

CEPF Final Project Completion Report

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

Organization Legal Name	BirdLife International
Project Title	Mediterranean Regional Implementation Team: Administrative Functions
CEPF GEM No.	61626
Date of Report	10 th April 2018

CEPF Hotspot: Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 4

Grant Amount: \$1,048,002

Project Dates: 1st June 2012 to 30th 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

Sustained and effective conservation of coastal areas, river basins, and other priority natural ecosystems, supported by the civil society in the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot, as a contribution to global biodiversity conservation and improved livelihoods of people dependent upon natural resources.

4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion

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.

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.

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

A CEPF investment carried out in the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot that realizes the vision set out in the Ecosystem Profile, specifically:

- 1. The Regional Implementation Team (RIT) becomes a key actor and leverages nature conservation in the Mediterranean Basin.*
- 2. A project portfolio that adequately represents the strategic directions and priority regions of the Ecosystem Profile for the Mediterranean becomes operational.*
- 3. Conservation efforts initiated and developed at priority Key Biodiversity Areas and corridors.*

5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion

1. The RIT becomes a key actor and leverages nature conservation in the Mediterranean Basin.
 - The RIT supported the granting of \$8.9million to conservation CSOs in the Mediterranean through 106 grants (53 Large, 53 Small Grants).
 - The RIT set up internal processes and systems for the implementation of the investment including staff and partner (sub-grantee) coordination – supporting the designing, contracting, monitoring and evaluation of grants.
 - The Small Grant Mechanism was established with 53 small grants contracted to local CSOs in-line with CEPF and BirdLife policies and procedures.
 - The RIT became a key actor in capacity building within the region, with 91 CSOs supported in implementing their projects, and 72% increasing their organizational capacity.
 - The RIT supported CEPF in implementing additional funds of \$1.129 million from the MAVA Foundation in 2014 for coastal conservation projects.
 - The RIT worked with CEPF to identify and support CEPF grantees with co-funding opportunities, where CEPF secured funding from GETF (Coca Cola Foundation), Prince Albert Foundation, to support follow up projects, for at least \$600,000.
 - By establishing the Hotspot Advisory Committee the RIT became a conduit for knowledge between key organizations and donors in the region who are working on similar issues.
 - In all eligible countries the RIT engaged with CSOs and key stakeholders from government and donors to identify, explore and create networks and partnerships.
2. A project portfolio that adequately represents the strategic directions and priority regions of the Ecosystem Profile for the Mediterranean becomes operational.
 - Grants covering all strategic directions were funded within 12 developing countries (\$3.2million to SD1, \$2.1 million to SD2 and \$3.5million to SD3).
 - The RIT planned and implemented 8 Calls for Proposals, explaining the CEPF Investment Strategy to stakeholders and supporting the receipt of eligible applications -

receiving a total of 394 Letters of Inquiry (227 for Large Grants and 167 for Small Grants).

- The review process was set up to ensure all accepted projects were in-line with the CEPF Investment Strategy, and were reviewed by the RIT and external reviewers where relevant.
- On the grant level the RIT monitored closely the activities of each grant to ensure they were in-line with their logframe and the Mediterranean portfolio.
- 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 mid-term and final assessments were conducted to evaluate the performance of the programme and assess the needs of CSOs in each country.

3. Conservation efforts initiated and developed at priority Key Biodiversity Areas and corridors.

i) Site and species impacts:

- Grantees implemented projects within 65 KBAs and corridors.
- 8 New protected areas created, covering 27,651 ha, and 7 new protected areas are expected, covering 115,000 ha. CEPF is expected to have contributed to creation of close to 140,000 ha of new protected areas.
- Strengthened management was monitored on 51 KBAs, covering 2,177,000 ha, and projects supported the management of 30 protected areas, with 80% increasing their management, covering 1,114,000 ha.
- Improved management of natural resources in 1,485,000 ha of productive landscapes, working with local communities.
- Improving knowledge for species conservation through data collection and assessments e.g. freshwater biodiversity, underground species, and plant diversity.
- Species-focused conservation projects through action plans and pilot innovative projects e.g. loggerhead turtles in Cape Verde and Dalmatian pelican in Montenegro.
- Site-based initiatives for endangered species using multiple conservation approaches have resulted in the improved management of the sites.

ii) Human well-being impacts:

- 50 projects (48%) included a strong community-based approach
- 59 communities have benefitted from grantee projects, and 8 specific income generation activities have been implemented.
- 12,000 people with increased revenues through livelihood activities
- 400 jobs created in ecotourism and small business around the region.
- 201 people benefitted from a job in relation to tourism (estimate 45% women)
- 199 people have created a small business (agricultural products, restaurants...) (estimate 32% women)
- 4,000 people have increased revenue from non-timber products (estimate 50% women)
- 8,140 people have increased revenue from improved management of natural resources (shepherds, fishermen) (estimate 45% women).

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, Albanian and Arabic), 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

Component 1: Operationalize the Regional Implementation Team (RIT).

1.1 Appropriately qualified staff recruited within 30 days and trained within three months of start of project.

1.2 BirdLife office and management/ procedures mobilized to implement grant within 30 days of start of project.

1.3 Support CEPF Secretariat to secure focal point endorsements for selected countries.

1.4 Financial reports and RIT performance reports submitted to CEPF in required formats and according to the schedule specified in the contract.

1.5 Mid-term and final RIT audits conducted.

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

Component 1: Operationalize the Regional Implementation Team (RIT).

1.1 Appropriately qualified staff recruited within 30 days and trained within three months of start of project.

i) Staff:

BirdLife RIT staff were recruited within 3 months of the contracts being signed, with everyone contracted by October 2012. There was a short delay in this to ensure the correct people were employed for the roles, and the experienced team created was able to quickly make up for the time that was lost. A temporary consultancy contract was drawn up for the Programme Officer for North Africa to ensure she could begin working on the programme immediately whilst her contractual arrangements with LPO sub-grant were finalized (see Activity 6.1).

In Q4 2013 the Programme Leader and Programme Assistant resigned their positions. With these staff changes and the additional funding from MAVA, the RIT was tasked with re-structuring and re-budgeting the team in Q1/2 2014. The RIT Manager and the Programme Officers took on relevant Programme Leader responsibilities, and an Admin Assistant was employed to assist with the Small Grant Mechanism.

The recruitment of a Communications Officer was approved by CEPF in June 2014. This position was made up of time split between an officer in each of the Cambridge and Middle East offices, to cover language and regional elements. The Middle East officer was replaced twice in the 2 years, with the Cambridge Communication Officer taking over all communications in the final year.

ii) RIT Training:

The BirdLife International Finance Team trained the RIT Manager in all relevant accounting procedures and legal obligations. The Small Grant Assistant joined in February 2014 and the

RIT Manager and Finance Team trained her on relevant BirdLife and CEPF policies, procedures and systems.

A number of meetings occurred throughout the investment, with an annual RIT meeting planned at least once per year for the chance for staff to train on new procedures, and to plan for upcoming activities. Often this occurred alongside another meeting or event (to save budget or allow for meeting preparation), so the team meeting occurred either before or after the event.

RIT-organized meetings (including CEPF supervision missions of the RIT):

- September 2012, Cambridge: CEPF-RIT induction meeting. A training week was organized within 3 months of the contracts being signed, with representatives from CEPF including the Executive Director, most members of the RIT and other key people involved in the project.
- December 2012, Jordan: RIT-only induction meeting. This was done in order for all RIT members to meet face-to-face, review the large grant LOIs from the second CFP, discuss the proposals from the first call, consolidate lessons learned from the first couple of months, train the team on areas such as monitoring and evaluation and carry out 2 site visits to KBAs in Jordan.
- March 2013, Jordan and Cambridge: CEPF supervision mission of the RIT - consisted of training sessions, reviewing LOIs and reviewing the Small Grant Mechanism and processes.
- September 2013, Morocco: A RIT-only meeting was an opportunity for the team to plan for the upcoming months and train on tools and documents.
- January 2014, France: RIT and CEPF planning meeting alongside the first Hotspot Advisory Committee and Donor Round Table.
- January 2015, France: Communications Strategy meeting at LPO office with RIT Manager, BirdLife comms and LPO staff.
- January-February 2015: Mid-term Assessment national meetings arranged by the RIT.
- May 2015, Montenegro: Mid-term Assessment Regional Meeting.
- December 2015, Slovenia: CEPF supervision mission of the RIT, including wider RIT team covering monitoring and communications.
- June 2016, Brussels: Presentation at the EU Commission on the Phase 1 Mediterranean investment, alongside Ecosystem Prolife launch event.
- June 2016, Brussels: CEPF-RIT team meeting, covering monitoring, closing grants and communications.
- August 2016, Cambridge: A RIT-only meeting covering monitoring, lessons learned and final assessment.
- November 2016, Morocco: Final Assessment meeting alongside an Advisory Committee meeting and the Regional Validation Meeting for the Ecosystem Profile.
- May 2017: Conservation Outcome workshops were arranged in each country and hosted by the RIT as part of the Final Assessment.
- February 2017, Balkans and Tunisia: The RIT coordinated and supported a World Bank mission to the Balkans.

Other RIT training/exchange opportunities were also utilized:

- October 2012: The Programme Leader and Programme Assistant attended the training week for the Eastern Afromontane RIT in Kenya (Due to visa issues out of the RIT's control, they could not attend the Cambridge meeting the month before). This ensured

the RIT all had the training required from CEPF and it was a great opportunity for building relationships across Hotspots and has led to continued communications and sharing of ideas and useful information between the two RITs.

- Dec 2012 and March 2013: The RIT Manager trained the Programme Assistant on financial procedures during the RIT training weeks.
- June 2013, Ottawa: RIT-organized side-event for CEPF at the BirdLife World Congress, inviting donors, grantees, stakeholders, aiding networking and information sharing.
- September 2013: A RIT Exchange organized by CEPF was an important week for RIT training and sharing of experience between other RITs.
- June 2014: the RIT Manager attended the Eastern Afromontane annual meeting to give input into certain processes like the Long-term Vision and Mid-term Assessment planning.
- October-November 2015: Long-term vision in the Balkans exercise incorporated country visits and meetings with grantees and key stakeholders.
- May 2017: A second RIT Exchange meeting organized by CEPF in Greece.

1.2 BirdLife office and management/ procedures mobilized to implement grant within 30 days of start of project.

All RIT members were set up in the Middle East regional office with the equipment required to carry out their duties.

Due to the unique set up of the project, through the administration and programmatic contracts, an agreed method of financial reporting was created and agreed upon by BirdLife International and CEPF.

Systems and tools were introduced and updated throughout the project:

- RIT Financial management: procedures were established for accounting, reporting and filing, and for sub-grant monitoring and reporting. A RIT Management Guide was created to clarify and help manage all programmatic and admin activities.
- Small Grant Mechanism: small grant financial documents created such as the grant agreement template, risk assessments, and small grant tracking worksheet.
- RIT Team management: staff admin was created and updated such as TORs, and for team management tools were created such as a roles and responsibilities workplan, RIT calendar, Programme Officer travel report templates
- RIT Project management: tools were created including LOI review cycles, technical review group documents, Advisory Committee TOR.

An assessment for the feasibility of purchasing a project management software for managing small grants was conducted. It was concluded that the team would be able to manage the grants with existing tools, saving some of the RIT budget. This will be monitored throughout the project to ensure efficiency.

With the staff changes and the additional funding from MAVAs at the start of 2014, the RIT was tasked with re-structuring and re-budgeting the team. The new budget and corresponding team changes were discussed and the decisions were made by the whole RIT (including sub-grantees DOPPS and LPO, and the BirdLife regional office in the Middle East). The new RIT budget and structure was approved by CEPF and signed in September 2014. The amended admin processes (e.g. finance templates) were updated with the sub-grantees.

Throughout the course of the programme the RIT contract was amended 3 times with CEPF. Each time the RIT assisted CEPF to complete, check and sign the necessary documents. The RIT also conducted amendments to the LPO and DOPPS sub-grants based on the change to the RIT contract, ensuring all CEPF and BirdLife T&Cs and policies were updated and carried over.

As a result of the mid-term assessment it was identified that the portfolio would be strengthened in the remaining time by increasing the Small Grant Mechanism funding pot to enable more funds to smaller grassroots CSOs. Therefore an amendment of the contract was organized increasing it by \$250,000 to overall new total of \$1million. The RIT assisted CEPF to complete, check and sign the necessary documents.

1.3 Support CEPF Secretariat to secure focal point endorsements for selected countries.

Communication with the GEF focal points in Libya, Algeria and Egypt was initiated within the first month of the RIT being formed to secure the endorsement letters (being the only countries remaining to endorse). Highlights on the CEPF investment strategy and the importance of having endorsements to protect the targeted KBAs in these countries were made and introduced to the GEF focal points in these countries. Regular communications were carried out by the North African Programme Officer for the 3 countries; via email, phone calls and face-to-face meetings. All communications with the focal points were documented and shared with CEPF. A template for the endorsement letter and contact details were provided for the GEF focal points in these countries to enable them to easily submit their endorsement to the World Bank.

Endorsement was secured for Libya in October 2012, within 1 month of the RIT being operational. This enabled Libya to be included in the call for small grant LOIs in November 2012. Endorsement was secured for Algeria in November 2012, within 2 months of the RIT being operational.

A face-to-face meeting was held in Cairo with the GEF Focal Point for Egypt and the Director of Conservation at BirdLife International in December 2012. The CEPF investment strategy was presented and questions answered about the endorsement. The RIT continued to meet and discuss endorsement with Egypt throughout the investment.

The GEF Focal Point in Morocco requested that all projects would be discussed with them, so the North Africa Programme Officer ensured this was carried out during the implementation. In Algeria a new law was put in place which forbid NGOs to receive funding from foreign sources without the agreement of the local Authority. The North Africa Programme Officer did a lot of research speaking to local NGOs about this, and worked with CEPF to find a way to work with this, through careful liaison with the government.

To ensure good communication with the GEF Focal Points, the RIT contacted them whenever there was a supervision mission to their country and was able to meet some face-to-face e.g. in Albania and Cape Verde (see the Stakeholder Engagement worksheet), and they were on the newsletter mailing list.

1.4 Financial reports and RIT performance reports submitted to CEPF in required formats and according to the schedule specified in the contract.

Performance and financial reports were submitted to CEPF meeting the formats required. Where there was a delay in reporting the RIT Manager would inform the Grant Director and seek an extension.

At the beginning of the programme in 2013 the RIT completed their Performance Monitoring Plan, and Annual Progress Report on the Logframe, these were then discontinued by CEPF and other reporting methods used.

The RIT supported the Grant Director to complete Annual Portfolio Overviews, a Biodiversity Impact Report and other ad hoc or donor reports which were required.

1.5 Mid-term and final RIT audits conducted.

A mid-term audit was arranged and conducted in April 2014. The audit report showed no issues and was submitted to CEPF.

The final RIT audit was conducted from August 2017. Due to time and capacity constraints the audit process took longer than anticipated. The final audit report was submitted to CEPF and showed no issues.

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

Component 2: Establish and coordinate a process for proposal solicitation and review.

2.1 Calls for LOIs issued and deadlines for submission set at least annually.

9 Calls for LOIs were announced in the years 2012-2016 (see table below), stopping when the investment funding became limited and Grants by Invitation were more relevant to fill gaps in the portfolio.

A cycle for issuing calls for LOIs was prepared and shared with CEPF in the initial stages of investment. Over time this process evolved by working alongside the Grant Director to decide upon the schedule as the output of Advisory Committee meetings or team planning meetings.

Each Call for LOIs document was created by the RIT and adapted over time to include more useful information and guidance to applicants, as well as an improved format. It would be prepared in the relevant language/s of the countries which would be eligible e.g. English and French for large grants, and English, French, Arabic, Montenegrin or Albanian for small grants.

To accompany Call for LOIs press releases were created in the relevant languages and distributed by email to the contact list, published on the CEPF and RIT websites, and advertised on the RIT's social media platforms. It would also be sent to numerous media organizations, leading to local, national and international media coverage through newspapers, radio stations, TV interviews and website articles.

Table 1. Calls for Proposals, January 2012 - July 2015

Release	Deadline	Specifications	Countries	LOIs received	Approved
---------	----------	----------------	-----------	---------------	----------

Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Large Grants Focus on regional	All eligible	40	6 (15%)
Oct. 2012	Nov. 2012	Large Grants All SDs	All eligible	77	19 (25%)
Nov. 2012	Dec 2012	Small Grants All SDs	All eligible	97	19 (20%)
Jan 2013	Feb 2013	Large Grants All SD	Algeria, Libya	15	1 (7%)
Jun. 2013	Jul. 2013	Large and Small Grants, SD 2	Albania, Lebanon, Montenegro, Morocco, Macedonia	LG: 34 SG: 12	LG: 7 (21%) SG: 3 (25%)
Nov. 2013	Jan 2014	Small Grants All SD	Albania, Algeria, Jordan, Libya, Macedonia, Morocco, and Tunisia	43	13 (30%)
Apr. 2014	May. 2014	Large Grants SD 1	Algeria, Cape Verde, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia	27	7 (26%)
Oct. 2014	Nov. 2014	Large Grants SD 2	Balkans: Albania, Montenegro, Morocco and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.	34	5 (15%)
July 2015	Sept. 2015	Small Grants SD 1	North Africa: Algeria, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia	15	3 (20%)
Grants by Invitation					11 (5 SG, 6 LG)

2.2 Technical review of all large grant LOIs conducted internally and by external parties as appropriate, within 8 weeks of close date of call for LOIs

The RIT developed the review process for large grant LOIs, establishing roles and responsibilities for members of the RIT, coordinating Skype meetings with CEPF staff to discuss LOIs, and creating/maintaining the spreadsheet to record the review process.

The review process evolved over time as RIT and CEPF staff changes occurred and meant a shifting in roles and responsibilities. The internal review process began by checking each LOI for eligibility, World Bank safeguard policies and links to the Ecosystem Profile investment strategy. These checks were carried out firstly by the Programme Officer, checked by the RIT Manager and finally by the Grant Director.

The second stage focused on the technical review of the LOI, where all sections such as the Project Approach were reviewed. This was conducted by the Programme Officer for each country, the RIT Manager and Grant Director for the region. In the years 2012-3 this was also conducted by the Programme Leader. Where LOIs had similar themes Programme Officers may also review LOIs from other sub-regions, and other BirdLife staff in the proposal also assisted the review for certain LOIs (e.g. the Director of Conservation).

After the initial review process the LOIs would be shortlisted (this would normally take 4 weeks), and where relevant, sent to external reviewers (if there was a Conflict of Interest or if additional information was required). A contact list of external reviewers was created and expanded over the course of the investment as new experts were identified. These reviewers were contacted when LOIs were relevant to their expertise, with approximately 10 individuals used for each sub-region, some for multiple reviews. The reviewers were given a template for reviewing the LOIs asked to respond within 4 weeks. It could prove difficult to collect reviews (no incentives were given) so in some cases this could be delayed or no review given and alternative reviewers had to be sought.

For the majority of LOI reviews, the total technical review period was completed within 8 weeks. This was occasionally extended where external reviews or information was sought, or if the sheer volume of LOIs was too large to thoroughly review in such a short timeframe.

2.3 Feedback on large grant LOIs provided to CEPF Grant Director within two weeks from the completion of the technical review.

The RIT would work alongside the Grant Director throughout the process, and so feedback would be recorded and shared via spreadsheets and Skype calls from the beginning of the review process.

A final discussion would be had between the RIT and Grant Director, using all information from the internal and external reviews to decide on the outcome. Justifications were finalized on which LOIs to take forward and those to reject, always within 2 weeks of the last review being submitted.

The RIT would draft detailed response letters using constructive feedback from the review process, and provided to the Grant Director to adapt, finalize and send.

2.4 Support applicants to finalize grant applications for submission to CEPF, on rolling basis.

Continuous support was given to applicants during the period of proposal submission; discussing project ideas, clarifying questions on eligibility, discussing technical issues, budget considerations and safeguard policies. The Programme Officers also provided technical support in completing all the required documents in the correct format with all necessary information e.g. logframes and financial questionnaires.

2.5 Technical review and strategic evaluation forms prepared; and initial justifications made for all large grants and submitted to the CEPF Secretariat.

The proposals were reviewed by the RIT and programmatic risk assessments carried out. As a result of the review, justifications were given to CEPF to award the grants.

Component 3: Manage a program of small grants; that is, grants of less than \$20,000.

3.1 Technical review of all small grant LOIs conducted internally and externally, as appropriate, within four weeks of submission.

The RIT developed the review process for small grant LOIs, establishing roles and responsibilities for members of the RIT, coordinating Skype meetings with staff to discuss LOIs, and creating/maintaining the spreadsheet to record the review process.

The review process evolved over time as RIT staff changes occurred and meant a shifting in roles and responsibilities. The internal review process began by checking each LOI for eligibility, World Bank safeguard policies and links to the Ecosystem Profile investment strategy. These checks were carried out firstly by the Programme Officer and checked by the RIT Manager.

The second stage focused on the technical review of the LOI, where all sections such as the Project Approach were reviewed. This was conducted by the Programme Officer for each country and the RIT Manager. In the years 2012-3 these 2 stages were also conducted by the Programme Leader. In early 2014 a Small Grant Assistant was recruited to assist the RIT Manager and so she also checked all LOIs for eligibility and reviewed their budgets. Where LOIs had similar themes Programme Officers may also review LOIs from other sub-regions, and other BirdLife staff in the proposal also assisted the review for certain LOIs (e.g. the Director of Conservation). This internal review would normally take 2 weeks, depending on the volume of LOIs and other activities happening alongside the process.

As for large grants, the same external review contact list and process would be used to support the small grant review process, the only difference would be that the RIT would request for feedback within 2 weeks. The majority of external reviews would be gathered and so generally the overall timing for the entire process would be within 4 weeks of the call deadline.

Where small grant LOIs emerged out of large grant Calls for LOIs or through Grants by Invitation, the RIT would carry out the same review process, including external reviews if required.

3.2 Feedback on small grant LOIs provided by BirdLife to all applicants within six weeks of each submission.

A final discussion would be had between the RIT Manager and Programme Officer using all information from the internal and external reviews to decide on the outcome. Justifications were finalized on which LOIs to take forward and those to reject.

The Programme Officer would draft detailed response letters using constructive feedback from the review process, and provided to the RIT Manager to adapt, finalize and send, all within 6 weeks of the deadline unless there was a delay due to volume or external reviews.

For applications moving to the next stage, the Programme Officer would follow up the response letter within a week to discuss more informally about the next steps and provide guidance on the process.

3.3 Risk assessments for each small grant made by BirdLife

A Financial Questionnaire was created using information from the large grant template CEPF used, and additional information required by BirdLife's legal team. This questionnaire was sent to all stage 2 applicants to complete, support given to them where required, and then reviewed by the Small Grants Assistant. If there was an issue flagged, the RIT Manager would be alerted.

A Financial Risk Assessment (FRA) document was created in order to assess the risk level of applicants, combining necessary CEPF and BirdLife procedures. Data entered by the applicant in the Financial Questionnaire would be used by the Small Grant Assistant to internally fill out the FRA. The resulting score would give a risk level, and would help determine: 1) if there would be an issue granting the organization, 2) if there needed to be any risk mitigating measures added to the grant (e.g. adding a project audit), 3) if the grantee required any additional capacity building support (e.g. additional finance staff time added to the budget), 4) what finance reporting level would be required (e.g. if a detailed transaction report would also be asked for), 5) frequency for reporting (e.g. quarterly for high risk) and, 6) the % amount of the grant to be given in the initial installment (lower % if high risk). The RIT Manager would then check the results, and a discussion would be had with the Programme Officer and Small Grant Assistant on issues raised and next steps. Where needed the Programme Officer would contact the applicant for further information or to adapt the LOI activities.

A Programmatic Risk Assessment (PRA) was also created using a similar comprehensive Excel sheet format. The PRA would be conducted by the Programme Officer, using information in the LOI, checking elements such as organizational history, project links to the CEPF investment strategy, safeguard checks and capacity of the organizations to undertake the activities proposed. As above, the RIT Manager would check the risk level results and relevant action would be taken in adapting the LOI or moving forward with deciding the technical reporting frequency. Once all agreed, the Small Grant Assistant would use the FRA and PRA information to prepare the reporting requirements for the grant contract. On average the risk assessment process would be 2 weeks, from the receipt of the information from the grantee.

The Anti-terrorist Screening Form (ATS) used by CEPF was re-formatted to use more 'user-friendly' language for the region, calling it instead an Organization Information Form. This was sent alongside the Financial Questionnaire to the grantee, and on receipt it was sent to CEPF to do their checks. The small grant contract was only created once CEPF had approved the ATS.

3.4 Legally binding, locally enforceable grant agreements made per small grant.

A legally binding, locally enforceable grant agreement template was created and agreed upon by the BirdLife International legal team and CEPF within 2 months of the formation of the RIT (in 2012). This template was then updated frequently based on new policies and procedures sent to the RIT from CEPF.

Each small grant agreement was adapted to specify the grant amount, payment timetable and reporting requirements established by the FRA and PRA, and contained the full LOI, budget and logframe.

The small grant agreement was translated into French and Arabic by the RIT. As this was not legally binding it was used only as a guidance document to support small grantees understand the content. This was essential for their compliance to terms and conditions. It was shared to other RITs also using these languages in their regions.

The small grant agreement was signed by the grantee, with support from the RIT where required.

To assist with the contracting stage, a Contracting Checklist was created by the RIT to monitor and log how far along the process was, who was responsible for which part, and what key documents were required/missing. The contracting stage differed in timing depending on grantee support required, however from when the LOI was finalized, the contract was normally signed by the grantee and BirdLife (the RIT Manager) with 2 weeks.

3.5 Regular technical and financial progress reports of grantees (based on length of the project).

A small grant Tracking Worksheet was created by the RIT to monitor when reports were due and the Small Grant Assistant sent out alerts to grantees a month before the deadline as stated in their contract. The Programme Officers would support the grantees to prepare their reports if required. Once submitted the Programme Officer would review the reports and get back to the grantee with any questions or issues. The Programme Officer would send their recommendations to the RIT Manager and a discussion would be had on next steps. Once the progress and financial reports were approved the next tranche of funding would be released based on the cashflow projection of the grantee.

Where a grant needed alterations to activities, timing or budget, the Programme Officer would work with the grantee to ascertain the need and required action. This may be flagged in progress reports, during general calls, or during supervision missions. The Programme Officer would discuss with the RIT Manager on the feasibility, and if a grant amendment would be required the team would work with the grantee to update the necessary areas of the LOI. The Small Grant Assistant would create a contract amendment, and it would be signed by the grantee and RIT Manager.

All small grants were monitored and tracked through the RIT tools specified in Component 4.

3.6 Funds allocated for each small grant disbursed upon the conditions in project contracts.

The initial payment of each small grant was determined by the FRA review. As per the CEPF terms and conditions, at least 20% of the grant amount was always retained for the final payment. Payments in between were made based on cashflow projections within the finance reports, which indicated the level of spend on a grant. If the grantee was due to spend less than expected, this would be taken account and the RIT ensured that there would still be enough funds held back as a final payment.

Funds were only disbursed after a review of the progress reports by the Programme Officer and RIT Manager, and finance report review by the Small Grant Assistant and RIT Manager. Once all were approved, the Small Grant Assistant would prepare a payment request and the RIT Manager would sign it.

3.7 Successful small grant proposal documentation submitted to the CEPF Secretariat within one month of grants being contracted

All documents such as the small grant agreement, final LOI, Financial Risk Assessment, Financial Questionnaire, ATS form and web summary were uploaded into GEM within a week of the contract being signed and updated where required.

Component 4: Monitor and evaluate CEPF investments at project and portfolio levels.

4.1 Civil Society Tracking Tool provided to all CEPF grantees for completion at appropriate intervals during their projects.

The Civil Society Tracking Tool was provided to small and large grantees at the beginning and end of their projects. They were uploaded to GEM and given to CEPF when required in the folders specified. Significant time was required of the RIT to ensure grantees understood the need of the document and supplied fair and accurate information.

The RIT transformed the CSTT from the original Word document into an Excel document, to make it quicker and easier for the grantees to fill out. This was proved a success and so CEPF used this format for other RITs.

The CSTT was translated into Arabic and French, which was shared with other RITs for them to use.

4.2 All CEPF grantees report on progress against targets set out in their individual project outlines/logframes and the overall investment strategy logframe at least every six months over course of project (more frequently for higher risk grantees).

All grantees would be monitored throughout their grant term through site visits and regular phone calls from the Programme Officer to check they are on-track with their project targets. They would then be able to report on their progress formally through their progress reports. Where it was apparent that some grantees were having difficulty implementing their project, CEPF, through advice and support of the RIT, would ask them for an interim progress report.

CEPF would send out an automatic reminder to large grantees to submit their reports, and the Programme Officers would also remind them and offer support (the small grant process covered in Activity 3.5). The reports would then be reviewed as set out in Activity 4.4.

A Monitoring Worksheet was created by the RIT for small and large grants to state when reports were due and also to flag what key documents the grantees needed to produce and when, such as safeguard documents, CSTTs and METTS.

4.3 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Strategic Program 1 for protected areas completed at the start, middle and end of the project.

The METT was provided to small and large grantees at the beginning, middle and end of their projects where it was relevant for their project. METTs were uploaded to GEM and given to CEPF when required in the folders specified. Significant time was required of the RIT to ensure grantees understood the need of the document and supplied fair and accurate information.

4.4 All programmatic and financial reports reviewed within two weeks of receipt, and CEPF Secretariat informed of any potential problems or requested modifications to large grant project design.

Once reports were submitted by the grantees, the Programme Officer would review the reports and get back to the grantee with any questions or issues. Once the report was improved and ready for CEPF review, the Programme Officer would send their recommendations to the Grant Director and RIT Manager and a discussion would be had on next steps. This was tracked by a Googlesheet so comments and the status of review was documented real-time.

Where a grant needed alterations to activities, timing or budget, the Programme Officer would work with the grantee to ascertain the need and required action. This may be flagged in progress reports, during general calls, or during supervision missions. The Programme Officer would discuss with the RIT Manager and Grant Director on the feasibility of alterations, and if required would set up further calls with the grantee with the CEPF-RIT to discuss the issues.

If a grant amendment would be required the Programme Officer would work with the grantee to update the necessary areas of the proposal and inform CEPF of the changes so the contract could be updated.

All Final Completion Reports were reviewed by the Programme Officers, and all final impact statistics and data were validated and collected in the Monitoring Tables.

4.5 At least one visit made to every large grantee over course of project, and visits made to small grantees where necessary, to review implementation and evaluate any requested modifications to project design.

At least one visit was made to every large grantee over the course of their projects as well as visits to most small grantees where it was possible.

Often the Programme Officer would be able to meet grantees at other events or conferences, and make time to discuss the projects. Alternatively the Programme Officers would arrange specific supervision missions in a country or sub-region and plan to meet as many grantees as possible. During a supervision mission the Programme Officer would aim to visit the KBA or area where work was focused, meet any project partners or key stakeholders e.g. community leaders, and visit the grantee's office to see the finance team and operational side of the project. These supervision missions were essential to understand project activities as well as understanding the more complex nature of politics, history, culture and the environmental threats at work in the region. When and where possible the RIT would also plan to meet with CEPF donors such as GEF Focal Points and World Bank representatives, and national/local government representatives. A Stakeholder Participation Sheet was created to log these meetings.

Some visa, safety and security issues impeded visits in some countries by CEPF or the RIT e.g. Libya, Lebanon and Algeria, however the RIT made good use of events/conference in other countries which CEPF grantees may be attending to make sure they could meet e.g. meeting Libyan grantees in Tunisia.

Planning meetings or supervision missions was a large undertaken for the staff involved – ensuring all high-risk grantees and key stakeholders (CEPF donors, government representatives), were met. This was especially important if there was a matter to support the grantees with in their project.

CEPF Supervision Missions (where the RIT arranged the logistics for country visits to monitor projects on the ground, with CEPF staff present):

- Tunisia, Oct 2013
- Balkan sub-region, March 2014

- Albania, November 2014
- Cape Verde, Sept 2015
- Morocco, April 2016

A Supervision Mission worksheet was created by the RIT to record when all small and large grantees were visited, either during informal meetings or supervision missions.

Where a supervision mission or meeting was held, a trip or meeting report would be completed by the Programme Officer to state the main topics discussed and any action to be taken. This would be discussed with the RIT Manager and Grant Director, and then shared with the grantee so they can work on the specific areas of improvement. If any other changes were required e.g. grant amendment, then the Programme Officer would discuss with the RIT Manager and/or Grant Director depending on if it was a small or large grant.

4.6 Mediterranean Hotspot Regional Advisory Group meetings held annually to provide review and feedback on implementation and portfolio development.

In late 2013 a TOR was developed for the Hotspot Advisory Committee (Mediterranean Hotspot Regional Advisory Group), and a list of members was developed including donors and key regional NGOs (see Annex 1), in close collaboration with CEPF.

The Advisory Committee was in place from January 2014, providing key insights in specific initiatives, and inputs on how to direct the portfolio via the different SDs, identifying synergies and expanding the network of the RIT.

With 10 initial members this increased to 13 with the addition of new contacts established by CEPF and the RIT during the investment (from AFD, GIZ and GEF Small Grant Program). One member left their position at PlantLife and she was replaced by another plant expert from the IUCN Mediterranean Plant Species Specialist Group. The constituency of the group was very strong, including a mix of people with established relationships with some brand new people in the region to add new ideas.

The committee was contacted throughout the investment through formal meetings (face-to-face and conference calls, see below), focused email updates on key issues or action points, e-newsletters, and individual correspondence on specific topics. Individuals of the committee were also met by the RIT or CEPF staff during other regional events or supervision missions, where key messages and discussions were continued.

Some members supported the RIT on additional aspects of the programme including the review of LOIs, input on individual project implementation, Long-term Vision process, and co-funding of projects. With proactive engagement in meetings and outside of meetings the Advisory Committee was a significant platform to assist the RIT.

Advisory Committee Meetings:

- 28/01/2014 (face-to-face Meeting, France: alongside Donor Round Table)
- 26/05/2015 (Face-to-face Meeting, Montenegro: alongside Mid-term Assessment Meeting)

- 07/09/2015 (Conference Call)
- 18/02/2016 (Conference Call)
- 24/11/2016 (Face-to-face Meeting, Morocco: alongside Final Assessment and Ecosystem Profile Regional Validation Meeting)

Meeting documents can be seen here:

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1AHCfs2sqN3Vq6F0PejZDXymay2_paxm-

The committee was linked to the Donor Round Table as some members were also present in that group (e.g. MAVA and Prince Albert II Monaco Foundation (PAII)), and so it was important to have different platforms to discuss differing issues, led by CEPF.

Through different events in the investment (mid-term and final assessments, long-term vision process and Ecosystem Profile Update), the RIT and CEPF were able to meet other key individuals where conversations fed into committee topics e.g. from the EU DG Environment, or led to the individual joining the committee e.g. GIZ, Biodiversity Sector of the Open Regional Funds for South East Europe.

The Advisory Committee was kept up-to-date with the Ecosystem Profile update process throughout 2016, with the Ecosystem Profile Update team working closely with the RIT. Two organizations of the committee contributed to the funding of the profile update (MAVA and PAII). And some members of the committee are from organizations within the consortium of organizations leading on the Ecosystem Profile Update process (IUCN, Conservatoire du Littoral, and Tour du Valat). Many committee members also attended national consultation meetings linked to their location of work (Algeria, Jordan, and Cape Verde). This meant that the Advisory Committee were heavily involved in the whole consultation process which was incredibly important.

4.7 A coherent project portfolio that adequately represents all investment priorities and covers all priority corridors by end of project.

The RIT supported CEPF to create a strong portfolio of conservation projects. The achievements and challenges faced are described in the previous sections. The establishment of the Advisory Committee helped ensure the investment was thoroughly assessed against the Strategic Directions and Investment Priorities. The RIT played a key role in assessing the CEPF Investment Strategy and granting the right projects, as well as making it accessible so that applicants could apply for funding and implement their projects as planned.

To help stakeholders better understand the granting programme and eligible KBAs, a Google map of all KBAs was made available on the CEPF Med RIT website, and projects were added to the Storymap. The original shapefiles were used to create high resolution PDFs and jpegs for use in presentations, leaflets and the RIT website.

As grants began to be made the RIT created a Dashboard (in 2013) to record which Strategic Direction (SD) and country the funds were going to. This Dashboard was manually updated on a monthly basis and included key grant data as well as updates if there were grant amendments. This enabled the RIT to track the portfolio investment and report on it during Advisory Committee meetings and national workshops. Gap analyses with this information helped inform discussions about further Calls for Proposals.

The Monitoring Tables were set up by the RIT from the mid-point of the investment as final project results began coming in and results needed to be collated. Information about all grant advancement and achievements were updated on the Monitoring Tables, including data on the location of activities such as KBAs, and the species targeted. This data helped the RIT and CEPF detect any patterns, see gaps and inform further action. These tables were evolved over time and required careful data validation by the RIT and Grant Director.

Stats from the Dashboard and Monitoring Tables were used to provide data for various reports and meetings including the Final Assessment presentations and documents, and Lessons learned 'Together' brochure.

4.8 Mid-term assessment of investment portfolio conducted by end of third year of project.

The mid-term assessment gathered input intended to evaluate CEPF funding, identify new areas of support and understand various challenges. The process was tailored to the needs of the Med region – which is wide and has challenges such as distances to travel and language, so all this was taken into account. The RIT specifically wanted to involve as many participants as possible, to make it a widely participative process and beneficial to Med stakeholders; therefore a series of assessment exercises were created.

1) National assessments

The RIT wanted all grantees to be given the opportunity to meet in person to exchange ideas and learnings, to meet other stakeholders (government and community leaders), to honestly feedback on CEPF processes, to discuss their challenges, and discuss the conservation priorities affecting them. All 11 eligible countries would be included in the national assessment, and in order to do this effectively it was decided to hold separate national meetings, 9 in total (with Libya conducted by conference call for security reasons, and for Cape Verde it was carried out through bespoke questionnaires). The RIT created a standardized TOR for the meetings, explaining the role and objective. The RIT identified organizations which they had granted before, or knew could handle such responsibility, and asked them to lead on the national meetings. 7 new small grants were created to fund the national meetings, the RIT contracted these (Grants by Invitation), and 2 large grants were amended to incorporate the meeting, with support from the CEPF Secretariat. The RIT constructed the content and framework of the meetings, providing each country meeting host with a specific country (and language) presentation, presenting guidelines, reporting template. It was decided that the RIT would not be physically present in the meeting, in order for it to be a fully transparent process. The meeting host then arranged the meeting for a date which worked for them, invited all participants and organized the location etc. In total 186 people were involved in the national assessment process. All 11 country reports were input into a worksheet which broke down all the feedback on the different topics. This detailed information can be used on a national level when considering new calls for proposals or monitoring. The combined information was used to identify themes through the region, and so a National Assessment Report '[Grantee Voices from the Med](#)' was produced by the RIT to collate all the findings, using national examples, to give some overarching conclusions to where CEPF can change processes or focus to improve the investment programme.

2) Stakeholder Survey

A stakeholder survey was created online to get feedback from various stakeholders aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the CEPF granting mechanism to identify areas of improvement – looking in detail at processes and support. This was decided to be anonymous in order to get more honest feedback, and was made available in 4 languages – French, Arabic, Montenegrin

and English. 116 responses were gathered. A [Stakeholder Survey Report](#) was compiled by the RIT to summarise the findings for wider audience, and a corresponding detailed worksheet was made to help the CEPF-RIT work on the areas it needs to improve.

3) Regional meeting

To verify the assessments to-date, allow regional grantee exchange and discuss long-term topics with different types of stakeholders, a regional meeting was planned and TOR written. Tunisia was chosen as the regional host country and an existing grantee was identified, AAO, and awarded a large grant. AAO was supported by the RIT to prepare the logistics of the event with over 50 participants. The RIT prepared the agenda and content of the 3 day meeting (23rd to 25th March 2015) in collaboration with CEPF and AAO. However, unfortunately this meeting was cancelled at the last minute after a terrorist attack in the museum of Bardo on 18th March. After wide consultation it was decided to hold the meeting in a new location within the Hotspot, Montenegro. Existing grantee CZIP was asked to host it and a new large grant created for the organization of the meeting. AAO was asked to be co-host, transferring much of the material over to be used for the new meeting, and so was still heavily involved in the event. The new meeting was able to be arranged within 2 months, despite logistical challenges, on 25th to 27th May. The RIT created an Investment Summary document, developed the meeting structure, created the presentations and RIT staff presented their work. The RIT also supported the grantee participants to prepare their presentations for the event. A mid-term summary was captured in an article, published in French, Arabic and English:

<http://www.birdlife.org/worldwide/news/conservation-investment-and-support-mediterranean-reaches-important-mid-term>

The RIT Manager supported the Grant Director to complete the overall mid-term assessment report for the portfolio.

4.9 Final assessment of investment portfolio conducted by end of project.

The Final Assessment was conducted over a number of key meetings and events. It began with a Final Assessment Regional Meeting in Tangiers, Morocco, from 25th - 26th November 2016. As the Ecosystem Profile update process was happening at the same time, involving all Mediterranean stakeholders and analyzing information on the region, it was conducive to hold the events side-by-side. Therefore the Final Assessment meeting was held in conjunction with the Ecosystem Profile Validation meeting, it was held on the first day, helping to set-the-scene for discussions and feedback key findings from the 5-year CEPF investment. Over 50 participants from throughout the hotspot attended the event to help build upon the CEPF Mediterranean network, promoting knowledge sharing.

The main event was preceded by an Advisory Committee Meeting the day before, where the results and recommendations from the Phase 1 investment were compiled and presented to the Advisory Committee for their inputs. The opportunity was also taken for the committee to review the initial analysis of the Ecosystem Profile update, where remarks were passed on to the Ecosystem Profiling Team to be considered in the development of the new investment strategy for the region.

For the Final Assessment Meeting the RIT compiled key stats, measuring progress of the CEPF investment against the logframe and CEPF global indicators, and analyzed per strategic direction and sub-region. During the event, time was taken for CEPF grantees to share lessons learned from their projects and initiate discussions. The RIT then also inputted to the discussions at the Ecosystem Profile Validation meeting.

The RIT supported the logistical event organization alongside the Ecosystem Profile Team. A contract was set up with a national NGO (AGIR) to host the event, and the RIT coordinated this and contracted it as a Professional Service with a sole source justification, with input from CEPF.

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. 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, and explaining to them about their national conservation priorities (NBSAPs) for future conservation work.

For these workshops the RIT announced a Call for Tender and contracted 10 organizations to conduct each national meeting (the Libyan workshop was hosted in Tunisia a day after the Tunisian workshop, bringing the Libyan participants to Tunisia as it was difficult to fund a Libyan organization and host it in Libya with the poor security situation). The workshops were held between May and June 2017.

The RIT prepared the agenda and supporting presentations (in relevant language e.g. Arabic, French), and supported the grantees to have the required expertise to cover the NBSAP element of the workshop. The national meeting organizers were required to produce a workshop report including a summary of the CEPF impact in the country, as well as a report explaining national NBSAPs and the links with CEPF. 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.

To contribute to CEPF's Final Assessment Report, the RIT finalized the monitoring of CEPF's impact on the portfolio level (hotspot-wide). Grant data was checked and inputted to the final monitoring worksheets with final data gathered by grantees from their final completion reports and impacts reports.

Component 5: Implementation of CEPF program in the Balkans (Subgrant to DOPPS)

5.1 Appropriately qualified staff recruited within 30 days and trained within three months of start of project.

The sub-contract was created by BirdLife and signed by DOPPS on 20th July 2012. A comprehensive TOR for the Programme Officer for the Balkans was prepared and agreed with DOPPS, and DOPPS carried out the recruitment process.

A Programme Officer for the Balkans was recruited within one month and attended the introductory training weeks for the CEPF programme in Cambridge in September and December 2012.

During the main RIT contract amendments the sub-grant contract was also reviewed by the BirdLife and DOPPS teams, and subsequent changes to budgets and deliverables were incorporated into an amendment to the grant agreement.

5.2 Establish office, policies, procedures and systems for grant solicitation, review and monitoring.

Financial and programmatic reporting procedures were created with DOPPS to cover all the RIT requirements needed by BirdLife International and CEPF.

Procedures for small and large grant solicitation, review and monitoring, were all developed in coordination with the RIT Manager, Program Leader and other RIT members (see components above).

All issues related to effective implementation of the CEPF program including communication, small grant management and review cycle and monitoring and evaluation were communicated with the RIT Manager and Program Leader.

Regular communication mechanisms were established with the RIT and CEPF (Skype meetings, email and phone communication). In addition, other opportunities were used for communication and sharing of operational procedures e.g. the Programme Officer meeting the CEPF Grant Director at the Skadar Lake meeting in Montenegro, and meeting all other RIT members at the RIT training meeting in Jordan.

Sub-regional activity reports were given to the team during annual team meetings as well as Advisory Committee meetings, including an overview of the conservation need in the region and role of civil society, investment progress updates, collaboration with other initiatives and feedback from grantees.

5.3 Support BirdLife to achieve performance targets in Components 2, 3 and 4.

Roles and responsibilities were defined for the Programme Officer in implementing the components 2, 3 and 4. An action plan was set for the Programme Officer to jointly implement these components with the RIT. A clear time frame with clear reporting system was established and used by the Programme Officer.

Responsibilities for the programme were met and difficulties in the implementation were mitigated through the support of the Programme Officer e.g. the premature closing of a grant in Albania, and granting the first small grant ahead of time.

The Programme Officer acted as the mediator and messenger for the LOI process between the grantee, and CEPF-RIT staff, gave guidance in designing the LOIs and budgets, support in proposal development, guidance in the contracting period and finally monitoring grants so they were successfully implemented.

The DOPPS office hosted the BirdLife and CEPF team during a supervision in March 2014 and December 2015, and helped support the Mid-term Assessment in Montenegro in 2015.

The Programme Officer also helped coordinate and arrange a number of CEPF supervision missions to Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Macedonia, and Montenegro during the investment, so grantees could be met, KBAs visited and key stakeholder meetings arranged (such as government representatives, EU, World Bank and GEF Focal Points).

The DOPPS office supported CEPF to conduct the work for the Long Term Vision for CEPF investments in the Balkans. The Programme Office provided key contacts, socio-economic

insights, CEPF information and logistical support to conduct the assessment, accompanying the consultant on country visits. Visits were carried out in all four eligible Balkan sub-region countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro) in October and November 2015 and majority of the active CEPF grantees were present on the meetings. Before or after the meeting the main issues of the ongoing grants were discussed which assisted the monitoring of the portfolio.

5.4 Support BirdLife to collect monitoring data from all grantees in the Balkans at the project level (every 6 months) and at the portfolio level (annually).

The Programme Officer assisted the RIT Manager, Programme Leader and Grant Director in collecting all necessary documents for small and large grants e.g. CSTTs, METTs and safeguard documents. Significant time was spent with grantees explaining the requirements and need for the data, and to ensure data was accurate and valid.

Data on project impacts e.g. # KBAs supported, # laws created, were gathered by the Programme Officer using progress and Final Completion Reports. These were validated and entered into the RIT's Monitoring Tables for the team to use in future reports or meetings.

Data was collated by the Programme Officer for key meetings such as the Advisory Committee, Mid-term and Final Assessments, where they would present the data for their sub-region or support the RIT Manager to analyze it.

Alongside these meetings the Programme Officer would also provide information on projects and figures for key annual or ad hoc reports for the RIT manager or Grant Director.

5.5 Prepare semestral technical reports and quarterly financial reports for submission to BirdLife and CEPF Secretariat.

The format of the technical and financial reports was agreed on between DOPPS and BirdLife International in 2012.

Financial reports were prepared on a quarterly basis covering expenses from the previous period and a cashflow projection for the next quarter. The RIT Manager reviewed all reports and liaised with DOPPS on any issues.

Progress reports were sent to BirdLife for review, incorporated into the overall RIT progress reports and submitted to CEPF within the deadline required.

Payments were made to DOPPS as per the contractual obligations, when CEPF had approved the overall RIT reports.

Component 6: Implementation of the CEPF program in North Africa (Subgrant to LPO).

6.1 Appropriately qualified staff recruited within 30 days and trained within three months of start of project.

The sub-contract was created by BirdLife and signed by LPO on 20th July 2012.

A comprehensive TOR for the Programme Officer for North Africa was prepared and agreed with LPO, and LPO carried out the recruitment process. The Programme Officer for North Africa was recruited by LPO within 2 months of the contract being signed, and employed by BirdLife International under a consultancy contract for the first 6 months (necessary to mitigate a long administrative delay in LPO contracting an overseas employee). This was an unforeseen but crucial action taken to ensure the Programme Officer for North Africa could begin work straight away, whilst still under the operational guidance of LPO.

The Programme Officer for North Africa and LPO contact Alison Duncan, Head of Overseas Mission, attended the introductory training week for the CEPF programme in Cambridge in September 2012, the Programme Officer attended the second meeting in December 2012.

A number of Skype calls and meetings were held with the BirdLife and LPO communications teams to establish roles. In January 2015 the LPO office hosted a meeting with BirdLife staff to finalize the Communication Strategy.

During the main RIT contract amendments the sub-grant contract was also reviewed by the BirdLife and LPO teams, and subsequent changes to budgets and deliverables were incorporated into an amendment to the grant agreement.

6.2 Establish office, policies, procedures and systems for grant solicitation, review and monitoring.

Financial and programmatic reporting procedures were created with LPO to cover all the RIT requirements needed by BirdLife International and CEPF.

Procedures for small and large grant solicitation, review and monitoring, were all developed in coordination with the RIT Manager, Program Leader and other RIT members (see components above).

All issues related to effective implementation of the CEPF program including communication, small grant management and review cycle and monitoring and evaluation were communicated with the RIT Manager and Program Leader. Regular communication mechanisms were established with the RIT and CEPF (Skype meetings, email and phone communication).

Sub-regional activity reports were given to the team during annual team meetings as well as Advisory Committee meetings, including an overview of the conservation need in the region and role of civil society, investment progress updates, collaboration with other initiatives and feedback from grantees.

6.3 Support BirdLife to achieve performance targets in Components 2, 3 and 4.

Roles and responsibilities were defined for the Programme Officer in implementing the components 2, 3 and 4. An action plan was set for the Programme Officer to jointly implement these components with the RIT. A clear time frame with clear reporting system was established and used by the Programme Officer.

Responsibilities for the programme were met and difficulties in the implementation were mitigated through the support of the Programme Officer e.g. securing the endorsement of Libya

and Algeria within 2 months of being in position, the significant low capacity of CSOs in the region and adapting to the altering security situation in Libya which was affecting grant implementation.

The Programme Officer acted as the mediator and messenger for the LOI process between the grantee, and CEPF-RIT staff, gave guidance in designing the LOIs and budgets, support in proposal development, guidance in the contracting period and finally monitoring grants so they were successfully implemented.

The LPO office helped to support the first Advisory Committee meeting in January 2014, in conjunction with arranging a reception for the Terre Sauvage - CEPF Hotspot Photographic Exhibition at the French Ministry of European and Foreign Affairs in Paris.

The Programme Officer assisted with organizing a RIT Team Meeting in Morocco in September 2013. The Programme Officer also helped coordinate and arrange a number of CEPF supervision missions to Tunisia, Morocco and Cape Verde during the investment, so grantees could be met, KBAs visited and key stakeholder meetings arranged (such as government representatives, AFD, EU and GEF Focal Points).

6.4 Support BirdLife to collect monitoring data from all grantees in North Africa at the project level (every 6 months) and at the portfolio level (annually).

The Programme Officer assisted the RIT Manager, Programme Leader and Grant Director in collecting all necessary documents for small and large grants e.g. CSTTs, METTs and safeguard documents. Significant time was spent with grantees explaining the requirements and need for the data, and to ensure data was accurate and valid.

Data on project impacts e.g. # KBAs supported, # laws created, were gathered by the Programme Officer using progress and Final Completion Reports. These were validated and entered into the RIT's Monitoring Tables for the team to use in future reports or meetings.

Data was collated by the Programme Officer for key meetings such as the Advisory Committee, Mid-term and Final Assessments, where they would present the data for their sub-region or support the RIT Manager to analyze it.

Alongside these meetings the Programme Officer would also provide information on projects and figures for key annual or ad hoc reports for the RIT manager or Grant Director.

6.5 Prepare semestral technical reports and quarterly financial reports for submission to BirdLife and CEPF Secretariat.

The format of the technical and financial reports was agreed on between LPO and BirdLife International in 2012.

Financial reports were prepared on a quarterly basis covering expenses from the previous period and a cashflow projection for the next quarter. The RIT Manager reviewed all reports and liaised with LPO on any issues.

Progress reports were sent to BirdLife for review, incorporated into the overall RIT progress reports and submitted to CEPF within the deadline required.

Payments were made to LPO as per the contractual obligations, when CEPF had approved the overall RIT reports.

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

The RIT completed all project components.

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=18plJzofF17Wk-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
- Together Brochure (Arabic): 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

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 building

grantees' capacity 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 (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 (2016-2017) 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: Programmatic Functions (Nature Alliance for the Mediterranean Basin) (#61625)*. 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, 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

Annexes

Annex 1: List of Hotspot Advisory Committee Members*

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

*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"> - 108 projects have been awarded, benefitting 91 organizations (grantees, sub-grantees, small grantees) - CEPF has supported projects on 65 Key Biodiversity Areas in five priority corridors - 15 policies or local regulations have been directly influenced by CEPF - 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. - 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. - The Ecosystem Profile, co-founded by MAVA Foundation and Prince Albert II Foundation, has been widely distributed. - 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 - CEPF participates to the Donor Round Table of Mediterranean focused organizations to ensure alignment

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

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Progress to date (December 2013)
<p>Outcome 1. 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>Budget: \$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>5 projects in the Balkans and 3 in North Africa awarded on ecotourism with expected income generation results; in Montenegro, Albania, Tunisia and Cape Verde</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Example: Marketing local food and handicraft products, ecotourism accommodation, local homestays, micro-grants to local businesses, work with fishermen - Tourism operator (resort) adopted new practices in Cape Verde/Boa Vista – sea turtle watching best practices - The Ulcinj Urban Planning and Coastal Zone Management has been influenced to integrate more eco-friendly tourism initiatives. - New small eco-business created in Albania (Bojana, Karaburun Peninsula): diving tours, eco-guides, small restoration and habitat. - New circuits and tourism offer to small business in Tunisia (Cap Bon, Tunis) <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"> - Civil society engaged to influence Coastal Planning in Montenegro, the Ulcinj Municipality (three projects) – ICZM Strategy. - Influencing the integration of ICZM protocol in local planning area in Tunisia Algeria and Morocco - support local municipalities and civil society organization to prepare and integrated local development plan in El Kala National Park, Algeria.
<p>Outcome 2. 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. Budget: \$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>12 river basins 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>Outcome 3. Conservation status of 70 priority key biodiversity areas improved via enhancing the protected area systems, supporting local communities and promoting international cooperation.</p> <p>Budget: \$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>Actions under SD 3 covered 33 out of the initial list of 42 Priority KBAs (79%), but some activities under SD 1 and 2 also resulted in improved management of KBAs.</p> <p>CEPF has supported actions in 65 sites. The actions have resulted in strengthened management or protection in 51 KBAs, covering a total of 2,177,000 ha. 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>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>Outcome 4. 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"> - 6% have seen their score decreasing significantly (by more than 5%) - 38% have seen their score stable (between minus 5% and plus 5%) - 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.

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

