meeting the RIT encouraged all grantees to produce posters to be shown at the event, outlining their projects and key achievements, with approximately 30 presented. The grantees present also presented a PowerPoint of their projects and lessons learned to the 50 hotspot-wide participants.

For the Final Assessment regional meeting the present grantees produced a poster and had a stand-up session explaining their project and highlighting challenges faced and overcome. In the national Conservation Outcome workshops the morning session was all about lessons learned and grantees presenting their project learnings to other grantees in their country.

*3.4 Project achievements and lessons learned posted on the Mediterranean webpage and shared with the CEPF Secretariat annually.*

RIT regularly updated the website with new documents and links. The RIT’s Facebook and social media platforms were also used to disseminate new publications, RIT updates and important lessons learned tools.

The Mid-term Assessment reports, Storymap, newsletters and Together brochures were published on the RIT website in the [Resources](http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med/resources) section: <http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med/resources>

In 2016 the RIT redesigned the website to allow for a specific 'Best Practices' section: [http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med#Best\\_practices](http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med#Best_practices). A new 'Video' tab was also created to provide inspiration and a snapshot of grantee activities <http://www.birdlife.org/cepf-med/video> (See Activity 1.2).

#### Component 4: Develop the capacity of grantees.

##### *4.1 Projects compatible with the ecosystem profile.*

###### i) Application stage:

The application process and key CEPF documents were translated into different languages to make it easier to understand for applicants and for them to ensure their projects fitted with the investment strategy.

After a few Calls for Proposals were sent out, the RIT modified the documents making them more useful for applicants to check their eligibility. More details were included to make applicants aware about strategic investment priorities, including the list of eligible KBAs and the focus of the call. The RIT increased the number of eligible LOIs by providing this information and guidelines on how to apply for CEPF. For some of the more complex Strategic Directions the RIT inserted a new section in the Call for Proposal document to include best practices, useful websites and examples, provided with support from the Advisory Committee e.g. with Integrated Coastal Zone Management.

The RIT was on-hand to field queries about the Calls for Proposals and discuss project ideas and design with applicants, to make sure they were in-line with the CEPF investment Strategy. This service was promoted to applicants and made clear in the documents, e-newsletters and website.

###### ii) LOI stage:

All LOIs were screened for eligibility with the Ecosystem Profile, ensuring they are for the correct KBAs and corridors. The Project Approach and Rational Sections were also carefully reviewed to ensure links to the investment priorities.

LOIs were reviewed by the RIT, CEPF, and by external reviewers. All reviews for all LOIs in were compiled in one standard excel sheet, including suggestions and recommendations from reviewers to ensure impacts linked to the Ecosystem Profile.

Detailed response letters were sent to all grantees informing of next steps, addressing key issues in their LOI and giving feedback from reviewers to help them produce improved LOIs in the future. Where relevant more information was given to clarify the Ecosystem Profile and to meet eligibility and safeguard requirements.

After a period of preparation using feedback and support from the RIT and CEPF, final

proposals were reviewed by the RIT and CEPF to ensure changes had been made and projects were still delivering the activities stated by the Ecosystem Profile.

### iii) Monitoring

The RIT had an important role in ensuring active projects were delivering what they intended, and were keeping to the investment priorities. The RIT continually engaged with grantees in providing technical support and practical ideas to ensure their conservation approaches were meeting the intended project outcomes (through remote calls and supervision missions). Feedback on performance was provided to grantees to ensure they were on the right track.

#### *4.2 Grantees with a clear understanding of the ecosystem profile and the wider vision CEPF.*

To ensure this happened the RIT undertook a number of methods, which were evolved over the course of the programme as more was known about the audiences and their needs.

### i) Accessibility

A dedicated email account was created for the RIT in 2012 so potential applicants and other stakeholders could contact the RIT if they required information, [cepf-med-rit@bridlife.org](mailto:cepf-med-rit@bridlife.org), it was publicized on the website, e-newsletters and printed materials.

Applicants/grantees were encouraged to send request for clarifications and ask for meetings to assess their project ideas. Many emails were received on the RIT email account and POs accounts after outreaching to grantees offering guidance. Applicants were provided with information and guidelines on priority and eligible KBAs and investment priorities in their own language with support of the Programme Officers.

All documents explaining the Ecosystem Profile, investment strategy and CEPF's vision for the hotspot were made available on the CEPF Mediterranean website, as well as a Googlemap of priority corridors and KBAs, eligibility criteria, and the safeguard policy.

Any updates to documents and guidance to grantees were sent through email alerts, the newsletter, social media and within Calls for Proposals.

### ii) Documents

The Mediterranean Hotspot summary booklet (in hardcopy and PDF) was translated into French and Arabic by the RIT in early 2013. All versions (English, Arabic and French) were made available through the website and promoted through social media.

The [Storymap](#) was created to further explain the CEPF investment, including zoom in-and-out maps for the public to explore eligible sites.

Guidance documents for the proposal process was adapted and translated by the RIT into all languages and posted on the website.

### iii) Workshops

Face-to-face meetings and workshops which the Programme Officers hosted in the countries were also used as an opportunity to explain the Ecosystem Profile. For example, the

Supervision Mission to the Balkans (March 20th to April 4th 2014) was used to improve understanding of grantees in terms of CEPF/RIT relations and mechanisms that CEPF put in place through RIT to assist them in applying for projects, implementing them and achieving tangible results.

The national workshops for the Mid-term Assessment was an opportunity for the RIT to present the CEPF investment strategy, progress made and the remaining gaps. Proper guidance, documents and presentations were prepared by the RIT and translated. Aspects of the Ecosystem Profile were highlighted where nationally relevant, and the global CEPF objectives explained. All participants of the meetings (186 people) were refreshed on the CEPF priorities, national areas of investment and conservation priorities, and were asked for their feedback.

The Final Assessment Conservation Outcome workshops were an opportunity for grantees to showcase their achievements and explore the linkages between the CEPF investment and their national priorities (NBSAPs). This allowed grantees and stakeholders see how the CEPF investment was directed in their country, what its impact was, and how it matched national biodiversity targets and initiatives.

The RIT supported the CEPF monitoring team to update and evolve the monitoring worksheets to measure the impact of the hotspot investment against global indicators. For key events like the mid-term and final assessments, and advisory committee meetings, reports were produced by the RIT that showed progress of the investment; highlighting the investment priorities and KBAs that have had investment and where there were any gaps. This helped steer the content of future calls for proposals, and could also be used by the RIT to feedback to grantees and stakeholders about the performance of the programme.

#### iv) Direct support

At the application stage the RIT helped applicants understand the investment strategy and link their conservation need to the correct investment priority. Feedback on LOIs was given to help applicants reapply in the future if they were not accepted, explaining where they may not have fitted the eligibility criteria.

For successful LOIs, the RIT would help grantees tailor their projects and workplan before contracting, to ensure activities were compatible with the CEPF investment approach. For active grants, projects were continually monitored on-site and remotely by the Programme Officers to make sure projects were being implemented as planned and in-line with the CEPF goals. Performance and final completion reports were reviewed and support provided to grantees to ensure conservation impacts were well documented.

The RIT gave grantees guidance on how to record the correct data for their projects, and validated their data in Final Completion Reports. The RIT also encouraged grantees to update key databases with project outputs, including KBA and species data, to ensure the data was available for future reference e.g. the update to the Ecosystem Profile.

#### *4.3 Enhanced institutional capacity of each grantee.*

The RIT is uniquely placed to identify needs of individual organizations as well as overarching national or sub-regional requirements. Therefore there were a number of ways in which the RIT worked to improve capacity building:

#### i) Identifying capacity needs

The institutional capacity of each organization was initially assessed in financial and programmatic risk assessments before granting, and certain tools or activities built into the workplan or budget to help the grantee. The Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) was also given to each grantee which the RIT used to identify areas of development.

This was monitored throughout by reviewing performance and financial reports submitted by grantees and following up on METTs and CSTTs. As this was often done remotely, supervision missions were an incredibly important way to validate what was reported on in reports, with the Programme Officers seeing what was actually being achieved in the field. Often at these face-to-face meetings the Programme Officer would identify areas of improvement and where necessary, agree on project amendments with the Grant Director to build in additional assistance.

The RIT also wanted to find out more about capacity building trends, as it was clear it varied between sub-region and country, and so this became a big element of the Mid-term Assessment in 2015. All 11 eligible countries had a national assessment (Croatia was no longer eligible at that time, see Table 1). A set standard range of questions was built into each national assessment, asking for the grantee's views on the challenges (operational and technical), fundraising, collaboration and communication. This gave incredibly detailed information of obstacles faced, areas CEPF need to improve upon and areas which CEPF could provide new support. These action points were built upon in the remaining time of the programme and used across the whole range of the RIT operations as well as by individual Programme Officers. Actions or tools were more easily produced/adapted/disseminated to more organizations when needs were considered on a national or sub-regional basis.

One element of this was actively tackled in the Final Assessment Conservation Outcome Workshops in 2017. It was shown at the mid-term and generally, that many CSOs were unaware or had limited knowledge on national conservation priorities. Therefore the RIT included the training and awareness raising of NBSAPs in each of the 11 national workshops. This helped the grantees have a greater understanding of how their work contributed to targets on the national level and how they could support governments better to achieve this. Government representatives were also present to also ensure they were aware of the important role CSOs could play in helping them reach their national goals.

The Long-term Vision process in the Balkans (2015) also looked deeply into the needs and role of civil society in the 4 eligible countries at that time (Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Macedonia and Montenegro). The findings were used alongside the results of the Mid-term Assessment national workshops to help grantees on a project level and also for national-level support. These documents were shared with the Ecosystem Profile Update Team, and the RIT also inputted to the updated 'Civil Society' chapter to provide up-to-date information on the status of civil society capacity.

#### ii) Peer-to-peer capacity building into projects

An important tool for capacity building is mentorship, with it often becoming a longer-term partnership. In some cases this is already identified by applicants in the LOI and sometimes it would be identified by the RIT or Grant Director. In the second scenario this became more common later on in the investment as more organizations were known by the CEPF-RIT team and so connections could be made based on history and experience of the organizations.

If an applicant was proposing an activity/component which may have a better impact carried out by a small local organization e.g. working on a local site or with a local community, the RIT would encourage them to see if a partnership could be made. If a strong, often international or larger national organization was applying, the RIT would encourage them also to see if they could extend their knowledge and experience into capacity building of smaller organizations.

Partners in projects could give specific, normally technical support on certain activities, and improve knowledge of grantee staff. In other cases, where a sub-grant is established between organizations, the large organization by nature of the arrangement, has to oversee the contracting and reporting aspects, and through this approach, gives more hand-on capacity building for project staff as well as finance staff. For small CSOs this was often a stepping stone to eventually managing their own small or large grant from CEPF.

Examples:

- In Cape Verde knowledge and experiences were shared between a small local NGO Biosfera 1 and larger NGO SPEA. Biosfera 1 began as a sub-grantee and eventually managed to apply and be funded a small grant later on in the investment, which was enabled through the SPEA support.
- In Libya, capacity building elements were identified by the RIT such as organizational structure, membership, fundraising and on ground conservation approaches, and then built into the exchange visit between 3 grantees in Libya visiting large grantees in Jordan.

Project exchanges were a less formal way of allowing information exchange or specific capacity building on on-the-ground issues, with the majority of CEPF grantees experiencing some kind of exchange through direct meetings, conferences, project workshops or attending RIT-organized meetings (these are covered in Activity 3.2).

### iii) RIT-facilitated training and workshops

During the implementation each Programme Officer actively provided grantees with technical guidance (in their local language) and put them in touch with key organizations or individuals that were capable of technically supporting grantees achieving their goals and build their capacity.

Many workshops were held by Programme Officers in countries to explain the CEPF application processes, and other aspects such as safeguard training and completing logframes. For example, a special side event was organized by the North African Programme Officer in Morocco to improve the institutional capacity of grantees in 2013. Monitoring and reporting was the focus of the event which was attended by 5 different organizations and allowed them to interact with each other and exchange ideas.

Another example of capacity building was a 3-day training organized in the RIT's DOPPS office in November 2013, giving a large grantee training on institutional/operational and financial management, provided by the Executive and Financial Directors.

### iv) Focused Calls for Proposals

It was identified that there may be some difficulties receiving quality LOIs from Libyan and Algerian CSOs after the North African Programme Officer visited Libya, Tunisia and Morocco in

2013. It was decided with CEPF Grant Directors to address the situation by launching a separate and focused call on capacity building for just Algeria and Libya in the first quarter of 2013. It still proved difficult to receive good quality and quantity of applications and so then-on the Programme Officer increased the number of country visits to hold more workshops and meet more stakeholders.

Capacity building was also stated in call for proposal documents as a major focus of CEPF. It was made a clear aim in Calls for Proposals for applicants to seek partners to carry out their projects, involve local communities, and government-level representatives where relevant.

Component 5: BirdLife works closely with CEPF Secretariat to leverage the investment for conservation outcomes in the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot through partnerships at project and portfolio levels.

*5.1 At least US\$3.5 million in co-financing for individual CEPF projects leveraged by end of project.*

Based on a self-declaratory process we can estimate that 38 grantees leveraged additional funding for implementation of their projects, amounting to \$ 4.205 million, i.e. close to 50% of the total amount granted by CEPF (\$8.667 million). (Note: no co-funding is required by CEPF at grant level).

CEPF secured funding for follow-up or stage 2 projects, with support from the RIT on project information, programme statistics and communication with grantees. CEPF held several meetings with the Global Environment and Technology Fund (GETF), an institution supporting the management of the RAIN programme of the Coca Cola Foundation on water management. CEPF presented several projects in need of further funding for consolidation or extension of activities. The Global Diversity Foundation working in Morocco has secured a \$300,000 grant to build on activities previously supported by CEPF, and Association des Amis des Oiseaux in Tunisia is in discussion regarding coastal wetland preservation – a program initiated by CEPF. CEPF also supported the Royal Society for Conservation of Nature in Jordan to receive additional support from Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation for implementation of an integrated water management plan initiated with CEPF funding. With GETF and the Prince Albert Foundation, CEPF helped to support follow up projects for at least \$600,000.

CEPF also participated in the Donor Round Table of Mediterranean (see below), an informal group of donors working with civil society in the region. This platform enabled information exchange and updates on CEPF activities and priorities, where synergies or co-funding opportunities could be discussed.

The RIT encouraged large and small grantees to find and explore co-financing opportunities – example: consultation with applicants from the Balkans to identify GEF Small Grants opportunities, EU IPA projects and the Slovenian Development Agency as sources for co-financing. Opportunities are sent to specific grantees to show them potential funding in the Med region. All relevant funding opportunities have been shared by the RIT on social media to alert grantees.

The RIT supported DOPPS (RIT sub-grantee for the Balkans) to apply for an EU grant for a EuropeAid initiative in Albania. Unfortunately the application was unsuccessful. However, it was a valuable opportunity for RIT staff to work together on the application in order to identify weak areas for future funding applications; it importantly strengthened the relationship between the



RIT and the Albanian grantee PPNEA; and it also helped the RIT to understand more about the challenges of Albanian CSOs for use in the CEPF investment.

The RIT Manager had a skype call with the Rufford Foundation for small grants, both agreed to share funding opportunities and lessons learned, and consider co-financing for projects to be identified by Programme Officers.

Visits to regions and meetings with civil society organizations were used to understand donor interests in each country and region, who the key donors were, what areas they have invested in the past, what partnerships have happened historically and the potential interest in co-funding individual projects.

### *5.2 At least US\$5 million in portfolio-level co-financing leveraged by end of project.*

This activity proved difficult to achieve as it was found that BirdLife (as the RIT) was not the correct entity to fundraise on a portfolio level, and this was not clearly understood during the formation of the proposal. Instead, fundraising efforts on this scale were more successful on a donor-to-donor level, via CEPF directly (see Activity 5.4), with the RIT instead supporting this process where required.

The MAVA Foundation became a Regional Donor of the CEPF Mediterranean Program in 2014, providing an additional \$1.129 million to CEPF's investment for the Strategic Direction 1 on coastal zone management. The MAVA Foundation was widely engaged with the CEPF investment through the Advisory Committee and Donor Roundtable, with a strong collaboration formed on the technical and strategic levels. The relationship was led by the Grant Director and the RIT supported this process through discussions with CEPF and inputting of data and knowledge to the initial concept note and proposal, followed up with support for reporting.

The MAVA Foundation also agreed to support the update of the Ecosystem Profile in 2016, together with Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, another member of both the Advisory Committee and Donor Roundtable.

CEPF held several meetings with other potential donors (USAID, USFWS, and Heinrich Böll Foundation) which the RIT inputted to beforehand to give the Grant Director up-to-date information on the portfolio.

Donors with other grant programmes or initiatives in the region were met over the course of the investment during supervision missions. In September 2015 the GEF Small Grant Program coordinator for Cape Verde was met during the CEPF-RIT visit, and subsequently became a member of the Advisory Committee to represent that country in the hotspot. A meeting in June 2016 in Brussels with GIZ discussing a small grant programme in the Balkans also led to GIZ becoming a new member of the Advisory Committee for the remainder of the investment.

Visits to regions and meetings with CSOs were used to understand donor interests in each country and region. Key events like the Mid-term and Final Assessments, and Long-term Vision process, helped the CEPF-RIT identify who the key donors were, what areas they have invested in in the past, what partnerships have happened historically and the potential interest in funding on a portfolio-level in the future.

### *5.3 Commitments of sustained funding for priority conservation actions by civil society beyond end of CEPF investment period secured.*

Discussions within the Advisory Committee and Donor Roundtable all aided the better understanding of CEPF's niche in the region, and its role in the future. Strategic discussions resulting in these meetings have led to collaborations and synergies which are designed to have an impact beyond the CEPF investment.

CSOs were also heavily consulted throughout the investment to gather a better understanding of the challenges faced. They gave their input to the issue of sustainability through the Mid-term Assessment national workshops, and pinpointed specific areas of concern or to build upon.

The RIT supported the CEPF Long-term Vision process in 2015, an important element in understanding the role of civil society and its potential to continue conservation work after the CEPF investment. After discussions with the RIT, CEPF decided to carry out the process sub-regionally instead of on the hotspot-level, as civil society were at very different stages. The Long-term Vision process would be carried out in the Balkans and then used as a template for the other sub-regions and CEPF hotspots. The RIT (Director of Conservation) supported the Grant Director to meet with the Chairman in Brussels, to engage him in the process. Administrative elements such as CV review and sole sourcing elements were carried out by the RIT Manager and DOPPS Balkan Programme Officer. The RIT sub-grantee DOPPS supported the Long-term Vision consultants to host national meetings, and the final regional meeting with multiple stakeholders was conducted in Slovenia in December 2015. The RIT commented on the [final report](#), and supported the production of a video which was also compiled to document the process: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xqmOV-POXHc>

In 2016 the CEPF Donor Council approved a further investment phase in the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, this commitment would be essential to further build the capacity of civil society and empower them to continue to protect biodiversity in the Mediterranean. The new 5-year CEPF investment was preceded by an update to the original Ecosystem Profile. This Ecosystem Profile update process began in 2016 (funded by the MAVA Foundation and Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation), with input from the RIT on the different chapters and feeding in lessons learned from the first 5 years. With an updated investment strategy for the region, based on new data and insight for all countries, the next CEPF investment is intended to result in more targeted support for civil society and sustainable conservation action.

### *5.4 Donor roundtable established.*

In the RIT induction meeting in Cambridge in September 2012 it was discussed with CEPF what the role and actions would be for creating a Donor Roundtable in the region. A fundraising strategy was finalized in September 2013 by the Senior Programme Advisor, identifying key donors and initiatives, and used in subsequent meetings and discussions with the CEPF-RIT teams.

During that time, CEPF had discussions with donors in the region to see what existing platforms there were, and there was already a donor roundtable forming. A meeting was held in Marseille in October 2013, hosted by MAVA and attended by the CEPF Grant Director. As a successful outcome of this meeting the donor roundtable members agreed for the CEPF-RIT to lead on the organization of the next meeting.

It was decided to host the meeting alongside the CEPF Donor Council meeting in Paris on January 29th 2014, at the Agence Française de Développement offices. The RIT worked with CEPF Grant Director to work on the logistics and members to attend the event. Admin support for the event was organized by the RIT such as the agenda and minutes. The RIT and CEPF met with 10 key donors in the region, where conversations on geographic and thematic areas of future interest and funding were discussed. The donor roundtable was held alongside the RIT's first Hotspot Advisory Committee meeting, where some donors were also present.

After the first donor roundtable meeting it was evident that the best way to interact with donors going forward would be through the CEPF Secretariat as they are on the same donor level. It was decided that for future communications with donors CEPF will lead on these, with support from the RIT as needed. The CEPF Grant Director attended a number of donor roundtables throughout the investment with at least one per year, with the CEPF Chief Executive also attending where possible.

The RIT continued to lead and arrange the Hotspot Advisory Committee which had some links to the donor roundtable with some donors as members, this helped to ensure strategic input to the portfolio and information exchange between the key stakeholders in the region.

#### *5.5 Long Term Financing Tracking Tool used to monitor the leveraging impact of CEPF investment in the region.*

The Long Term Financing Tracking Tool was no longer used by CEPF, so the RIT instead updated the Performance Monitoring Plan, bi-annual reports, monitoring tables and other reports as required.

### Component 6: Coordinate and communicate the CEPF investment in the Balkans (sub-grant to DOPPS in Slovenia ).

#### *6.1 Summary of investment strategy, eligibility criteria, application process in Serbo-Croat within four months of start of project.*

Documents for translation were defined and developed throughout the investment; press releases, Calls for Proposals for large and small grants, LOI templates for small grants and periodic email updates (see Component 1, 2, 3 and 4 for more detail).

Serbo-Croat is a term to cover a number of spoken languages in the Balkans. The Programme Officer carried out research in the region to find out what written languages the RIT would need to cover, and it was concluded that to ensure an equal opportunity for NGOs to apply for funding the first small grant call for LOIs was to be translated into both Montenegrin (the most widespread written regional language) and Albanian, and that small grant LOIs would be accepted in both these languages. Documents needed were translated into Montenegrin by the Programme Officer and in Albanian by a conservation NGO in Kosovo. From this first call 23 out of 48 applications were in Serbo-croatian, and no LOIs submitted in Albanian. In the second Call for Proposals it was announced in Montenegrin, with no applications received in that language, all in English. After stakeholder input during the Mid-term Assessment in 2015 it was decided that future Calls for Proposals would be in English for the Balkans. In total 2 Montenegrin small grants were contracted, the other Balkan LOIs granted were in English.

## *6.2 Key CEPF documents distributed among key stakeholders in the Balkans*

A distribution and contact list was developed for the region and updated. All key documents were created and distributed to stakeholders in the region, including presentations and press releases explaining the CEPF investment in the region. New documents and news updates were shared with existing contacts, and new contacts were given all documents and information about the Hotspot in workshops, meetings and via email (see Component 1 for more detail, and the Stakeholder Participation Sheet).

## *6.3 Support BirdLife to achieve performance targets in Components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.*

Roles and responsibilities were defined for the Programme Officer in implementing components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and these were delivered as outlined above. The Programme Officer based in DOPPS was responsible for activities in Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and Montenegro. Croatia became an EU country in 2013 and so activity there ceased once this happened, however 1 small grant was contracted and delivered before the ascension occurred (see Table 1).

An action plan for the Programme Officer was prepared jointly to implement these components alongside other RIT members, and updated annually. It was agreed for each Programme Officer to submit a quarterly progress report and attend a meeting every 2 weeks to discuss on-going progress. CEPF RIT Supervision Meetings were attended as were other RIT training workshops throughout the investment.

Support given to host a CEPF-RIT training and supervision meeting in Slovenia in 2015 at the DOPPS office.

Support was given to arrange all CEPF supervision missions in the different countries – liaising with grantees for office meetings and site visits, as well as meetings with national donors, governments, and local municipalities and community groups (see Components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for examples and more detail, and the Stakeholder Participation Sheet).

Significant support was given to deliver the wide-reaching Mid-term and Final Assessment national workshops, Long-term Vision Process meetings and Ecosystem Profile update consultations.

## Component 7: Coordinate and communicate the CEPF investment in North Africa (sub-grant to LPO).

### *7.1 Summary of investment strategy, eligibility criteria, application process in French within four months of start of project.*

Documents for translation were defined and developed throughout the investment; press releases, Calls for Proposals for large and small grants, LOI templates for small grants and periodic email updates. The Programme Officer and Head of International provided French translation support. The Programme Officer also provided Arabic translation support where required (see Component 1, 2, 3 and 4 for more detail).

### *7.2 Key CEPF documents in French and Arabic distributed among key stakeholders in North Africa.*

A distribution and contact list was developed for the region and updated. All key documents were created and distributed to stakeholders in the region, including presentations and press releases explaining the CEPF investment in the region. New documents and news updates were shared with existing contacts, and new contacts were given all documents and information about the Hotspot in workshops, meetings and via email.

North African countries were the hardest to reach out to due to communications challenges (poor email and phone connections) and therefore the North African Programme Officer visited a the countries more often than planned, with careful budget management, to meet with NGOs and key stakeholders in the sub-region to communicate about the CEPF opportunity.

Significant communications support was given to the RIT with LPO translating key news articles and publishing them in their website and magazine (see Components 1 and 2).

### *7.3 Support BirdLife to achieve performance targets in Components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.*

Roles and responsibilities were defined for the Programme Officer in implementing components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and these were delivered as outlined above. The Programme Officer for North Africa was responsible for all activities in Algeria, Cape Verde, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia.

An action plan for the Programme Officer was prepared jointly to implement these components alongside other RIT members, and updated annually. It was agreed for each Programme Officer to submit a quarterly progress report and attend a meeting every 2 weeks to discuss on-going progress. CEPF RIT Supervision Meetings were attended as were other RIT training workshops throughout the investment.

Support given to host a CEPF-RIT Advisory Committee meeting in January 2014, and Communications meeting in January 2015 at the LPO offices.

Support was given to arrange all CEPF supervision missions in the different countries – liaising with grantees for office meetings and site visits, as well as meetings with national donors, governments, and local municipalities and community groups (see Components 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for examples and more detail, and the Stakeholder Participation Sheet).

Significant support was given to deliver the wide-reaching Mid-term and Final Assessment national workshops, and Ecosystem Profile update consultations.

The Programme Officer assisted with donor synergies for example, being on the advisory committee of the North Africa Programme de Petites Initiatives pour les Organisations de la Société Civile d'Afrique du Nord (PPI-OSCAN) implemented by IUCN and funded by FFEM/MAVA – in particular to coordinate support to small, local organizations.

**10. If you did not complete any component or deliverable, how did this affect the overall impact of the project?**

Some component deliverables or activities were adapted or reduced throughout the course of the programme to adapt to changing circumstances or new information. These are the deliverables which were not completed:

*Component 2: Activity 2.2 At least two updates sent monthly to the distribution list on key developments.*

At the beginning of the programme updates were sent to the mailing list via email e.g. announcing calls for proposals. However after the Communication Strategy was developed and the target audience and needs were carefully discussed, it was decided that this frequent communication would not always be relevant and could end up reducing the contact list or engagement of stakeholders. It was decided instead to produce a quarterly newsletter, and improve that content and produce it in multiple languages. This was well-received by stakeholders, as assessed in the Mid-term Assessment. Unfortunately the RIT suffered capacity issues with Communications Officers leaving, and so at those times we had to devote our efforts to the high priority communication items such as the Storymap and Together Lessons Learned brochure. Producing the newsletter was a long and time consuming process, and heavily impacted the Programme Officers as it involved a lot of translation, and so in busy times it was particularly difficult to produce e.g. Final Assessment workshops. Due to these capacity issues the newsletter was created whenever possible, normally around a key announcement, and so in some cases it was sent bi-annually. News and lessons learned in years 2016 and 2017 would ideally be distributed via the newsletter and so this was impacted, however the RIT was undertaking workshops in each country due to the Final Assessment and Ecosystem Profile update process, and so were using a different tool to disseminate information. At these events the RIT was communicating the key messages to the different stakeholders face-to-face, so had a different form of engagement, and in the Final Assessment workshops especially, lessons learned were covered by the RIT as well as grantees themselves, and so the outputs were met but using different methods.

*Component 5: Activity 5.2. At least US\$5 million in portfolio-level co-financing leveraged by end of project.*

As explained under that section, this activity was not achieved by the RIT as it was found that donors in the region responded better to CEPF than being approached by BirdLife - taking a more donor-alignment approach than an NGO seeking funding approach. This approach proved more effective as it ensured deeper strategic discussions on the donor level resulting in filling gaps and a more sustainable outcome for both donors (with the MAVA Foundation funding the Strategic Direction 1 of the portfolio to match their strategy). The RIT supported CEPF in the process through the Advisory Committee – so donors could see the CEPF strategy in more detail and contribute to its implementation through the various themes (Strategic Directions), and in the process seeking how similarities in their own strategies could align. Their access and input to the CEPF investment strategy on this level played a significant role in the MAVA Foundation and Prince Albert II Monaco Foundation funding the update to the Ecosystem Profile in 2016, an essential process required for future conservation investment in the region.

*Component 5: Activity 5.4. Establish a Donor Round Table.*

The activity here could not be directly attributed to the RIT as conversations and some meetings between Mediterranean donors were already occurring prior to the formation of the RIT. And although the RIT did arrange a donor roundtable meeting in January 2014, it was found through that event that the nature of the RIT being an NGO made it difficult for us to be a convener or

participant in the donor discussions. Therefore, as linked to Activity 5.2 above, the RIT stepped back from organizing or participating into the subsequent donor roundtables, with CEPF instead having the direct link and responsibility here. This was the correct approach for this deliverable and as mentioned above, portfolio and project-level funding resulted from the donor-to-donor relationships cultivated through the efforts of the CEPF Grant Director.

**11. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results**

Products the RIT produced:

i) These products can be accessed in this folder:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=18pJz0jF17Wk-HWGo3ZZhuRBRW5TlrM4>

- Mid-term Assessment report: Grantee Voices from the Med: Lessons learned and shared
- Mid-term Assessment report: Stakeholder Survey
- Mid-term Assessment report: Investment Summary Document
- Stakeholder Participation Sheet

ii) These products can be accessed via the web links:

- Mediterranean Basin Storymap:  
<http://birdlife.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=0370696a3e124396bf4954f5fefb09cc>
- Arabic Translation of Ecosystem Profile Summary:  
<https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/mediterranean-basin-ecosystem-profile-summary-brochure-2010-0>
- French Translation of Ecosystem Profile Summary:  
<https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/mediterranean-basin-ecosystem-profile-summary-brochure-2010-1>
- Together Brochure (English):  
[http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/together\\_local-solutions-from-the-med\\_for-web.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/together_local-solutions-from-the-med_for-web.pdf)
- Together Brochure (Arabic): [http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/01-24\\_high\\_2014\\_arabic\\_final\\_email.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/01-24_high_2014_arabic_final_email.pdf)
- Together Brochure (French): [http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/01-24\\_low\\_french\\_1.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/01-24_low_french_1.pdf)

ii) These products can be viewed on request:

- Civil Society Tracking Tool (Excel version, translated to Arabic and French)
- Contracting Checklist
- Financial Risk Assessment
- Monitoring Tables
- Monitoring Worksheet
- Programmatic Risk Assessment
- Grant Dashboard
- Small Grant Tracking List
- Supervision mission worksheet

## Products the RIT contributed to:

- CEPF report: Update on Impact on Biodiversity of the Mediterranean Portfolio (Dec 2016): <https://www.cepf.net/sites/default/files/mediterranean-biodiversity-impact-report-2016.pdf>
- CEPF report: Annual Portfolio Overview (Fiscal Year 2016): <https://www.cepf.net/sites/default/files/med-apo-fy16.pdf>
- CEPF report: Long-Term Strategic Vision for Graduating Civil Society from CEPF Support in the Balkans, Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot (2016): <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/long-term-strategic-vision-graduating-civil-society-cepf-support-balkans-2016>
- CEPF Report: Mid-term Assessment (2015): <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/mediterranean-basin-mid-term-assessment-2015>
- CEPF report: Annual Portfolio Overview (Fiscal Year 2013): <https://www.cepf.net/resources/documents/mediterranean-basin-annual-portfolio-overview-2013>

## **Lessons Learned**

### **12. Describe any lessons learned related to organizational development and capacity building.**

#### i) RIT development/capacity building lessons learned

- Peer-to-peer support from other RITs: it was incredibly important to have the network of other CEPF RITs to discuss issues with and share tools and processes. Luckily the RIT could attend both RIT exchanges and so benefited a lot in the first from lessons learned experiences for the others, then contributed to newer RITs in the second meeting in 2017. More peer-to-peer training and support could be beneficial to RITs during the different phases of implementation and for certain topics.
- Training on the portfolio for RIT staff: At the beginning of each investment there should be detailed and continual support to the RIT staff from CEPF (and also the Ecosystem Profiling team), to explain the themes around the Ecosystem Profile and create a strategy around the portfolio investment, potentially using expertise from other hotspots to see what worked well and what didn't.
- Training on implementation for RIT staff: over 5 years the activities of RIT staff differs year-on-year, so 'drip-fed' targeted training by CEPF staff (or other RITs) could be given on key processes when they happen, using up-to-date tools and systems e.g. setting up review processes, identifying safeguards, monitoring project results and mid-term/final assessments.

#### ii) Portfolio development/capacity building lessons learned

- Importance of capacity building by the RIT: The RIT model is unlike any donor in the region and frequent feedback from grantees is that this additional capacity building support from the donor is invaluable, and opens doors not only on a peer-to-peer level e.g. through new networks or joining events, but also on a high-level allowing for decision makers to be approached by providing the platform to meet with government



representatives and donors. All these ways allow for information exchange and sharing of conservation best practices.

- Facilitating knowledge exchange was an effective and necessary tool in capacity building: National workshops were hosted throughout the investment based around supervision missions, calls for proposals and the mid-term and final assessments. The opportunity for national organizations to meet and discuss key topics and be trained together was incredibly beneficial, in Algeria for example the mid-term workshop was the first gathering of CSOs in the country on conservation issues. Regional meetings, tackling specific themes were also found to be beneficial, in particular for fostering collaboration for transboundary sites and via regional networks. Participation in regional workshops organized by other regional initiatives (such as MedPAN, CAR-SPA, etc.) was also found to be helpful in enlarging the regional conservation community, by involving more local actors.
- Importance of peer-to-peer capacity building: there were many ways in which CSOs themselves provided learning opportunities and tools for each other:
  - Mentoring of recently established, smaller organizations by stronger, longer-established organizations proved a very successful model for strengthening organizational capacities;
  - The RIT facilitated peer-to-peer exchanges on specific practices, rooted in on-the-ground experience, were recognized by grantees as an invaluable way to build their capacities. This had great results in terms of alliance building and capacity strengthening. This was built into individual grants at the beginning of a project if an opportunity was known, however it was shown more often that these opportunities arose once projects were already active, and so the flexibility of the RIT and CEPF was essential to allow for new activities to be added to a project through an amendment.
  - “Clustered” grant-making, where clusters of grants were made to CSOs with complementary skills to address the conservation of the same site, proved to be an effective approach to leveraging the complementary skills and experience of different CSOs, in contexts where no single organization has the necessary capabilities vertically integrated.

**13. Describe any lessons learned related to project Design Process (*aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)**

i) RIT design process lessons learned

- The RIT role and responsibilities: it would be useful on finalizing a RIT proposal that other hotspot RIT activities and logframes are made available to the organization to ensure standardization of components and objectives. General responsibilities between hotspots are roughly the same, despite the investment strategies differing, so most implementation components still remain the same and can be replicated to ensure standardization of RIT roles.
- The RIT structure: the support mentioned above could also be used to ensure that a RIT is proposing to include the right staff (in terms of time, skills and position), which is very difficult to predict when the scope of the RIT programme is unknown. The role of

capacity building grantees should not be underestimated, with staff (Programme Officers specifically), hired with strong communication and development skills, and patience.

- Allocation of RIT budget: the original RIT budget was difficult to spread out across the full 5-years and so staff time was drastically cut in the final years. Thankfully with additional funding this could then be brought back up to the workable levels e.g. with Programme Officers back up to 100%, and in the final years this was essential to ensure active grants were delivering conservation outcomes as well as adhering to CEPF policies and procedures – for other RITs it's important to have a full capacity RIT for all stages of implementation.

## ii) Portfolio design process lessons learned

- Devoting significant time to grantees at the contracting stage: The presence of an RIT is essential in having well-structured grantee projects from the beginning, after a careful contracting phase to ensure everything is thought-through and incorporated into their logframe. The hands-on approach of the Programme Officers leads to great communication between the RIT-CEPF teams and the grantee (ideally if this can be done face-to-face), and is essential in the ongoing monitoring (and frequent adaptation) of projects. It can also be a useful tool if CEPF is encouraging new partners to be involved in the project – the Programme Officer can be used as a neutral person to assist this process and also foresee any issues from the start.
- Careful engagement of project partners: Where projects involve different partners or sub-grantees, it is better if these links can be established during the design stage (before or during the proposal writing stage), so that they can work on it together. The RIT found that asking applicants to form alliances, merging projects or getting a new partner on-board when the proposal is already written can be very difficult. With competition particularly high for some sites or in some countries, asking for collaboration may cause unnecessary difficulties and a loss of time. This was mitigated by giving two grants with complementing activities to the different organizations, but alongside an MOU so they know to involve each other.
- Linking projects to national conservation priorities: The RIT helped grantees design and elaborate their project ideas to complement national priorities (NBSAPs), ensuring greater acceptance by decision makers and more sustainable outcomes.
- Sustainability: For those projects moved to contracting the RIT would provide guidance to the organizations on how to improve sustainability the project design. It could be a challenge to provide low-capacity CSOs with the knowledge on how to apply sustainable measures to their project plans, taking significant time of Programme Officers. It was also easier if a Programme Officer had been to a site to experience the issues first-hand and meet key stakeholders, however budget and time could not allow for this with all projects, especially as the RIT had to prioritize visits to granted projects. Once projects were granted supporting grantees to apply their actions sustainably was an additional challenge, dependent on the grantee's experience and capacity. Through monitoring the RIT would evaluate the conservation approaches, and also determine replicability of actions and how to disseminate the results to the relevant recipients.

**14. Describe any lesson learned related to project Implementation (*aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings*)**

i) RIT implementation lessons learned

- Country visits: Having the Programme Officers visit grantees and KBAs is vitally important for them to understand the interactions of CSOs in an area/country, and the different political, cultural and environmental aspects at work. The greater the time spent on the ground meeting people (CSOs, governments, communities), attending events, presenting CEPF and seeing the sites in the first years, the greater understanding the RIT has on implementing the portfolio, so travel and Programme Officer budget must be adequately allocated to account for this.
- Grantee supervision missions: for successful projects it's essential for Programme Officers to conduct on-the-ground visits to every grantee at least once, so the budget must allow for this. Face-to-face contact is the most effective way of addressing both specific technical issues and more general themes (such as participatory processes of local communities and finance issues). The majority of new ideas, amendments, improvements etc. can really only be efficiently discussed in person, and once the Programme Officers have seen the challenges encountered and spoken to the different staff and partners in a project.
- Giving grantees a voice: as a specific lesson learnt from the [mid-term assessment](#), it was made clear that the involvement and presence of the RIT and CEPF can be a major benefit to grantees when implementing their projects. Through letters requesting support, or meetings within the country, doors can be opened to grantees having conversations with key decision makers. So the RIT's active engagement on project events, or meeting high-level stakeholders when in the country, can make significant changes to the timing or output of projects.
- Monitoring the portfolio and extracting results: It is essential for RITs to fully understand what the portfolio KPIs are, how to extract this data from reports and to support grantees to be accurate. It has been a challenge to accurately evaluate the Phase 1 investment as the tools were not in place at the start, and they have constantly evolved alongside altering definitions. Robust tools, guidelines and training is needed for RITs to be able to carry out this important part of monitoring and evaluation of the portfolio. Ensuring that grantees are recording accurate information is also key and often a time consuming process for Programme Officers, and must be taken into account when allocating their time in the final years.
- Communications: it was essential to do a thorough assessment of the audience and potential tools to use, and how to use them, before dedicating too much time on communications. The importance of accessible (multi-lingual), attractive, simple and informative communications was key for the RIT to reach out to stakeholders.
- Training on global and national conservation priorities: RIT-led final assessment workshops in each country explained to CSOs the importance of the Sustainable Development Goals and related Aichi Targets, and how their CEPF-funded work can help their government achieve their targets.

## ii) Portfolio implementation lessons learned

- The value of the Hotspot Advisory Committee: By establishing this core regional group of organizations (and active individuals) at the beginning of the investment it has enabled CEPF to have access to essential knowledge and expertise. This led to many synergies with other programs (e.g. PPI-OSCAN) and establishing better donor relations. Having a mixed make up of participants was not easy as donors and NGOs are not usually around a table, so it was a fine balance of selecting the right individuals, some with prior history of collaboration, alongside new faces to ensure new ideas would come to the table.
- Forming a Donor Round Table: having the platform for donor conversations is essential in determining where there are gaps and opportunities in the region. As a deliverable of the RIT an initial meeting of Mediterranean donors was instigated in 2014, however it was apparent that the RIT, led by an NGO, was not the right convening organization for this level of meeting. After this the communication continued with CEPF directly, with the RIT supporting CEPF where required but not participating. This worked well for CEPF and the other donors, resulting in a strong group and developing further individual collaborations (MAVA Foundation and Prince Albert II Foundation). For other hotspots this may differ but it is important for other RITs to carefully assess their role and approach with CEPF before embarking on the establishment of a donor round table or other donor conversations.
- Contribution to long-term processes: The contacts and processes which the RITs establish can be used to contribute to other initiatives. Having the Ecosystem Profile update at this stage in an investment – whilst the first phase was coming to an end, was incredibly beneficial. The lessons learned from phase 1 have directly fed into the process, the networks and relationships formed in the 4 years have ensured that key national stakeholders were reached, the technical knowledge within the RIT was valuable to input to the Ecosystem Profile Team, and the active Advisory Committee all helped to ensure the consultation reached widely and was incredibly thorough (where some organizations in the committee were also part of the Ecosystem Profiling consortium).
- Funding local vs. international CSOs: The aim of CEPF is to fund local CSOs which was achieved (76% of projects were to national CSOs), however there are benefits to funding international organizations. In most cases the grants to international organizations comprised either sub-grants to national organizations, or included them as beneficiaries. Also, two thirds of the international NGOs granted by CEPF are "Mediterranean NGOs" based in Spain (1), Portugal (1), Greece (2), Slovenia (2), Italy (4) or France (2), therefore strengthening the regional cooperation.
- Duration of grantee projects: On the grant level, the continuity of funding over several years proved to be very important. By extending the timeline of grants to allow grantees more time to utilize grant funds, or approving cost-extensions to grants, grantees could consolidate or build on success. Supporting consecutive grants to the same institution to support different phases of a program of work, ensured continuity of funding and allowed grantees to fully achieve their objectives and increase the sustainability of the results. It was also essential for initiatives involving protected area establishment or strengthening, for which three-years appeared to be the minimum implementation period necessary.

- Feedback from grantees: It was important to get feedback from the grantees and other stakeholders about the CEPF programme as well as what they felt were key conservation issues within their country. The RIT gathered this from the mid-term assessment through [national-level workshops](#) and an anonymous online [stakeholder survey](#), this method of gathering input was incredibly useful for the RIT in focusing its efforts in the final years of investment.

#### **15. Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community**

The ability for civil society to understand global terminology such as KBAs, and national processes such as NBSAPs, is incredibly important for them to link their work to higher-level goals, for future policy work and fundraising efforts.

The RIT produced this lessons learned brochure documenting best practices from a handful of our grants which could be shared and replicated globally;

- *Together: Local solutions for nature conservation, Lessons from the Mediterranean:* [http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/together\\_local-solutions-from-the-med\\_for-web.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/together_local-solutions-from-the-med_for-web.pdf) (also available in French and Arabic).

#### **Sustainability / Replication**

#### **16. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated**

##### i) RIT sustainability

On the RIT-level much has been achieved through the development of processes, tools, documents and systems, which can be replicated or adapted in other CEPF hotspots e.g. monitoring tables and the CSTT Excel format. The RIT has documented this through CEPF and directly with other RIT Managers, so there's a lasting record of these project management and grant making tools. In the final year of operations CEPF introduced a platform for all RITs and CEPF to share information which is an important and useful way to ensure sustainability.

The RIT has acted as a steward for the hotspot, with many of the successes of the programme due to the face-to-face interactions of RIT staff and key stakeholders. It takes many years to become a trusted presence in a country, supporting organizations and building up the CEPF network. CEPF demonstrated its commitment and expertise through the RIT, particularly through the establishment of the Advisory Committee and frequent interactions by Programme Officers with grantees and stakeholders in national meetings and events. Having dedicated individuals behind the RIT leading the programme alongside the Grant Director, CEPF has become widely known and grants have had greater impact. At the end of the 5-year investment CEPF is seen as a key actor in the region and significant conversations are happening on a high-level relating to regional biodiversity conservation. It's incredibly important that CEPF remains active in the region to build upon this work.

It's important that the organization/s leading the RIT assess its impact on a region (biodiversity and civil society), and how the CEPF programme has affected its own current and future strategy. BirdLife and its sub-grantees LPO and DOPPS are committed to follow-through capacity building initiatives and tackling key conservation issues in the Mediterranean using the knowledge gained through this investment.

Through CEPF's Long-term Vision Process (carried out for the Balkans in this investment phase) a series of actions are laid out which could help civil society lead and support conservation action with less reliance on CEPF funding. The RITs play a significant role in this process by building up capacity (skills and knowledge), encouraging networks, and establishing platforms for collaboration, so that civil society can influence decision-makers for a more sustainable viewpoint when tackling complex issues.

## ii) Portfolio sustainability

The RIT had a key role to play in enhancing the prospects for sustainability. In addition to what is outlined below, the RIT needed to ensure grant proposals were realistic in terms of what can be delivered in the time frame of a funded project, and that proposed project activities were wherever possible building on agendas and had prospects for their own sustainability beyond the life-time of the grant. Where projects were stand-alone, it was important to ensure the need for them was clear. This involved a significant level of training with CSOs, especially grassroots small grantees, to link their project objectives (often on a site or species level) to their national biodiversity targets (NBSAPs) as well as the CEPF portfolio and global targets.

To replicate best practices and learn from challenges it's essential to document key findings and lessons throughout the investment to ensure that knowledge is shared – on the portfolio and project-level. It is a challenge to find the correct tools to disseminate information and on the portfolio level the RIT managed to facilitate this through the Advisory Committee, mid-term/final assessments, and national workshops. However more could be done to share strategic knowledge between other RITs, conservation initiatives and projects. On the project level, the RIT was able to conduct lessons learned workshops and produced the Together brochure to highlight grantee conservation actions, however more can still be done to encourage grantees to share their own best practices, giving them the responsibility and the tools to share their own challenges and learnings from their conservation actions.

A key to sustainability, and a lasting contribution that CEPF made in the Mediterranean in this 5-year phase, is the emphasis it gives to capacity development, especially the development of local civil society organizations. They have a stake in the values and services of nature, which will last well-beyond the life-time of CEPF investment in the Hotspot. Younger, more fragile CSOs in countries where civil society is less-well developed can gain confidence and experience, and thus enhance prospects for organization sustainability, from collaboration with CSO at more advanced stages of development.

A further dimension to enhancing the sustainability of investment is recognition by CEPF of the need to seek to catalyze and support the development of integrated, multi-stakeholder approaches. The CEPF investment in the region has facilitated in many cases establishment of partnerships nationally and regionally, leading to maturity of NGOs thinking to adopt a more strategic approach of building alliances to maximize benefit sharing and achieving a larger impact during project implementation. Although this approach has not reached the level of formal agreement, we can conclude that NGOs are now adopting a strategic approach in establishing long term partnerships. Such integration requires and helps to ensure the adoption of nature conservation objectives and progress in wider land-use planning and management arrangements and helps to ensure that conservation outcomes are not stand-alone and vulnerable once conservation investment has ended. Linked to this is the role that CSOs can play in enabling local communities to manage areas for biodiversity.

Linked to an integrated approach, is the importance that CEPF attaches to support mainstreaming by CSOs of biodiversity into public policy and planning, and private sector

practice. This was a challenge as explained in other sections, and such work is critical for enhancing the sustainability of CEPFs investment in the region.

Another key approach to sustainability was the need to build synergies with the agendas of other donors in the region. It is of mutual benefit to other donors that such alignment is sought. They too will have concerns about the sustainability of their funding. As the Ecosystem Profile recognizes, the donor community showed great interest in the investment strategy in the first phase, and took an active role in the Hotspot Advisory Committee. Having donors take part in this enabled further alignment and even funding of the portfolio through the MAVA Foundation, and wider donor interaction through the Donor Round Table led to further synergies previously highlighted. Having donors and other key regional NGOs and stakeholders as part of the Advisory Committee enabled deeper discussion and collaboration on key issues, and actions which can be built upon on project-levels as well as strategic levels.

The original Ecosystem Profile provided a solid base for sustainable conservation investment in the Mediterranean and CEPF delivered on this initial strategy with support from the RIT as described in the impact sections. The multi-level approach to determining the strategy through documenting key threats, socio-economic factors, as well as the species and site data, ensured that conservation actions would be focused on sustainability. The updating of the Ecosystem Profile (2016-7) had input from the RIT so that lessons learned, experience, new contacts and data could be incorporated, all with the rational of improving the chances of sustainability of the new CEPF investment strategy.

**17. Summarize any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability**

Through BirdLife linkages, the RIT connected with other BirdLife programmes with similar functions, themes or deliverables, contributing insight as well benefitting from their project outputs, these were:

- Practical Impact Assessment Methods for Small and Medium-sized Conservation Projects (PRISM)
- Conservation Leadership Programme (CLP)
- The Toolkit for Ecosystem Service Site-based Assessment (TESSA)
- Integrating Rights and Social Issues in Conservation (A Trainer's Guide) (INTRINSIC)

**Safeguards**

**18. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social and environmental safeguards that your project may have triggered**

All active grantees were monitored (by site visits/email/phone support) and verified related to the necessity of safeguard policy assessment. EIAs, Process Frameworks and other safeguard docs were collected and uploaded on GEM (small and large grants). The RIT Manager provided documents and lists to CEPF on request.

## Additional Funding

**19. Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of CEPF investment**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
MAVA Foundation	C	\$1.129 million	This grant was between CEPF and MAVFA, the RIT supported CEPF where required in order to secure and report on the project e.g. reporting

\* Categorize the type of funding as:

- A *Project Co-Financing (other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B *Grantee and Partner Leveraging (other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project)*
- C *Regional/Portfolio Leveraging (other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)*

## Additional Comments/Recommendations

**20. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF**

This report is complementary to the CEPF grant - *Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team: Administrative Functions* (#61626). The combined components and activities in these grants led to the overall impact of the RIT in the initial CEPF investment phase in the Mediterranean Basin (2012-2017).

BirdLife International and the RIT partners LPO and DOPPS would like to thank CEPF for the opportunity of running the RIT for the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot. The team would also like to extend their gratitude to the CEPF staff who have supported the RIT throughout the implementation.

## Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

**21. Name:** Liz Smith

**22. Organization:** BirdLife International

**23. Mailing address:** BirdLife International, The David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge, UK. CB2 3QZ

**24. Telephone number:** +44 (0)1223 747578

**25. E-mail address:** [liz.smith@birdlife.org](mailto:liz.smith@birdlife.org)



## **Annexes**

### **Annex 1: List of Hotspot Advisory Committee Members\***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Fabrice Bernard	Conservatoire du Littoral Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Gabriele Rechbauer	Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM)
Constance Corbier	IUCN/SSC/MPSG - Mediterranean Plant Specialist Group
Bertrand de Montmollin	MAVA Foundation
Paule Gros	Prince Albert II Foundation
Raphael Cuvelier	Society for the Protection of Prespa
Myrsini Malakou	The GEF Small Grants Programme Cabo Verde
Ricardo Pimenta Monteiro	The GEF Small Grants Programme Jordan
Munir Adgham	The IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation
Antonio Troya	Tour du Valat
Jean Jalbert	University Bejaia
Aissa Moali	WWF Mediterranean Programme Office
Paolo Lombardi	

\*Members of the Committee at the close of the Phase 1 investment (September 2017)

Advisory Committee meeting minutes and documents:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1LSlh3j8tIDQiuz-WnKcpONLloORBBtCS>

## Annex 2: Progress Against the Logframe

Objective	Targets	Progress to date (June 2016)
<p>Engage civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity through targeted investments with maximum impact on the highest conservation and ecosystem services priorities</p>	<p><i>(note: due to eligibility issues, this target was reduced to 42 KBAs in 5 priority corridors following mid-term assessment)</i></p> <p>NGOs and civil society actors from CEPF eligible countries, with an emphasis on the priority 6 corridors and 70 key biodiversity areas, effectively participate in conservation programs guided by the ecosystem profile.</p> <p>Development plans, projects and policies which influence the priority 6 corridors and 70 key biodiversity areas mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services, with a focus on tourism, water and agriculture.</p> <p>70 priority key biodiversity areas have strengthened protection and management.</p> <p>Strategic areas of production landscapes of six priority corridors under improved management for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.</p> <p>The Mediterranean Basin Hotspot ecosystem profile influences and complements other donor's investment strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 108 projects have been awarded, benefitting 91 organizations (grantees, sub-grantees, small grantees)</li> <li>- CEPF has supported projects on 65 Key Biodiversity Areas in five priority corridors</li>   <li>- 15 policies or local regulations have been directly influenced by CEPF</li>   <li>- Projects in 65 Key Biodiversity Areas in five priority corridors, and improved management monitored for at least 51 of them — covering an estimated surface of 2,177,000 ha.</li>   <li>- CEPF has supported a wide range of activities related to sustainable use of natural resources and improved agricultural or fishing practices in 51 sites. Overall, the surface of productive land where changes in productive practices with positive impact on biodiversity is estimated at 1,485,000 ha.</li>   <li>- The Ecosystem Profile, co-founded by MAVA Foundation and Prince Albert II Foundation, has been widely distributed.</li> <li>- MAVA Foundation became a Regional Donor of the CEPF Mediterranean Program in 2014, providing an additional \$1.129 million to CEPF's investment for the Strategic Direction 1 on coastal management</li> <li>- CEPF participates to the Donor Round Table of Mediterranean focused organizations to ensure alignment</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GETF (Coca Cola Foundation), Prince Albert Foundation, have supported projects introduced by CEPF for \$600,000, building on previous CEPF projects.</li> <li>- Profile and KBAs in Montenegro are being used as a basis for the Natura2000 preparatory action</li> <li>- Albania: EU Delegation use priority KBAs as focus for support to Environmental organization (civil society support)</li> <li>- CEPF took part in preparation and support the implementation of the North Africa PPI implemented by IUCN and funded by FFEM/MAVA</li> </ul>
--	--	---

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Progress to date (December 2013)
<p><b>Outcome 1.</b> Negative effects of coastal development, especially those associated with tourism, minimized via promoting Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) and sustainable nature-based economic alternatives, with a focus on the priority corridors of the (1) Southwest Balkans, (2) Cyrenaican Peninsula, and (3) Mountains, Plateaus, and Wetlands of Algerian Tell and Tunisia, and in 20 coastal and marine priority key biodiversity areas in other corridors.</p> <p><b>Budget:</b> \$2,500,000</p>	<p>Number of income generation projects that contribute to conservation of a key biodiversity area.</p> <p>Number of tourism development plans, tourism authorities, and tourism businesses adopting safeguards and environmentally friendly practices where CEPF investment will take place</p> <p>Coverage area of coastal zones subject of Integrated Coastal Zone Management plans or similar planning tools</p>	<p><b>5 projects in the Balkans and 3 in North Africa</b> awarded on ecotourism with expected income generation results; in Montenegro, Albania, Tunisia and Cape Verde</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Example: Marketing local food and handicraft products, ecotourism accommodation, local homestays, micro-grants to local businesses, work with fishermen</li> <li>- Tourism operator (resort) adopted new practices in Cape Verde/Boa Vista – sea turtle watching best practices</li> <li>- The Ulcinj Urban Planning and Coastal Zone Management has been influenced to integrate more eco-friendly tourism initiatives.</li> <li>- New small eco-business created in Albania (Bojana, Karaburun Peninsula): diving tours, eco-guides, small restoration and habitat.</li> <li>- New circuits and tourism offer to small business in Tunisia (Cap Bon, Tunis)</li> </ul> <p>21 KBAs with CEPF-funded project to improved coastal zone management; 2 Algeria, 5 Albania, 3 Cape Verde, 1 Montenegro, 8 Tunisia, and 2 Morocco.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Civil society engaged to influence Coastal Planning in Montenegro, the Ulcinj Municipality (three projects) – ICZM Strategy.</li> <li>- Influencing the integration of ICZM protocol in local planning area in Tunisia Algeria and Morocco</li> <li>- support local municipalities and civil society organization to prepare and integrated local development plan in El Kala National Park, Algeria.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome 2.</b> Sustainable management of water catchments and the wise use of water resources established with a focus on the priority corridors of the (1) Atlas Mountains, (2) Taurus Mountains, (3) Orontes Valley and Lebanon Mountains, and (4) Southwest Balkans. The lessons learned shared and replicated from and with other river basin management experiences elsewhere in the Mediterranean. <b>Budget:</b> \$3,000,000</p>	<p>Number of basins where IRBM has started</p> <p>Stronger legal basis for IRBM</p> <p>Hectares of habitats restored or protected through innovative financing triggered by CEPF investments</p>	<p><b>12 river basins</b> covered with initiatives to improve management at basin or sub-basin level, 11 KBAs with CEPF-funded projects (5 KBAs in Morocco, 4 priority KBA in Albania, 2 in Macedonia, plus initiatives influencing river basin management under SD3 in Jordan, Lebanon.</p> <p>Apart from the national concrete IRBM actions, IUCN Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment and Conservation Priorities project, co-funded by MAVA, produced an assessment and mapping of 1,236 freshwater species and identified and listed 167 freshwater KBAs, among which 40 meet the criteria of the Alliance for Zero Extinction.</p> <p>Coordinated actions of civil society led to adoption of measures for improved preservation of ecosystems in three freshwater basin: Drin River, Orhid Lake and Dojran Lake</p> <p>Prespa and Orhid Lakes Nature Fund (PONT) has been established under the auspices of WWF Greece, with endowment from MAVA and KfW of € 25 M. CEPF supported, humbly, the establishment of the Fund (setting up the administrative and</p>

	<p>Number of initiatives with significant impact to reduce water consumption</p>	<p>financial management, communication and stakeholders involvement...)  Two projects (Albania, Lebanon) worked on assessing value of ecosystem services, paving the way for future PES schemes. CEPF supported project generating incomes for local communities with objective to reduce dependency on natural resources:</p> <p>Six innovative actions to preserve water resources and protect freshwater ecosystems (Morača river, Montenegro: drop-by-drop irrigation, Ait Mhamed and Imegdale, Morocco, provision of drinking water to two villages together with reforestation of 80 ha for the conservation of land against erosion, community groups for wise use of water resources in Dojran Lake (Macedonia), Skumibini river in Albania: work with farmers' association to improve irrigation system and maintain wetlands, Hima approach promoted in Anti-Lebanon, Green fodder production in Mujib, Jordan)</p>
--	--	---

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Progress to date.
<p><b>Outcome 3.</b>  Conservation status of 70 priority key biodiversity areas improved via enhancing the protected area systems, supporting local communities and promoting international cooperation.</p> <p><b>Budget:</b> \$3,505,000</p>	<p>Demonstrable improvements in the conservation and management of priority key biodiversity areas as guided by formal management plan or other appropriate documents.</p>	<p><b>Actions under SD 3 covered 33 out of the initial list of 42 Priority KBAs (79%),</b> but some activities under SD 1 and 2 also resulted in improved management of KBAs.</p> <p><b>CEPF has supported actions in 65 sites. The actions have resulted in strengthened management or protection in 51 KBAs,</b> covering a total of <b>2,177,000 ha.</b> In the remaining 14 sites, either activities have not yet demonstrated impact on the management of the site, or activities were limited in size and scope and were not expected to have a direct impact on site management (e.g., scientific study, awareness-raising activities, etc.)</p> <p>Overall, the surface of productive land where changes in productive practices with positive impact on biodiversity (improved fishing, agriculture, forestry...) have been noted is estimated at 1,485,000 ha.</p> <p>Among the 51 Key Biodiversity Areas that have benefitted from CEPF support, 30 are — at least partially — under protection status. 80 % of protected areas covered by CEPF project have</p>

	<p data-bbox="583 149 1066 207">Number of hectares brought under new or upgraded protection.</p> <p data-bbox="583 1172 1117 1263">Percent and number of grants that enable effective stewardship by local communities for biodiversity and ecosystem conservation.</p>	<p data-bbox="1146 149 1860 207">seen increase in their METT score (Monitoring of Effectiveness of Protected Areas), covering 1,114,000 ha.</p> <p data-bbox="1146 240 1860 298"><b>6 new protected areas and one expansion, covering 27,542 ha.</b></p> <p data-bbox="1146 305 1843 363">7 other sites in the process of being declared for an estimated additional surface of 115,000 ha.</p> <p data-bbox="1146 370 1831 428">Overall, the creation of about <b>140,000 ha of new protected areas is expected.</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1192 435 1894 1266" style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The concept of micro-reserves has been used for the first time in Lebanon, based on agreements with local authorities on communal lands (Ehmej), or with the church (Sarada) or private landowners (Baskinta). Although small in size, these sites are of important biodiversity value and are well adapted to the preservation of micro-endemic or rare plants. A first micro-reserve (Ehmej) was officially created in 2015, and officially recognized by the Lebanese Ministry for Environment, setting up a precedent for scaling up the approach in the newly identified Important Plant Areas.</li><li>- Also in Lebanon, the Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon has adapted the traditional concept of Hima — a system of land and water management. This alternative, community-managed protected area concept could potentially be replicated in many other places in the Mediterranean Basin.</li><li>- Qaytouli-Roum in Lebanon is the first "sustainable hunting area" set up in the country. The area is managed by local government with support from hunting and nature conservation.</li><li>- the Kuriat Islands Marine Protected Area in Tunisia is expected to become the first co-managed protected area in the country, closely involving a civil society organization (Notre Grand Bleu) with the everyday management of the site — a situation that would have been completely impossible only a couple of years ago.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="1146 1299 1860 1390">Balkans: At least 83% of the grants under SD3 with objectives including increased stewardship of local communities</p> <p data-bbox="1146 1393 1293 1416">Middle-East:</p>
--	---	--

		<p>At least 55% of the grants under SD3 with objectives including increased stewardship of local communities</p> <p>North Africa:</p> <p>At least 33% of grants under SD 3 with objectives including increased stewardship of local communities.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 4.</b> Strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment provided through a regional implementation team.</p>	<p>Regional Implementation Team performance in fulfilling the approved Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Number of groups receiving grants that achieve a satisfactory score on final performance scorecard.</p>	<p>Actual performance of RIT approved by CEPF Secretariat</p> <p>Data from Civil Society Tracking Tool available for 76 grantees.</p> <p>72% increased their score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6% have seen their score decreasing significantly (by more than 5%)</li> <li>- 38% have seen their score stable (between minus 5% and plus 5%)</li> <li>- 56% have seen a important increase of their capacities, as measured by CSTT – with 16% seeing a huge increase of over 25% in their score.</li> </ul>

### Annex 3. CEPF Grants, Mediterranean Basin – Phase I

Zone of Implementation	Sub-Region	Strategic Direction	Applicant/ Grantee	Applicant Acronym	Title	Total
Albania	Balkans	SD1	Institute of Nature Conservation in Albania	INCA	Albania Field Project: Sustainable Economic Activities in Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas	\$236 628
Albania	Balkans	SD1	Association for the Protection and Preservation of Natural Environment in Albania	PPNEA	Land of Eagles and Castles: Pilot Sustainable Tourism Model for the Albanian Adriatic Coastline	\$258 608
Albania	Balkans	SD1	Istituto Sindacale Per La Cooperazione Allo Sviluppo	ISCOS	Preserve and Enhance Sustainable Tourism Between Lalzi Bay and Berat, Albania	\$52 993
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Urban Research Institute (URI)	URI	Albanian Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$2 270
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Instituti i Politikave Mjedisore	IEP	Developing Sustainable Water Management Practices for the Ohrid Lake Region	\$13 050
Albania	Balkans	SD2	The Women At Work Initiative (TAWWI)	TAWWI	Master Plan for the Recovery of the Spring Water Ecosystem in Lalzi Bay	\$19 376
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Agro-Environmental & Economic Management-Center	(AEEM-Centre)	Economic and Ecological Assessment of Ecosystem Services in Karavasta Lagoon	\$19 987
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Urban Research Institute	URI	Conservation of Biodiversity in Patoku Lagoon and Ishmi River Outlet Through Integrated River Basin Management	\$180 000
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Centre for Forest Studies and Consulting (Albaforest)	ALBAFOREST	Integrated Drini River Basin Management	\$116 150
Albania	Balkans	SD2	Agro-Environmental & Economic Management-Center	AEEMC	Integrated Natural Water Management of Shkumbini River, Albania	\$29 470
Albania	Balkans	SD3	Albanian Society for the Protection of Birds & Wild Fauna (Mammals)	ASPBM	Enforcing Hunting Legislation and Strengthening Institutional Capacities for Wildlife Management in Albania	\$120 267
RIT	Hotspot Level	SD4	BirdLife International	Birdlife International	Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team: Administrative Functions	\$985 215
RIT	Hotspot Level	SD4	BirdLife International	Birdlife International	Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team: Programmatic Functions	\$1 050 527



Hotspot Level	Hotspot Level	SD3	IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	IUCN,	Freshwater Key Biodiversity Area refinement: Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot.	\$19 705
Hotspot Level	Hotspot Level	SD2	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	IUCN	Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment and Conservation Priorities for the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot	\$248 331
Hotspot Level	Hotspot Level	SD1	KANOPEE SAS (Horwath)	HORWATH HTL	Studying the Involvement of the Tourism Sector in Financing Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas	\$19 976
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD2	WWF Greece	WWF Greece	Promoting Conservation in the Transboundary Prespa Eco-Region of Albania, Macedonia and Greece: Establishment of the Prespa Ohrid Nature Trust	\$76 981
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD2	Mediterranean Information Office for Environment, Culture and Sustainable Development	MIO-ECSDE	Living Well in Harmony With the Drin: Raising Public Awareness, Enhancing Knowledge and Empowering NGOs to Protect and Conserve Freshwater Ecosystems in the Drin River Basin	\$199 983
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD3	Društvo za jamsko biologijo (SCB)	Društvo za jamsko biologijo (SCB)	Assessment of the endangered subterranean biodiversity of the Skadar/Shkodra Lake Basin	\$19 992
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD3	Asociacion Beyond Light (The Living Med)	(The Living Med)	Multimedia Communications Campaign for Dalmatian Pelicans in Lake Skadar	\$17 000
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD3	Noe Conservation	Noe Conservation	Conservation of Pelicans, a Key Biodiversity Species of Skadar Lake	\$287 120
Regional Projects - Balkans	Balkans	SD3	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	IUCN (ESARO)	Supporting the Long-Term Sustainable Management of Transboundary Lake Skadar	\$287 508
Algeria	North Africa	SD1	Laboratoire de recherche "Ecologie des Systèmes terrestres et Aquatiques" (EcoSTaQ)	EcoSTaQ	Developing an Integrated Coastal Management Plan for l'Edough	\$19 900
Algeria	North Africa	SD1	Association Promotion des Femmes Rurales de Wilaya de Skikda	APFRWS	A Study for the Development of Ecotourism Activities at Guerbes Sanhadja, Algeria	\$19 110
Algeria	North Africa	SD3	Souidi Zahira	Souidi Zahira	Study of floral diversity and dynamics in Macta Marsh, Algeria : Application for biodiversity conservation	\$18 090
Algeria	North Africa	SD3	Association de Réflexion, d'Échanges et d'Actions pour L'Environnement et le Développement	AREA-ED	Contribution à la création participative d'une aire protégée dans le massif des Babor	\$157 680

Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD3	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	IUCN MedPO	Promouvoir la valeur des zones clés pour la biodiversité à travers le renforcement du rôle des organisations de la société civile dans leur conservation et gestion en Afrique du Nord	\$316 076
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD3	Fondation Tour du Valat	TdV	Suivi des Oiseaux d'eau en Afrique du Nord pour la conservation des zones humides	\$230 000
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Cabinet Sami Ben Haj	Cabinet Sami Ben Haj	Cartographie des Initiatives GIZC, collecte et partage des leçons apprises dans trois corridors prioritaires et deux zones clés pour la biodiversité en Afrique du Nord	\$72 000
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Living Planet Tunisia	Living Planet Tunisia	Intégration Effective de l'Approche Gestion Intégrée des Zones Côtières dans les Pays de l'Afrique du Nord	\$135 627
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Conservation International	CI CSP	Introducing the Conservation Agreement Model for Community-Based Conservation to Nongovernmental Organizations in Tunisia and Algeria	\$19 716
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Fondation Tour du Valat	Fondation Tour du Valat	Integration of Integrated Coastal Zone Management Objectives and Nature Conservation in Algeria's El Kala National Park and Surrounding Areas: Training on Territorial Challenges and Sustainable Development	\$17 600
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Association de Réflexion, d'Échanges et d'Actions pour L'Environnement et le Développement	AERA-ED	Intégration des objectifs de la GIZC et de la conservation de la nature dans les plans de développement locaux des territoires du Parc national d'El Kala (y compris les régions limitrophes en Algérie et en Tunisie)	\$53 291
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe Country Office Bosnia and Herzegovina (REC)	REC- BiH	Bosnian and Herzegovina Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$4 830
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Mountain Rescue Service of Herzegovina (Hercegovanka Gorska Sluzba Spasavanja)	HGSS	Production of Speleological Cadaster for the Trebižat Area	\$18 684
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Hrvatska Ekološka Udruga	BUNA	Educating the Public on Sustainable Water Use and the Protection of Endemic Fish in the Neretva River Valley	\$18 750
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Društvo Za Jamsko Biologijo - Society of Cave Biology (SCB)	SCB	A Survey of the Distribution of Olm by Environmental DNA Sampling	\$16 515
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Institute for Adriatic Crops and Karst Reclamation (IAC)	IAC	Conservation of Wild Grapevine (Vitis Vinifera L. Subsp. sylvestris) in Bosnia and Herzegovina	\$16 970

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Society for Biological Research and Protection of Nature (BIO.LOG)	BIO.LOG	Karst Freshwater Habitats: Identification and Participatory Conservation Planning of Threatened Invertebrate and Fish Species	\$19 850
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Centar za krš i speleologiju (Center for Karst and Speleology) (CKS)	CKS (Center for Karst and Speleology)	Protection of Underground Biodiversity in the Neretva River Catchment Area: Identifying and Raising the Awareness of Conservation Hotspots	\$15 300
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	WWF European Policy Programme-Branch Office	WWF -EPP	Securing the Future of Hutovo Blato Nature Park	\$169 844
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	EuroNatur Foundation	EuroNatur Foundation	Improving the Management of Hutovo Blato Nature Park	\$162 209
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Center for Karst and Speleology	CKS	Protection of Bats in the Neretva River Catchment Area	\$40 241
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	Ornitološko društvo naše ptice	OD naše ptice	Hutovo Blato Nature Park and Mostarsko Blato as Safe Breeding, Stop-Over and Wintering Sites for Birds	\$48 550
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Balkans	SD3	The Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe	REC	Promoting Trebizat as an Ecotourism Destination	\$109 996
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD1	BIOS.CV – Environmental Conservation and Sustainable Development	BIOS.CV	Integrating conservation, tourism and local community development on Boa Vista Island	\$19 660
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD1	BIOS.CV – Association for the Conservation of the Environment and Sustainable Development (BIOS.CV)	BIOS.CV	Environmental Initiatives to Enhance Ecofriendly Tourism in Boa Vista Island, Cape Verde	\$19 800
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD1	Turtle Foundation	Turtle Foundation	Fair Access: Managing Turtle Watching and Quad Bike Traffic on the Nesting Beaches of Boavista	\$3 885
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD1	Sociedade Portuguesa para o Estudo das Aves	SPEA	Protecting Threatened and Endemic Species in Cape Verde: A Major Island Restoration Project	\$275 309
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD3	Biosfera I Association for environment protection	Biosfera I	Strengthening organizational capacities and field research on Raso Islet, Cape Verde	\$19 438
Cabo Verde	North Africa	SD3	International Union for Conservation of Nature Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	IUCN	Identifying Important Plant Areas in Cabo Verde	\$65 598
Croatia	Balkans	SD3	Institute for Adriatic Crops and Karst Reclamation (IAC)	IAC	Locating the Wild Grapevine ( <i>Vitis Vinifera</i> L. Subsp. <i>sylvestris</i> ) Along the River Banks of Krka (Croatia)	\$2 700
Jordan	Middle-East	SD1	Sweimeh Association Charity	SAC	Libyan Ecotourism Experience Exchange Visit to Jordan	\$15 554

Jordan	Middle-East	SD3	The United Society for Developing Water Resources and Environment	USDWE	Jordanian Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$2 231
Jordan	Middle-East	SD3	Sweimeh Association Charity	SAC	Rehabilitation of the Sweimeh Eco-Park	\$19 450
Jordan	Middle-East	SD3	Bab Assalam Women's Cooperative	BASWC)	Integrated Ecosystem Management of Tel Al Arbin Special Conservation Area	\$19 700
Jordan	Middle-East	SD3	The United Society for Developing Water Resources and Environment (USDWE)	USDWE	Green Fodder Pilot Project	\$19 975
Jordan	Middle-East	SD3	The Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature	RSCN	Strengthening Management Planning of Mujib as a Biosphere Reserve in Jordan	\$242 103
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon (SPNL)	SPNL	Evaluating the Status of the Monk Seal Population in Lebanon	\$4 700
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Université Saint Joseph de Beyrouth (USJ)	USJ	Lebanon Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$2 690
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Environment For Life (EFL)	EFL	Raising Awareness on Hunting and Biodiversity Conservation in Al Chouf Cedars Nature Reserve Key Biodiversity Area	\$16 000
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Arts, Sciences and Technology University in Lebanon (AUL)	AUL	Photographic Guide to Wildflowers of Lebanon with Emphasis on the Three Priority KBAs in Lebanon	\$19 920
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Lebanese Environment Forum	LEF	Promoting Sustainable Hunting Practices in Lebanon Using a Community-Based Approach	\$182 385
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Université Saint-Joseph	USJ	Détermination de zones importantes pour les plantes et création de micro-réserves pour conserver des plantes rares ou endémiques du Liban.	\$207 788
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Al-Shouf Cedar Society	ACS	Enhancing Sustainable Livelihoods and Promoting Community Management of Shouf Biosphere Reserve	\$160 300
Lebanon	Middle-East	SD3	Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon	SPNL	Demonstrating Sustainable Management of Important Eastern Mediterranean Forests and Key Biodiversity Areas in the Anti-Lebanon Mountains	\$220 220
Libya	North Africa	SD1	Libyan Wildlife Trust (LWT)	LWT	Improve Knowledge on Integrated Management of Coastal Zones and Biodiversity Protection in Alqrbolli Area, Libya	\$15 390
Libya	North Africa	SD1	Libyan Society for Birds (LSB)	LSB	Awareness of the Local Communities and Hunters About the Importance of Wetlands and Waterbirds	\$19 960
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	Reseau Enfant de la Terre (RET)	RET	Tunisian and Libyan Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$4 308
Regional Projects - North Africa	North Africa	SD1	WWF European Policy Programme-Branch Office	WWF EPP	Sustainable Economic Activities in Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas	\$349 470

Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)	REC Com MK	Macedonian Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$4 996
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	Environmental Organization "Grashnica" (Grashnica)	Grashnica	Smart Water Use in the Ohrid Lake Region	\$18 880
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	GAUS INSTITUT – Fondacija za novi tehnologii, inovacii i transfer na znanje (GAUSS)	GAUSS	Agricultural Water Stewardship Initiative in Ohrid Lake Basin	\$13 100
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici S.c.a r.l.	CCMC	Integrated Water Resources Management at Dojran Lake	\$117 166
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe	REC CO Macedonia	Developing Capacities for the Sustainability of Dojran Lake	\$168 663
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD2	Macedonian Ecological Society	MES	Water for the Lakes, Bogs, Streams and People on Jablanica Mountain	\$75 116
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD3	Macedonian Ecological Society	MES	Education and Capacity Building for the Conservation of Lake Dojran	\$19 282
Macedonia, FYROM	Balkans	SD3	Environmental Citizens Association "Front 21/42"	Front 21/42	Save Ohrid Lake And Galištica National Park, Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia	\$32 287
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	ZELENI DOM - Green Home	NGO Green Home	Montenegro Mid-Term Stakeholder Assessment of the CEPF Investment	\$1 945
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	KAWKA PRODUCTION, VIDEO SNEMANJE Gregor Šubic s.p (KAWKA)	KAWKA	Promotion of Biodiversity Conservation Actions in Ulcinj Salinas	\$16 980
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	ECNC Land & Sea Group Agrupación Europea de Interés Económico	ECNC Land & Sea Group A.E.I.E	Fostering and Bringing Together Nature, Tourism and Civil Society at Bojana Delta Through Integrated Coastal Zone Management	\$240 382
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	Ngo Center For Protection And Research Of Birds Of Montenegro	CZIP	Mediterranean Mid-term Assessment Regional Meeting - Montenegro	\$33 940
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	NGO Center for Protection and Research of Birds of Montenegro	CZIP	Ecotourism in Ulcinj Salina	\$194 748
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	NGO Green Home	NGO Green Home	Support Local Communities to Implement Nature-Based Tourism Practices Around Sasko Lake	\$123 820
Montenegro	Balkans	SD1	Institute for Entrepreneurship and Economic Development	IEED	Engaging Civil Society in Integrated Coastal Zone Management Planning	\$58 012

Montenegro	Balkans	SD2	Ngo Center for Protection and Research of Birds of Montenegro	CZIP	River Mora?a Sustainable Development Against Floods	\$89 997
Montenegro	Balkans	SD2	The Network for the Affirmation of NGO Sector	MANS	River Mora?a: The New Way Forward	\$39 966
Montenegro	Balkans	SD3	Crnogorsko društvo ekologa [Montenegrin Ecologists Society (MES)]	CDE-MES	Action for Ecological Valorisation of Buljarica Cove	\$19 980
Montenegro	Balkans	SD3	NGO Green Home (GREEN HOME)	NGO Green Home	Engaging Civil Societies in Harmonization of Actions for Improving the Conservation and Management Effectiveness of Lake Skadar	\$19 375
Morocco	North Africa	SD1	Association des Enseignants des Sciences de la Vie et de la Terre (AESVT-MAROC)	AESVT-MAROC	Pilot Project for the Effective Integration of Integrated Coastal Zone Management Approach to the New Coastal Law: Case Corridor Ouranie and Moulaya	\$19 406
Morocco	North Africa	SD1	Groupe de Recherche Pour la Protection des Oiseaux au Maroc (Grepom)	GREPOM	The Essaouira Dunes: Mapping a Sustainable Future for the Coastal Atlantic Plains of Morocco	\$19 432
Morocco	North Africa	SD1	Association de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources	AGIR	Contribution à la Conservation de la Lagune de Bou Areg (Mar Chica) à travers l'Implication de la Société Civile dans la Gestion Intégrée des Zones Côtières.	\$189 132
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	ADDICT COM	ADDICT COM	Communication Support for Ifrane National Park	\$15 594
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Tissu associatif de développement de la province d'Azilal	TADA	Supporting Civil Society in Conserving Water Resources and Biodiversity in Azilal	\$19 997
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Section d'Ifrane de l'Association des Enseignants des Sciences de la Vie et de la Terre au Maroc (AVEST)	AVEST	Implementing Sustainable Agricultural Practices Contributing to the Protection and Ecological Integrity of the Oued Boufekrane River	\$19 901
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Enda Maghreb	ENDA	Ensuring the Preservation and Enhancement of Atlas Mountain Ecosystems through the Capacity Building of Local Stakeholders in Sustainable Water Management	\$19 700
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Association Haute Moulouya pour l'Ecotourisme et la Protection de la Nature	AHMEPN	Conservation de la biodiversité pour l'orientation stratégique 2 Cas du micro-bassin versant d'oued Outat et extensions (Affluent d'Oued Moulouya Maroc)	\$102 817
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Global Diversity Foundation	GDF	Integrated River Basin Management in Ait M'hamed and Imegdale Rural Communes	\$196 987
Morocco	North Africa	SD2	Association Marocaine pour l'Ecotourisme et la Protection de la Nature	AMEPN	Valorisation écotouristique de la biodiversité piscicole et aquatique de l'Atlas marocain pour la contribution à la préservation des ressources en eau "Cas des Parcs Nationaux d'Ifrane et du Haut Atlas Oriental"	\$276 368

Morocco	North Africa	SD3	Stichting Moroccan Primate Conservation (MPC)	MPC	Restoring the Endangered Barbary Macaque Species	\$19 152
Morocco	North Africa	SD3	Global Diversity Foundation (GDF)	GDF	Sustainable Livelihoods and Community Management of Medicinal Plants and Important Plant Areas of the High Atlas Mountains	\$19 900
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Reseau Enfant de la Terre (RET)	RET	Promoting wetland eco-tourism for local development (Promotion des zones humides pour le développement local)	\$17 770
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Association de protection de l'environnement Hammem Ghezaz (APEHG)	APEHG	Circuit Ecotourism Within the Dunes of Ras Alby	\$19 962
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Association des Fans de la Chebba (AFC)	AFC	Protection of Marine Turtles and the Coastal Environment of the Kuriat Islands	\$19 963
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Association Les Amis des Oiseaux	AAO	Projet de Développement d'activités éco-Touristiques pour la Conservation de Sites Clés de la Biodiversité au Nord de la Tunisie	\$285 910
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Association Tunisienne des Ingénieurs Agronomes	ATIA	Projet de Renforcement des Organisations Tunisiennes En Compétences Techniques Environnementales	\$70 617
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Association Les Amis des Oiseaux	AAO	Mediterranean Mid-Term Assessment Regional Meeting	\$9 939
Tunisia	North Africa	SD1	Notre Grand Bleu	Notre Grand Bleu	Contribute to the Conservation of Kuriat Islands and the Bay of Monastir Through the Involvement of Civil Society and the Private Sector	\$181 010

