



## Small Grants –Final Completion and Impact Report

**Instructions:** CEPF requires that each grantee report on project results and impacts at the end of their grant. To monitor CEPF's global indicators, CEPF will aggregate the data that you submit with data from other grantees, to determine the overall impact of CEPF investment. The aggregated results of all grantees will be reported on in our annual impact report and other communications materials. Your Final Completion and Impact Report will be posted on the CEPF website.

**Ensure that the information provided pertains to the entire project, from start date to project end date.**

*Please complete all fields and respond to all questions listed below.*

**Organization Legal Name:**Centre for Climate Change, Natural Resources and Energy

**Project Title:**Assessment and Mainstreaming of Ecosystem Services of the Niksic field, Montenegro

**Grant Number:**CEPF Grant - 112347

**Date of Completion of this Report:**30<sup>th</sup>of June 2022.

**CEPF Hotspot:** Mediterranean Basin

**Strategic Direction:** 2: Support the sustainable management of water catchments through integrated approaches for the conservation of threatened freshwater biodiversity.

**Grant Amount:** 17,649\$

**Actual Expenditure:** 16,564.73\$

**Project Dates:**01.06.2021-31.06.2022.

### PART I: Overview

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

**CEPF's NGO grantees** (Green Home, Montenegrin Ecologists' Society) –we established cooperation during the project implementation, and our activities were coordinated. We have participated in their workshops and events (such is the field visit to learn about EPCG work in the field of Niksic), and they in ours. Data and feedback were shared among our organizations. During the project, we agreed to jointly present the results of our projects, which was done on a joint final conference in Niksic.

**Local NGOs Ozon and Zupa u srcu**– they were involved as stakeholders who know the local conditions best, and who helped us reach other relevant stakeholders. They also assisted in dissemination of project results through their members, websites and social network profiles.

**Local communes** – Representatives of local communes (Municipality of Nikšić, Local community of Tovic, Local community of Uzdomir), participated in our workshop, and provided relevant information. They also helped us reach the target stakeholders for carrying out the research.

**Local environmentally-conscious “Propaganda bar”** – They assisted in data gathering by distributing the survey questionnaire for the general public.

## 2. Summarize the overall results of your project

The project provided the first assessment and valuation of ecosystem services in the Field of Niksic. They were based on the inputs from the specifically designed research, consisting of two surveys (one for general public, and one for agricultural producers), and analysis of the existing data and literature, as well as inputs from stakeholders and project partners through participative process.

The results demonstrate that the citizens of Niksic highly value the benefits they receive from the local nature, although their awareness of how biodiversity provides these benefits needs improvement. The ecosystem services that most citizens perceive are the ones related to food production (locally produced food, pastures and pollination) and cultural services related to the opportunities for tourism, recreation and aesthetic values.

The findings were summed up into three main products:

- the report for decision makers, which contains a list of concrete recommendations on how to mainstream biodiversity protection in municipal plans and policies
- the information brochure on ecosystem services of Niksic Field for general public download [here](#).
- the promotional video for the general public on the ecosystems of Niksic Field, the services and development opportunities they provide, the pressures they are facing and means of diminishing these pressures (view [here](#))

## 3. Briefly describe actual progress towards each planned long-term and short-term impact (as stated in the approved proposal)

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

Impact Description	Impact Summary
Contribute to the mainstreaming of biodiversity into the municipal planning processes	The project produced novel information on ecosystems of Niksic Field, the services they provide to local communities and development, and the values local people place on them through targeted research. The analysis was a basis for preparation of a position paper with concrete recommendations on how municipal decision makers can mainstream biodiversity protection into their policies, plans and programs. The document is expected to be used in the process of drafting the new municipal development plan that

	is ongoing, and new local biodiversity action plan (envisaged in near future)
Awareness rising of local community about biodiversity conservation in Niksic field	<p>We contributed to this in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- representatives of Municipal departments, local communes and NGOs have participated in the training workshops on the ecosystem services and learned about how nature provides the humans with benefits and how it can be better protected</li> <li>-A brochure for the general public on ecosystems of Niksic Field and their services was prepared and disseminated (hard copy and online)</li> <li>- A promotional video on ecosystems of Niksic Field and their services was prepared and disseminated</li> </ul> <p>The feedback received so far showed that local inhabitants were not fully aware of the richness of Niksic field, and the way the information was presented was novel to them</p>

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

<b>Impact Description</b>	<b>Impact Summary</b>
1. Improve the knowledge base for informed decision making: A novel set of scientifically-based information is provided for mainstreaming biodiversity into development planning on the level of Niksic municipality	<p>One of the project outputs was a document (position paper) containing new information on the ecosystem services of Niksic field, and a set of recommendations for local decision makers on how to mainstream ecosystem services and biodiversity protection into municipal development plans. Information was obtained by conducting a specifically designed research (two surveys), the analysis of the existing data and literature by relevant experts, and a participative process with the local stakeholders.</p>
2. Raise awareness of local communities on ecosystem services in Niksic field: At least 3 representatives of local authorities are informed on the values of ecosystem services in Nikšić field on a special meeting	<p>Two workshops were organized within the project, with the aim to raise local capacities in regard to ecosystem services. A total of 16 representatives of local stakeholders participated in these workshops (including: Municipality of Nikšić, Local community of Tovic, Local community of Uzdomir, TV Nikšić, together with several national level NGOs). On the workshops, the participants learned about the concept of ecosystem services, the ways of assessing and valuing ecosystem services, and the means of mainstreaming that information into the decision-making processes, with the aim of improving biodiversity protection as well as ensuring the sustainable flow of ecosystem services</p> <p>The project was concluded with the final project conference, instead of the meeting that was originally envisaged. This was a result of the decision made through established cooperation with other CEPF grantees. The purpose of the conference was to introduce the findings of different projects to decision makers, practitioners and the general public in Niksic and wider.</p>

	<p>The conference was a one day event. It was held on the 1<sup>st</sup> of June 2022. Although representatives of the municipal bodies were invited, only one participated.</p> <p>The project publications included a brochure and a study (both printed in 50 copies and online version). Hard copies were delivered to these actors, so they are able to access all the information and are expected to utilise it in their further work.</p> <p>The educational video was also prepared as planned and distributed via CCCNRE's YouTube channel. On the day of the conference, it was also broadcasted on the local TV Niksic.</p> <p>Link to the broadcast can be found here:  <a href="https://fb.watch/edvtxpijHc/?fs=e&amp;s=cl">https://fb.watch/edvtxpijHc/?fs=e&amp;s=cl</a> (from the 58th minute)</p>
--	---

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

We had a very good response from the local community and the municipality. They actively participated in trainings, information gathering and surveys, as well as dissemination through social networks and the local TV station. With the vast majority of stakeholders, there is a great awareness of the importance and preservation of the Nikšić field, and this is a value that must be used for these processes.

**PART II: Project Products/Deliverables**

**5. List each product/deliverable as stated in your approved proposal and describe the results for each of them:**

#	Deliverable Description	Deliverable Update
1.1	Prepared a document on valuation and assessment of ecosystem services in Niksic field as a policy recommendation	<p><i>Indicator: document prepared and published</i></p> <p>We prepared the document titled: <i>Assessment and valuation of ecosystem services of Niksic Field – Recommendations to decision makers for mainstreaming ecosystem services in development planning</i>. The document was prepared as a position paper on the basis of the inputs from local stakeholders, analysis of the existing data and literature, expert opinions and the results of two specifically designed surveys. More detailed methodology is described in section 6.</p> <p>Document (in Montenegrin) has 32 pages, and is attached to this report.</p>

		<p><i>Indicator: at least 150 people participating in the data gathering survey</i></p> <p>After applying the relevant methodology (6 step IES methodology, see section 6), we designed two data gathering surveys – one was for the general public in Niksic, and was aiming to determine the understanding of the ecosystem services by the local population and social and economic values. In this survey, 212 people participated. The second one was for the agricultural producers in Niksic Field, aiming to determine the ecological impact of agricultural production in this area, so that recommendations on its improvement can be made. 48 people participated in this survey. So in total, the final number of participants in the two surveys was 260.</p> <p><i>Indicator: document prepared and published , document presented on the meeting to local authorities (at least 3 representatives)</i></p> <p>The document was prepared and published in hard copy and online version. It was presented on the final conference that was organised jointly by CEPF grantees (on the 1<sup>st</sup> of June 2022, in Hotel Onogost. It was attended by 13 participants, among them one representative of the municipality, However, the document and other project outputs were sent directly to the municipal authorities (mayor, municipal manager, directors of departments for environmental protection, agriculture, and others).</p>
2.1	<p>oRaise capacities of main stakeholders: At least 15 local stakeholder representatives in Niksic field are instructed in the biodiversity's contribution to wellbeing and livelihoods through the ecosystem services</p>	<p><i>Indicator: Two-day training/scoping event organised, Indicator: number of participants (at least 8), representativeness of stakeholder groups (at least 5 groups)</i></p> <p>The two trainings were organized as envisaged. A total of 16 participants were present, from 4 stakeholder groups (2 from municipality, 8 from local communes, 4 from NGOs, 2 from local media).</p> <p>The first workshop was held on the 23rd of July 2021, at Hotel Onogost in Niksic. The workshop was a one full day event, and representatives of local stakeholders were invited. The aim was to familiarise the participants with the concept of ecosystem services, and use their knowledge and inputs to scope the ecosystem services within the Field of Nikšić and select the priority ones for further analysis. This workshop was attended by 8 participants, representing local authorities, local communes, local media and NGOs. The participants provided inputs, on which basis the following ecosystem</p>

		<p>services were prioritised for further analysis: food production (cultivated crops), animal feed (pastures, haying meadows), pollination, landscape aesthetics, opportunities for recreation and tourism. This provided the basis for designing the subsequent research (design of the questionnaires and valuation methods, basis for preparation of the promotional materials).</p> <p>The second workshop (also a full day event) was held on the 15th of October, in Nikšić (venue: Hotel Onogošt). The aim was to analyse the conditions, trends, drivers of change and main stakeholders for the five ecosystem services prioritised on the first workshop. This workshop was also attended by 8 participants, representing local authorities, local communes, local media and NGOs. The results from the workshop were used to refine the research design. On this basis, it was decided to organise the research in three main courses – an in-depth analysis of the small scale agriculture in Niksic field, analysis of recreation and tourism values and research into the social and cultural values placed by the local inhabitants on the nature and biodiversity of Niksic Field.</p> <p>Through both workshops, the participants gained an increased understanding on the concept of ecosystem services, and the ways of using this concept in the nature protection context.</p> <p>Detailed reports from the two workshops were prepared, and can be found in Annex 1.</p>
2.2	Local community educated about the ecosystem services of Niksic field for wider public	<p><i>Indicator: Brochure prepared and printed (50 copies)</i></p> <p>The brochure was prepared on the basis of the research and data analysis. It contains information on ecosystems of Niksic Field, the services they provide, problems they are facing and recommendations to different stakeholders on how to reduce their impact on the local ecosystems. The brochure (in Montenegrin) is 20 pages long, and can be accessed <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p><i>Indicator: number of people actively accessing the brochure (at least 100 downloads and 100 views)</i></p> <p>At the time of this report, the brochure was shared on the Facebook page of CCCNRE, Faculty of Food Technology, Food Safety and Ecology of University of Donja Gorica from which it reached 300 people. Individual people have also shared the post, but we don't have insights into web statistics from other profiles.</p>

		<p><i>Indicator: Video recorded and uploaded on YouTube, minimum 500 views and 100 shares by the end of the project</i></p> <p>At the moment of this report, the video had 541 views (from Facebook and Youtube). It has not reached 100 shares, but the video was streamed on TV Niksic on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June.</p> <p>The video can be viewed on the following link:  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR120EVbfhCWk338CA6V7q6OsIM19y5WnxN6ibAnG4Qa8BpRVkOsFbW-Fgo&amp;v=2gE-vxhwfrQ&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?fbclid=IwAR120EVbfhCWk338CA6V7q6OsIM19y5WnxN6ibAnG4Qa8BpRVkOsFbW-Fgo&amp;v=2gE-vxhwfrQ&amp;feature=youtu.be</a></p>
3.1	All Reports submitted to CEPF within a deadline	<p>Indicators:</p> <p><i>Indicators: Completed tracking tools, safeguard documents and reports: CSTT (first), GTT (first), METT (first); stakeholder engagement plan and health plan (for both documents first and final); progress report and financial reports (first and second); final completion report and final financial report</i></p> <p>The tracking tools , final progress and financial reports were prepared and submitted as separate documents.</p>

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

Overall methodology used within the project was 6 step Integration of Ecosystem Services into Development Planning (IES) methodology, developed by German organisation GIZ. It consists of the following 6 steps

1. Defining the scope of the ecosystem services assessment and valuation
2. Analysis and prioritisation of ecosystem services in the target region
3. Identifying the conditions, trends and compromises between ecosystem services
4. The assessment of institutional and cultural framework
5. Preparation of better decision making
6. Implementation of change

Detailed information on this approach can be found [here](#).

This methodology applies participative approach, so within it, two workshops were organised in order to gather relevant stakeholders and obtain their inputs for the six steps of the process. Workshop combined presentations, brainstorming and guided discussion approaches(detailed reports on workshops with how the methodology was applied are prepared as separate documents).

Based on stakeholder inputs, particular ecosystem services were prioritised for more detailed analysis of their ecologic, economic and social values.

*Methods of ecological valuation of ecosystem services:*

This was carried out through mapping of ecosystems and their services. Distribution of ecosystems was determined by using the Corine Land Cover (CLC), and converting the land use categories into ecosystem types. This was enhanced with the participative mapping, where the stakeholders were identifying the areas of ecosystem services supply and utilisation. The presence of important species and habitats was determined on the basis of desk top research into the existing literature and databases.

#### *Methods for economic valuation of ecosystem services*

We used the methods of market prices and production function methods to determine the economic values of prioritised services. The inputs were obtained from the market analysis, existing statistical databases and the results of two specifically designed surveys.

#### *Methods of social valuation of ecosystem services*

Determined on the basis of the preference analysis through two specifically designed surveys.

#### *Surveys carried out within this project*

On the basis of the participatory process, the priority ecosystem services for more detailed analysis were the ones related to food production (locally grown food, pastures and pollination), opportunities for recreation and tourism and aesthetic values.

They were specifically designed in order to obtain the inputs for the analysis within this project. The first survey targeted agricultural producers. It had a dual purpose – to obtain the relevant data for the social and economic valuation of the prioritised ecosystem services as well as to assess what is the impact of the agricultural production in Niskic Field on biodiversity. This survey had 50 questions, it was carried out online and in person, and it was filled in by 48 agricultural producers from the whole of Niskic Field.

The second survey targeted general public in Niskic, and its aim was to determine the social values that the people of Niskic place on biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as to assess the attitudes of local inhabitants towards the biodiversity and the issues it faces within Niskic Field. This survey was carried out online and in person, and a total of 212 people took part. The results were analysed with relevant statistical analysis in SPSS software.

Relevant experts were engaged in this process, and they performed desk top research into the relevant literature, databases, legislation, policy documents, applying deduction, induction, comparisons and historic methods in order to assess the ecological, economic and social values of ecosystem services in Niskic field.

The project products were

Document: *Assessment and valuation of ecosystem services of Niskic Field – Recommendations to decision makers for mainstreaming ecosystem services in development planning*

Brochure: *Nature and people of Niskic Field – challenges and opportunities for development*(download [here](#))

Video: *Nature and people of Niskic Field – challenges and opportunities for development*(view [here](#))

### **PART III: Lessons, Sustainability, Safeguards and Financing**



## Lessons Learned

### **7. Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building.**

“Lessons learned” are experiences you have gained that you think would be valuable successes worth replicating or practices that you would do differently if you had the chance. Consider lessons that would inform project design and implementation, and any other lessons relevant to the conservation community. CEPF Lessons Learned Guidelines are available here: <https://www.cepf.net/sites/default/files/cepf-lessons-learned-guidelines-english.pdf>.

- The implementation of this project was the opportunity for our organisation’s capacity building. In this process, we have greatly improved our knowledge and skills in designing and conducting sociological surveys as well the statistical analysis of the results. This will be very useful in planning some future research projects.

- We have learned that there is a general inertia of decision makers and particular stakeholder groups to take part and actively contribute to solving the issues of nature protection. The participation at workshops and within the research surveys should have been better. Although we have engaged the support from the local NGOs (CEPF grantees) and various personal contacts, and joined forces with other NGOs, the participation of the most relevant decision makers was still lacking. For the future, we will try to find alternative communication channels towards them, and find particular persons of authority as our champions (e.g. local community leaders, religious authorities and such). In the future projects of this kind, we will also envisage special communication strategies as part of the project design from the very start in order to mitigate these kind of problems.

- In the initial project design we have underestimated the time required for this kind of research, so we had to ask for the no-cost extension of the project in order to finalise all the planned activities. In the future, we will plan similar activities with this experience in mind.

## Sustainability / Replication

### **8. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated, including any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability.**

The sustainability of this project was envisaged in a way to produce outputs that will be used by the local authorities, and to increase the capacities of local stakeholders to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services protection into their future work. At this stage it is early to estimate the impacts of this, but we have prepared a list of concrete recommendations to the local decision makers on how they can mainstream ecosystem services into their local development plan. The new development plan for the Municipality of Niksic is being prepared at the time of this report, and we have presented the local authorities with the new knowledge and recommendations that can be directly integrated into this plan. If this is achieved, the ecosystem services will achieve their mainstreaming into the main municipal strategic document.

The approach applied here can be replicated by other organisations and/or on other locations.

During the project implementations, the CEPF grantees have come together, and decided to continue cooperation beyond the scope of their respective projects. The idea is to lobby for the improved nature protection with joined forces, to propose the establishment of new protected areas and better management of the existing ones, as well as to push for solving the chronic environmental issues in this region, such as the industrial pollution, poor waste management etc.

**Safeguards**

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

There were no complaints received about the project. In accordance with the given instructions, all stakeholders were able to file a complaint to the CCCNRE via mail or post. Stakeholders were actively involved in data collection, surveys, and training throughout the all process of project implementation. They were also provided with a study for inspection before the public presentation, where they had the opportunity to give their comments. The separated stakeholder engagement plan was submitted along with this report.

Having in mind that the project was not threatened by COVID or COVID protection measures, there was no need to implement additional activities listed in initial the Health and Safety plan which was submitted separately.

**Additional Funding**

- 10. Provide details of any additional funding that you have secured to support this project.**

- a. Total additional funding (US\$)**

There was no additional funding to this project.

- b. Type of funding**

Please provide a breakdown of additional funding (counterpart funding and in-kind) by source.

Donor	Type of Funding	Amount

**Additional Comments/Recommendations**

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

During the implementation of the projects under this grant call, the grantee organisations came together and joined forces in order to strengthen the messages of nature protection towards the decision makers. Although it is not possible to estimate the impact at this point, this kind of approach was useful for all the participating NGOs. It improved the exchange of information, coordination of action, better participation in planned events. So, bringing the grantees of the same grant call and/or target region together and promoting their networking and cooperation is a practice CEPF should exercise in the future.

**PART IV: Impact at Portfolio and Global Level**

**Contribution to Portfolio Indicators**

**12.** In order to measure the results of CEPF investment strategy at the hotspot level, CEPF uses a set of Portfolio Indicators which are presented in the Ecosystem Profile of each hotspot. Please list these below and report on the project’s contribution(s) to them.

Indicator	Actual Numeric Contribution	Actual Contribution Description
2.4. Number of Freshwater KBAs in priority CMZ with improved information on biodiversity, shared with stakeholders	1	KBA Trebjesa MNE15 The research conducted in Catchment management zone Niksic, where KBA Trebjesa is included, provided new information on the ecosystems, their pressures, ecosystem services they provide and ecological, social and economic values of these services. The information was presented in the document for decision makers, brochure and promotional video for the general public. All were disseminated in hard copy, online (via web sites and social networks). The video was also streamed by TV Niksic.

**Contribution to Global Indicators**

**Please report on all Global Indicators that pertain to your project.**

**13. Benefits to Individuals**

**13a. Number of men and women receiving structured training.**

Report on the number of men and women that have benefited from structured training due to your project, such as financial management, beekeeping, horticulture, farming, biological surveys, or how to conduct a patrol.

# of men receiving structured training*	# of women receiving structured training*	Topic(s) of Training
8	8	Ecosystem services (their assessment and valuation, means of mainstreaming into development planning)

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received structured training in beekeeping, and 3 of these also received structured training in project management, the total number of men who benefited from structured training should be 5.*

### 13b. Number of men and women receiving cash benefits.

Report on the number of men and women that had an increase in income or cash (monetary) benefits due to your project from activities such as tourism, handicraft production, increased farm output, increased fishery output, medicinal plant harvest, or payment for conducting patrols.

# of men receiving cash benefits*	# of women receiving cash benefits*	Description of Benefits
/	/	

*\*Please do not count the same person more than once. For example, if 5 men received cash benefits due to tourism, and 3 of these also received cash benefits from increased income due to handicrafts, the total number of men who received cash benefits should be 5.*

### 14. Protected Areas

#### Number of hectares of protected areas created and/or expanded

Report on the number of hectares of protected areas that have been created or expanded as a result of your project. Protected areas may include private or community reserves, municipal or provincial parks, or other designations where biodiversity conservation is an official management goal.

Name of PA*	Country(s)	Original # of Hectares*	# of Hectares Newly Protected	Year of Legal Declaration/Expansion	Longitude***	Latitude***

*\* If possible please provide a shape file of the protected area to CEPF.*

*\*\* Enter the original total size, excluding the results of your project. If the protected area was not existing before your project, then enter zero.*

\*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456). To obtain the latitude and longitude of your protected area, use googlemap, right click on the center of your protected area, and select "What's here?", and copy the latitude and longitude appearing in the popup window.

## 15. Key Biodiversity Area Management

### Number of hectares of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) with improved management

Report on the number of hectares in KBAs with improved management, where tangible results have been achieved to support conservation, as a result of your project. Examples of improved management include, but are not restricted to: increased patrolling, reduced intensity of snaring, invasive species eradication, reduced incidence of fire, and introduction of sustainable agricultural/fisheries practices. Do not record the entire area covered by the project - only record the number of hectares that have improved management.

If you have recorded part or all of a KBA as newly protected for the indicator entitled "protected areas", and you have also improved its management, you should record the relevant number of hectares for both this indicator and the "protected areas" indicator.

Name of KBA	KBA Code from Ecosystem Profile	# of Hectares Improved *
/		

\* Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were improved due to implementation of a fire management regime in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were improved due to invasive species removal in the second year, the total number of hectares with improved management would be 500.

## 16. Production landscapes

### Number of hectares of production landscape with strengthened management of biodiversity

Please report on the number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity, as a result of your project. A production landscape is defined as a landscape where commercial agriculture, forestry or natural product exploitation occurs.

- For an area to be considered as having "strengthened management of biodiversity," it can benefit from a wide range of interventions such as best practices and guidelines implemented, incentive schemes introduced, sites/products certified, and sustainable harvesting regulations introduced.
- Areas that are protected are not included under this indicator, because their hectares are counted elsewhere.
- A Production Landscape can include part or all of an unprotected KBA.

Name of Production Landscape*	# of Hectares with Strengthened Management**	Latitude***	Longitude***	Description of Intervention

\* If the production landscape does not have a name, provide a brief descriptive name for the landscape.

\*\*Do not count the same hectares more than once. For example, if 500 hectares were strengthened due to certification in the first year, and 200 of these same 500 hectares were strengthened due to new harvesting regulations in the second year, the total number of hectares strengthened to date would be 500.

\*\*\* Indicate the latitude and longitude of the center of the site, to the extent possible, or send a map or shapefile to CEPF. Give geographic coordinates in decimal degrees; latitudes in the Southern Hemisphere and longitudes in the Western Hemisphere should be denoted with a minus sign (example: Latitude 38.123456 Longitude: -77.123456). To obtain the latitude and longitude of your production landscape, use googlemap, right click on the center of your production landscape, and select "What's here?", and copy the latitude and longitude appearing in the popup window.

### 17. Benefits to Communities

CEPF wants to record the non-cash benefits received by communities, which can differ to those received by individuals because the benefits are available to a group. CEPF also wants to record, to the extent possible, the number of people within each community who are benefiting. Please report on the characteristics of the communities, the type of benefits that have been received during the project, and the number of men/boys and women/girls from these communities that have benefited, as a result of your project. If exact numbers are not known, please provide an estimate.

Please provide information for all communities that have benefited from project start to project completion.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics (mark with x)							Country of Community	Type of Benefit (mark with x)								# of Beneficiaries	
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Other*		Increased access to clean water	Increased food security	Increased access to energy	Increased access to public services (e.g. health care, education)	Increased resilience to climate change	Improved land tenure	Improved recognition of traditional	Improved representation and decision-making in governance forums/structures	Improved access to ecosystem services	# of men and boys benefiting

\*If you marked "Other" to describe the community characteristic, please explain:

**18. Policies, Laws and Regulations**

Report on policies, laws and regulations with conservation provisions that have been enacted or amended, as a result of your project. “Policies” pertain to statements of intent formally adopted or pursued by a government, including at sectoral or sub-national level. “Laws and regulations” pertain to official rules or orders, prescribed by authority. Any law, regulation, decree or order is eligible to be included.

**18a. Name, scope and topic of the policy, law or regulation that has been amended or enacted as a result of your project**

No.	Name of Law, Policy or Regulation	Scope (mark with x)			Topic(s) addressed (mark with x)																
		Local	National	International	Agriculture	Climate	Ecosystem Management	Education	Energy	Fisheries	Forestry	Mining and Quarrying	Planning/Zoning	Pollution	Protected Areas	Species Protection	Tourism	Transportation	Wildlife Trade	Other*	
1	/																				
2																					
...																					

\* If you selected “other”, please give a brief description of the main topics addressed by the policy, law or regulation.

**18b. For each law, policy or regulation listed above, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.**

No.	Country(s)	Date enacted/ amended MM/DD/YYYY	Expected impact	Action that you performed to achieve this change



1	/			
2				
3				

## 19. Biodiversity-friendly Practices

### Number of companies that adopt biodiversity-friendly practices

Please list any companies that have adopted biodiversity-friendly practices as a result of your project. While companies take various forms, for the purposes of CEPF, a company is defined as a for-profit business entity. A biodiversity-friendly practice is one that conserves or uses natural resources in a sustainable manner.

No.	Name of Company	Description of biodiversity-friendly practice adopted during the project	Country(s) where the practice has been adopted by the company
1	/		
2			
...			

## 20. Networks & Partnerships

### Number of networks and/or partnerships created and/or strengthened

Report on any networks or partnerships between and among civil society groups and other sectors that you have created or strengthened as a result of your project. Networks/partnerships should have some lasting benefit beyond immediate project implementation. Informal networks/partnerships are acceptable. Examples of networks/partnerships include: an alliance of fisherfolk to promote sustainable fisheries practices, a network of environmental journalists, a partnership between one or more NGOs with one or more private sector partners to improve biodiversity management on private lands, or a working group focusing on reptile conservation.

Do not list the partnerships you formed with others to implement this project, unless these partnerships will continue after your project ends.

No.	Name of Network / Partnership	Year established	Did your project establish this Network/ Partnership? Y/N	Country(s) covered	Purpose
1	Networking in the Niksic field - NGO sector (Drustvo mladnih ekologa, Centar za klimatske	2021	Y	Montenegro	NGOs working in the Niksic field – CEPF held regular meetings, exchanged information, organized events and created an informal (for now)

	promjene, prirodne resurse i energiju)- Crnogorsko društvo ekologa- Regionalni)				partnership that has helped in the implementation of every project in this area. We expect that the good practice of cooperation will continue and that we will continue to work on the preservation of the natural values of the Niksic field, as well as the river Zeta, and carry out joint and individual activities in this area.
2					
...					

## 21. Sustainable Financing Mechanism

List any functioning sustainable financing mechanisms created or supported by your project. Sustainable financing mechanisms generate funding for the long-term (generally five or more years). These include, but are not limited to, conservation trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, payment for ecosystem service (PES) schemes, and other revenue, fee or tax schemes that generate long-term funding for conservation. To be included, a mechanism must be delivering funds for conservation.

### 21a. Details about the mechanism

No.	Name of Financing Mechanism	Purpose of the Mechanism*	Date of Establishment**	Description***	Countries
1	/				
2					
3					

\*Please provide a succinct description of the mission of the mechanism.

\*\*Please indicate when the sustainable financing mechanism was officially created. If you do not know the exact date, provide a best estimate.

\*\*\*Description, such as trust fund, endowment, PES scheme, incentive scheme, etc.

### 21b. Performance of the mechanism

For each Financing Mechanism listed previously, please provide the requested information in accordance with its assigned number.

NO.	Project intervention (mark with x)	Has the mechanism disbursed funds to conservation projects?
-----	------------------------------------	---

	Created a mechanism	Supported an existing mechanism	Created and supported a new mechanism	
1	/			
2				
3				

## 22.Red List Species

If the project included direct conservation interventions that benefited globally threatened species (CR, EN, VU), as per the IUCN Red List, add the species below.

Examples of interventions include: preparation or implementation of a conservation action plan, captive breeding programs, species habitat protection, species monitoring, patrolling to halt wildlife trafficking, and removal of invasive species.

Genus	Species	Common Name (Eng)	Status (VU, EN, CR or Extinct in the Wild)	Intervention	Population Trend at Site (increasing, decreasing, stable or unknown)
/					

## Part V. Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

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

Provide the contact details of your organization (organization name and generic email address) so that interested parties can request further information about your project.

**Organization Name:**Centre for Climate Change, Natural Resources and Energy

**Generic email address:**[ccnre@udg.edu.me](mailto:ccnre@udg.edu.me)