

## **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund**

Eleventh Meeting of the Donor Council  
World Bank Headquarters, Washington, DC  
18 July 2007

### **Setting Priorities for Future Investment**

#### **Recommended Action Item:**

The Donor Council is asked to **review** and **approve** the attached paper entitled “Setting Priorities for Future Investment.” The paper, based on a consensus of the CEPF Working Group, proposes an indicative list of hotspots for future CEPF investment and the first three new regions to subsequently begin profile preparation.

#### **Background:**

In April 2007, the CEPF Secretariat prepared an information matrix for all hotspots and four scenarios for future investment for discussion with the CEPF Working Group at its sixteenth meeting held on 27 April 2007.

The scenarios offered a continuum of four potential and varied scenarios illustrating the range of possible choices among the entire current list of 34 global biodiversity hotspots. Each of the four scenarios relied on a consistent ranking formula displayed in tables that compared all of the hotspots based on the number of endemic plant species; civil society capacity; the percentage of remaining habitat; and the total GEF allocation under the Resource Allocation Framework. Additional information on conservation gains under prior CEPF investment and opportunities for sustainability were provided in a supplementary ranking.

Working Group members expressed differing emphases in assigning priorities among new and existing regions, but reached a consensus on an approach that combined elements of the scenarios prepared by the CEPF Secretariat. The scenarios paper was thus subsequently refined and discussed again at the Seventeenth Meeting of the Working Group on 6 June 2007.

This paper presented for Donor Council endorsement is based on a consensus of the Working Group.

In addition to the three new regions for which ecosystem profiles were approved in April (the Indo-Burma, Polynesia-Micronesia, and Western Ghats and Sri Lanka hotspots), the paper proposes combining an emphasis on additional new regions that would receive full investment with selected existing regions that would receive shorter term and smaller amounts to consolidate conservation gains achieved by earlier CEPF actions.

## **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund**

Eleventh Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council  
World Bank Headquarters, Washington, DC.

18 July 2007

### **Setting Priorities for Future Investment**

Expanding on the seminal article published by Norman Myers in 1988 that began the systematic targeting of conservation priorities, *Hotspots*, published in 1999, identified 25 regions as the most urgent locations for terrestrial conservation action to diminish the global loss of biodiversity. Standard, data-driven criteria were used to construct this list of hotspots, providing a transparent and replicable method for making the necessary strategic choices at a global level. Combined, those places provided habitat for more than 50 percent of all terrestrial plants and animals within less than 2 percent of the Earth's land surface, making them obvious targets for the most efficient use of the scarce funding available for international conservation.

Taking advantage of that efficiency and the large operational impact of bringing civil society structures more comprehensively into conservation programs provided the basic rationale for the establishment of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) in 2000. Those distinguishing aspects of CEPF continue to motivate its work.

The CEPF Donor Council used the 1999 hotspots list as the basis for selecting the initial priorities for CEPF investment. Although the hotspots are defined by ecosystem boundaries rather than political frontiers, the choice of target regions for CEPF investment was also shaped by several political and economic criteria applied to the countries that harbor them. These national government variables included being a signatory of the Convention on Biological Diversity and being a member country of the World Bank.

Hotspots in high-income countries (such as Southwest Australia and New Zealand) were not included because they did not meet the eligibility criteria. Several of the original 25 hotspots presented a mix of eligible and ineligible countries (such as the Mediterranean Basin and the insular Caribbean), and they were not selected for CEPF's initial investment period. Others (the Cerrado, Central Chile, and Wallacea) offered fewer opportunities for early investment.

As a result of these considerations, the Donor Council ultimately selected 18 regions within 17 of the original 25 hotspots as priorities for CEPF investment. CEPF has awarded grants in 15 regions within 14 of those hotspots since the program was launched in 2000 (the Mesoamerica Hotspot was divided into two regions). Ecosystem profiles were completed for the three additional hotspots selected as priorities for CEPF investment—Indo-Burma, Polynesia-Micronesia, and Western Ghats and Sri Lanka—however, the Donor Council decided that a sixth donor partner would be needed before implementation could begin.

In 2004, the list of hotspots was revised and expanded to 34 regions, as described in *Hotspots Revisited*. In that volume, nine new ecosystems were added to the global list and the boundaries of several original hotspots were altered, all as a result of new data. The same criteria used in the first analysis were employed in constructing the larger list.

In addition to the changes resulting from the more recent analysis, planning for a new CEPF 5-year Strategic Framework and expansion of the global program raise many questions about the options for reinvestment. Considering areas of earlier CEPF grantmaking for additional investment would need to include consideration of the potential new targets offered by the longer list of ecosystems now qualified for CEPF attention. Consequently, the CEPF Working Group asked the CEPF Secretariat to recommend a tentative priority list of regions for future investment, using the revised, full list of 34 hotspots and a target of at least 14 hotspots for future investment as defined in the new Strategic Framework.

Criteria suggested for use in making these recommendations were:

- 1) a mix of new regions with those previously receiving CEPF investment;
- 2) geographic balance among global regions (Africa, Asia, Latin America);
- 3) some emphasis on ecosystems in countries slated to receive less GEF funding under the new Resource Allocation Framework (RAF);
- 4) complementarity with other programs of CEPF's partners;
- 5) the level of biodiversity and urgency of the threats;
- 6) the capacity of civil society organizations;
- 7) potential for phase-out grants over 1-2 years to consolidate gains in previously supported regions; and
- 8) positive policy environments for conservation.

In April 2007, the CEPF Secretariat prepared an information matrix for all hotspots and four scenarios for future investment for discussion with the Working Group at its sixteenth meeting held on 27 April 2007.

The scenarios offered a continuum of the four potential and varied scenarios illustrating the range of possible choices among the entire hotspot list. Each of the four scenarios relied on a consistent ranking formula displayed in tables that compared all 34 regions based on the number of endemic plant species; civil society capacity; the percentage of remaining habitat; and the total GEF allocation. Additional information on conservation gains under prior CEPF investment and opportunities for sustainability was also included in a supplementary ranking of only those 10 hotspots where CEPF investment would end as of July 2007.

All scenarios assumed the inclusion of the Indo-Burma, Polynesia-Micronesia, and Western Ghats and Sri Lanka hotspots, and therefore presented 11 additional priorities for investment to meet the target of at least 14 regions for future investment. As l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD) joined the partnership in March 2007, the Donor Council approved the ecosystem profiles and spending authority for these three hotspots in April 2007 and therefore designated these regions as the first for future CEPF investment.

The information matrix and tables are included as an appendix to this document.

Working Group members expressed differing emphases in assigning priorities among new and existing regions, but reached a consensus on an approach that combined elements of the scenarios prepared by the CEPF Secretariat. The scenarios paper was thus subsequently refined and discussed again at the Seventeenth Meeting of the Working Group on 6 June 2007.

This paper presents the proposed priorities for future investment and the first regions to subsequently begin profile preparation based on a consensus of the Working Group.

## **Proposed Priorities for Future Investment**

CEPF would combine an emphasis on 10 new regions that would receive full investment with selected existing regions that would receive shorter term and smaller amounts to consolidate conservation gains achieved by earlier CEPF actions. The indicative list of hotspots for future CEPF consolidation and full investment are detailed in the text below and in the table on page 5, which also includes the criteria used to rank the hotspots.

The three regions for which the Donor Council approved ecosystem profiles and spending authority in April 2007 would be the first new priorities:

- 1) Indo-Burma (Indochina)
- 2) Polynesia-Micronesia
- 3) Western Ghats and Sri Lanka (Western Ghats)

4-7) All 13 of the existing regions that will be closed by July 2008 would be eligible for consolidation grants, drawing from a total consolidation allocation of \$20-24 million. That amount approximates the total budget of four conventional regional investments out of the 14 that constitute the goal for new grantmaking and would take the place of four new regions (thus accounting for targets 4 through 7 in the investment plan).

Consolidation grants would be designed to capitalize on opportunities to both advance and sustain the conservation gains made as a result of the full portfolio experience. They would aim in particular to reinforce the networks among civil society organizations and the partnerships these organizations have formed with government agencies as results of earlier CEPF investments. To take advantage of existing momentum, relationships, and staff experience, such a portfolio of grants, if approved, should be undertaken promptly.

The 13 regions eligible for consolidation grants would be:

- Atlantic Forest (Brazil)
- Cape Floristic Region
- Caucasus
- Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya
- Guinean Forests of West Africa (Upper Guinean Forest)
- Madagascar
- Mountains of Southwest China
- Philippines
- Southern Mesoamerica
- Succulent Karoo
- Sundaland (Sumatra)
- Tropical Andes (Vilcabamba-Amboró Corridor)
- Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena (Chocó-Manabí Corridor)

In choosing additional hotspots as priorities, five new hotspots would be selected based on the comprehensive ranking that combines the indicated variables with two exceptions: the Irano-Anatolian Hotspot, excluded because of U.S. government restrictions on investment, and the Horn of Africa, which presents serious implementation problems but could be considered along with the adjacent Eastern Afromontane region.

The first five to be selected would be:

- 8) Mediterranean Basin

- 9) Caribbean Islands
- 10) East Melanesian Islands
- 11) Eastern Afromontane (incorporating the Horn of Africa as appropriate)
- 12) Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany

Two regions that ranked higher than Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany—the Madrean Pine Oak Woodlands and Cerrado hotspots—would not be selected at this time because of existing and planned GEF investment. However, the two remaining regions required to reach the total of 14 would be selected at a later date at the discretion of the Donor Council from the following five hotspots:

Madrean Pine-Oak Woodlands  
Cerrado  
Wallacea  
Chilean Winter Rainfall-Valdivian Forests  
Mountains of Central Asia

This mixed approach yields a scenario that produces the most complete achievement of the criteria recommended by the Working Group. It combines investment in previous regions with a strong emphasis on new ones through including a set of grants designed to consolidate conservation gains made in the first five years of investment. The systematic ranking formula includes assessments of civil society strength and gives greater weight to ecosystems in countries that are slated to receive smaller GEF allocations. As well, it includes indicators of the level of biodiversity and the urgency of threats. Fundamentally, it gives CEPF a consistent and explainable set of priorities that stand a good chance of maximizing the impact of future investments.

### **Sequencing of Priorities**

As during the first phase of the global program, the sequencing of new hotspots for ecosystem profile preparation and subsequent investment would be staggered based on CEPF Secretariat capacity and available resources.

The sequencing of new priorities for profiling would, in general, follow the ranking in the attached tables as detailed above with the exception of the East Melanesian Islands, in which a delay is recommended so CEPF can derive lessons from implementation in the adjacent Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot.

Thus, the Mediterranean Basin, Caribbean Islands, and Eastern Afromontane hotspots are recommended to be the first approved by the Donor Council for profile preparation.

All Hotspots, Ranked by Priority Formula (updated 18 June 2007 to include priority status recommendation)

Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)	Number of Endemic Plant Species	Civil Society Capacity Score	% Remaining Habitat	Total GEF allocation, millions US\$	Priority Formula	Recommendation
Mediterranean Basin	11700	3	5	31.0	22645.16	New priority
Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands	11600	4	10	36.8	12608.70	Eligible for consolidation
Sundaland	15000	3	7	56.6	11357.90	Eligible for consolidation
Horn of Africa	2750	5	5	25.0	11000.00	Not a priority in its own right due to implementation challenges but may be considered as part of Eastern Afromontane profiling, as appropriate
Philippines	6091	2	7	21.3	8170.36	Eligible for consolidation
Caribbean Islands	6550	4	10	43.3	6050.81	New priority
Indo-Burma	7000	5	5	118.8	5892.26	New priority; first for investment with ecosystem profile for Indochina approved by Donor Council in April 07
Irano-Anatolian	2500	4	15	19.6	3401.36	Not a priority due to U.S. government restrictions on investment
Mountains of Southwest China	3500	3	8	46.0	2853.26	Eligible for consolidation
Cape Floristic Region	6210	2	20	22.5	2760.00	Eligible for consolidation
Coastal Forests of Eastern Africa	1750	4	10	27.5	2545.45	Eligible for consolidation
East Melanesian Islands	2356	5	30	15.9	2469.60	New priority
Eastern Afromontane*	3000	5	10	64.9	2311.25	New priority (see also Horn of Africa)
Polynesia-Micronesia	3074	3	21	22.1	1987.07	New priority; first for investment with ecosystem profile approved in April 07
Guinean Forests West Africa	1800	5	15	34.7	1729.11	Eligible for consolidation
Atlantic Forest	8000	1	8	79.4	1259.45	Eligible for consolidation
Tropical Andes	15000	3	25	143.4	1255.23	Eligible for consolidation
Western Ghats and Sri Lanka	3049	3	23	36.0	1104.71	New priority; first for investment with ecosystem profile for Western Ghats approved by the Donor Council in April 07
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodlands	3975	3	20	54.6	1092.03	Potential priority for selection in the future at the discretion of the Donor Council.
Succulent Karoo	2439	3	29	29.0	870.04	Eligible for consolidation
Cerrado	4400	3	22	76.3	786.37	Potential priority for selection in the future at the discretion of the Donor Council.
Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany	1900	3	24	31.0	766.13	New priority
Wallacea	1500	3	15	41.4	724.64	Potential priority for selection in the future at the discretion of the Donor Council.
Chilean Winter Rainfall-Valdivian Forests	1957	3	30	30.2	648.01	Potential priority for selection in the future at the discretion of the Donor Council.
Mountains of Central Asia	1500	5	20	65.2	575.15	Potential priority for selection in the future at the discretion of the Donor Council.
Caucasus	1600	4	27	43.2	548.70	Eligible for consolidation
Himalaya	3160	3	25	84.1	450.89	Eligible for consolidation as current investment does not end as of July 08
Mesoamerica	2941	3	20	100.2	440.27	Eligible for consolidation for Southern Mesoamerica; Northern Mesoamerica not eligible as current investment ends after July 08
Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena	2750	3	24	96.3	356.96	Eligible for consolidation
California Floristic Province	2124	1	25	54.6	155.60	not considered
Southwest Australia	2984	1	30	0	0	not considered
New Caledonia	2431	2	27	0	0	not considered
Japan	1950	1	20	0	0	not considered
New Zealand	1865	1	22	0	0	not considered

Areas of current/past CEPF investment indicated by green shading

\* The Eastern Afromontane Hotspot is a new hotspot identified during the 2004 hotspot re-evaluation. It includes part of the former Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya Hotspot (specifically the Eastern Arc Mountains).

## **Definitions**

### **Priority Formula**

$$\frac{\# \text{ Endemic Plant Species} \times \text{Civil Society Capacity Score}}{(\% \text{ habitat remaining}/100) \times \text{GEF RAF Allocation in US\$}}$$

### **Scoring for Civil Society Capacity**

- 1 = Local NGOs work comprehensively in coordinated and strategic ways to ensure conservation success and sustainability.
- 2 = Local NGOs have developed a limited capacity to work in coordinated and strategic ways.
- 3 = Emergent local NGOs working in tandem with government and international NGOs, but overall capacity to sustain conservation activities is still weak.
- 4 = Core group of international and local NGOs addressing development and humanitarian sectors, but local environmental NGOs are few and weak.
- 5 = Limited presence of local civil society groups.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Information Matrix for All Hotspots, Alphabetical Order

Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)	Number of Endemic Plant Species	% Remaining Habitat	Civil Society Capacity Score	CEPF investment to Date	Conservation Gains Under Prior CEPF Investment Score*	Opportunities for Sustainability Score*	Countries, with GEF allocation in millions US\$	Total GEF allocation, millions US\$
Atlantic Forest	8000	8	1	Yes. \$8 M. Brazil only. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	4	5	Argentina, 14.5 Brazil, 63.2 Paraguay, 1.7**	79.4
California Floristic Province	2124	25	1	No			United States (n/a) Mexico, 54.6	54.6
Cape Floristic Region	6210	20	2	Yes. \$6 M. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	4	5	South Africa, 22.5	22.5
Caribbean Islands	6550	10	4	No			Antigua & Barbuda, 1.7 Barbados, 1.7 Cuba, 14.7 Dominica, 1.7 Dominican Republic, 5.8 Grenada, 1.7 Haiti, 4.1 Jamaica, 5.1 St. Kitts & Nevis, 1.7 St. Lucia, 1.7 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, 1.7 Trinidad & Tobago, 1.7	43.3
Caucasus	1600	27	4	Yes. \$8.5 M. 5-year cycle ends July 08.			Armenia, 1.7 Azerbaijan, 1.7 Georgia, 1.7 Iran, 6.7 Russia, 25.3 Turkey, 6.1	43.2
Cerrado	4400	22	3	No			Bolivia, 11.4 Brazil, 63.2 Paraguay, 1.7	76.3
Chilean Winter Rainfall-Valdivian Forests	1957	30	3	No			Argentina, 14.5 Chile, 15.7	30.2
Coastal Forests of Eastern Africa	1750	10	4	Yes. \$7 M for Tanzania and Kenya only as part of Eastern Arc Mountains & Coastal Forests Region 5-year cycle ends July 08.			Kenya, 7.9 Mozambique, 6.8 Somalia (n/a) Tanzania, 12.8	27.5
East Melanesian Islands	2356	30	5	No			Papua New Guinea, 12.5 the Solomon Islands, 1.7 Vanuatu, 1.7	15.9
Eastern Afromontane***	3000	10	5	Yes. \$7 M for Tanzania and Kenya only as part of Eastern Arc Mountains & Coastal Forests Region 5-year cycle ends July 08.			Burundi, 1.7 D.R. of Congo, 9.6 Ethiopia, 7.7 Kenya, 7.9 Malawi, 4.2 Mozambique, 6.8 Rwanda, 1.7 Somalia (n/a) Tanzania, 12.8 Uganda, 4.0 Yemen, 1.7 Zambia, 5.1 Zimbabwe, 1.7	64.9
Guinean Forests West Africa	1800	15	5	Yes. \$6.2 M. For Upper Guinean Forest Ecosystem only (Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Togo) 5-year cycle ended Dec. 05.	2	3	Benin, 1.7 Cameroon, 11.9 Côte d'Ivoire, 3.6 Equatorial Guinea, 1.7 Ghana, 1.7 Guinea, 1.7 Liberia, 1.7 Nigeria, 5.6 Sao Tome and Principe, 1.7 Sierra Leone, 1.7 Togo, 1.7	34.7
Himalaya	3160	25	3	Yes. \$5 M. For Bhutan, India, Nepal only. 5-year cycle ends Feb. 2010			Bhutan, 1.7 China, 44.3 India, 29.6 Myanmar, 1.7 Nepal, 1.7 Pakistan, 5.1	84.1

APPENDIX

Table 1. Information Matrix for All Hotspots, Alphabetical Order

Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)	Number of Endemic Plant Species	% Remaining Habitat	Civil Society Capacity Score	CEPF investment to Date	Conservation Gains Under Prior CEPF Investment Score*	Opportunities for Sustainability Score*	Countries, with GEF allocation in millions US\$	Total GEF allocation, millions US\$
Horn of Africa	2750	5	5	No			Djibouti, 1.7 Eritrea, 1.7 Ethiopia, 7.7 Kenya, 7.9 Somalia (n/a) Sudan, 4.3 Yemen, 1.7	25
Indo-Burma	7000	5	5	No. Ecosystem profile for Indochina submitted for Donor Council approval.			Bangladesh, 1.7 Cambodia, 1.7 China, 44.3 India, 29.6 Laos, 5.2 Malaysia, 15.2 Myanmar 1.7 Thailand, 9.2 Vietnam, 10.2	118.8
Irano-Anatolian	2500	15	4	No			Armenia, 1.7 Azerbaijan, 1.7 Georgia, 1.7 Iran, 6.7 Iraq (n/a) Turkey, 6.1 Turkmenistan, 1.7	19.6
Japan	1950	20	1	No			Japan (n/a)	
Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands	11600	10	4	Yes. \$4.3 M. For Madagascar. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 05.	4	4	Madagascar, 24.2 Comoros, 1.7 Mauritius, 5.6 Seychelles, 5.3	36.8
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodlands	3975	20	3	No			Mexico, 54.6	54.6
Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany	1900	24	3	No			Mozambique, 6.8 South Africa, 22.5 Swaziland, 1.7	31
Mediterranean Basin	11700	5	3	No			Algeria, 3.7 Cape Verde, 4.1 Egypt, 4.3 Jordan, 1.7 Lebanon, 1.7 Libya, 1.7 Morocco, 4.3 Syria, 1.7 Tunisia, 1.7 Turkey, 6.1	31
Mesoamerica	2941	20	3	Yes. \$7.3 M. (Northern – Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico) 5-year cycle ends Jan. 09; \$5.5 M. (Southern – Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Panama) 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	4	5	Belize, 1.7 Costa Rica, 12 El Salvador, 1.7 Guatemala, 8.2 Honduras, 6.8 Mexico, 54.6 Nicaragua, 4.0 Panama, 11.2	100.2
Mountains of Central Asia	1500	20	5	No			Afghanistan, 3.5 China, 44.3 Kazakhstan, 5.5 Kyrgyzstan, 1.7 Pakistan, 5.1 Tajikistan, 1.7 Turkmenistan, 1.7 Uzbekistan, 1.7	65.2
Mountains of Southwest China	3500	8	3	Yes. \$6.5 M. For China. 5-year cycle ended June 07.	3	3	China, 44.3 Myanmar, 1.7	46
New Caledonia	2431	27	2	No			New Caledonia (n/a)	
New Zealand	1865	22	1	No			New Zealand (n/a)	
Philippines	6091	7	2	Yes. \$7 M. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	3	4	Philippines, 21.3	21.3

APPENDIX

Table 1. Information Matrix for All Hotspots, Alphabetical Order

Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)	Number of Endemic Plant Species	% Remaining Habitat	Civil Society Capacity Score	CEPF investment to Date	Conservation Gains Under Prior CEPF Investment Score*	Opportunities for Sustainability Score*	Countries, with GEF allocation in millions US\$	Total GEF allocation, millions US\$
Polynesia-Micronesia	3074	21	3	No. Ecosystem profile submitted for Donor Council approval.			Cook Islands, 1.7 Fiji, 5.1 Kiribati, 1.7 Marshall Islands, 1.7 Micronesia, 1.7 Nauru, 1.7 Niue, 1.7 Palau, 1.7 Samoa, 1.7 Tokelau Tonga, 1.7 Tuvalu, 1.7	22.1
Southwest Australia	2984	30	1	No			Australia (n/a)	
Succulent Karoo	2439	29	3	Yes. \$8 M. 5-year cycle ends Feb. 08.			Namibia, 6.5 South Africa, 22.5	29
Sundaland	15000	7	3	Yes. \$10 M. Sumatra only. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	3	4	Indonesia, 41.4 Malaysia, 15.2	56.6
Tropical Andes	15000	25	3	Yes. \$6.2 M for Bolivia and Peru only. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 05.	3	5	Argentina, 14.5 Bolivia, 11.4 Chile, 15.7 Colombia, 36.6 Ecuador, 23.2 Peru, 25.3 Venezuela, 16.7	143.4
Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena	2750	24	3	Yes. \$5 M. 5-year cycle ended Dec. 06.	3	3	Colombia, 36.6 Ecuador, 23.2 Panama, 11.2 Peru, 25.3	96.3
Wallacea	1500	15	3	No			Indonesia, 41.4 Timor Leste (n/a)	41.4
Western Ghats and Sri Lanka	3049	23	3	No. Ecosystem profile for Western Ghats submitted for Donor Council approval.			India, 29.6 Sri Lanka 6.4	36

Areas of current/past CEPF investment indicated by green shading

\* Conservation gains and opportunities for sustainability scored only in portfolios where CEPF will have completed investment by July 2007.

\*\* Value of \$1.7 million entered for countries listed by GEF as part of "group" eligible to receive smaller non-specified allocations of up to \$3.5 million

\*\*\* The Eastern Afromontane Hotspot is a new hotspot identified during the 2004 hotspot re-evaluation. It includes part of the former Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya Hotspot (specifically the Eastern Arc Mountains, which would be excluded if the Afromontane region is chosen as a new investment hotspot).

## APPENDIX

### **Definitions for Tables 2 and 3**

#### **Priority Formula**

$$\frac{\# \text{ Endemic Plant Species} \times \text{Civil Society Capacity Score}}{(\% \text{ habitat remaining}/100) \times \text{GEF RAF Allocation in US\$}}$$

#### **Priority Formula for Closed Regions**

$$\frac{\# \text{ Endemic Plant Species} \times \text{Civil Society Score} \times \text{Conservation Gains Score} \times \text{Sustainability Score}}{(\% \text{ habitat remaining}/100) \times \text{GEF RAF Allocation in US\$}}$$

#### **Scoring for Civil Society Capacity**

- 1 = Local NGOs work comprehensively in coordinated and strategic ways to ensure conservation success and sustainability.
- 2 = Local NGOs have developed a limited capacity to work in coordinated and strategic ways.
- 3 = Emergent local NGOs working in tandem with government and international NGOs, but overall capacity to sustain conservation activities is still weak.
- 4 = Core group of international and local NGOs addressing development and humanitarian sectors, but local environmental NGOs are few and weak.
- 5 = Limited presence of local civil society groups.

#### **Conservation Gains Under Initial CEPF Investment Scoring**

- 1 = Minimal progress made and conditions for future conservation efforts not significantly strengthened.
- 2 = Minimal progress made on all priorities but some promising conditions for future work now in place.
- 3 = Progress made on several 5-year priorities but not all.
- 4 = Achieved several 5-year priorities and made progress on all priorities.
- 5 = All 5-year priorities achieved (but not yet secured for the long term).

#### **Opportunities for Sustainability Scoring**

- 1 = Most initiatives/projects close when CEPF funding ends. Civil society remains ineffective in implementing coordinated conservation efforts.
- 2 = Several initiatives/projects have attracted additional funding, but have not yet built a broad base of donor support. Civil society demonstrates a limited ability to implement effective and coordinated conservation efforts.
- 3 = Several initiatives/projects have attracted a broad base of donor support and are likely to continue beyond CEPF support. Civil society plans and executes coordinated conservation initiatives periodically, generally with international NGO leadership.
- 4 = Most initiatives/projects have attracted a broad base of donor support and are likely to continue beyond CEPF support. Civil society plans and executes coordinated conservation initiatives regularly, often with local NGO leadership. Long-term financing mechanisms are in development and donor commitments made to capitalize them.
- 5 = Most initiatives/projects have attracted a broad base of donor support and are likely to continue beyond CEPF support. Civil society plans and executes coordinated conservation initiatives regularly with local NGO leadership. Long-term financing mechanisms are in place and capitalized.

APPENDIX

Table 2. All Hotspots, Ranked by Priority Formula

Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)	Number of Endemic Plant Species	Civil Society Capacity Score	% Remaining Habitat	Total GEF allocation, millions US\$	Priority Formula
Mediterranean Basin	11700	3	5	31.0	22645.16
Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands	11600	4	10	36.8	12608.70
Sundaland	15000	3	7	56.6	11357.90
Horn of Africa	2750	5	5	25.0	11000.00
Philippines	6091	2	7	21.3	8170.36
Caribbean Islands	6550	4	10	43.3	6050.81
Indo-Burma	7000	5	5	118.8	5892.26
Irano-Anatolian	2500	4	15	19.6	3401.36
Mountains of Southwest China	3500	3	8	46.0	2853.26
Cape Floristic Region	6210	2	20	22.5	2760.00
Coastal Forests of Eastern Africa	1750	4	10	27.5	2545.45
East Melanesian Islands	2356	5	30	15.9	2469.60
Eastern Afromontane*	3000	5	10	64.9	2311.25
Polynesia-Micronesia	3074	3	21	22.1	1987.07
Guinean Forests West Africa	1800	5	15	34.7	1729.11
Atlantic Forest	8000	1	8	79.4	1259.45
Tropical Andes	15000	3	25	143.4	1255.23
Western Ghats and Sri Lanka	3049	3	23	36.0	1104.71
Madrean Pine-Oak Woodlands	3975	3	20	54.6	1092.03
Succulent Karoo	2439	3	29	29.0	870.04
Cerrado	4400	3	22	76.3	786.37
Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany	1900	3	24	31.0	766.13
Wallacea	1500	3	15	41.4	724.64
Chilean Winter Rainfall-Valdivian Forests	1957	3	30	30.2	648.01
Mountains of Central Asia	1500	5	20	65.2	575.15
Caucasus	1600	4	27	43.2	548.70
Himalaya	3160	3	25	84.1	450.89
Mesoamerica	2941	3	20	100.2	440.27
Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena	2750	3	24	96.3	356.96
California Floristic Province	2124	1	25	54.6	155.60
Southwest Australia	2984	1	30	0	0
New Caledonia	2431	2	27	0	0
Japan	1950	1	20	0	0
New Zealand	1865	1	22	0	0

Areas of current/past CEPF investment indicated by green shading

\* The Eastern Afromontane Hotspot is a new hotspot identified during the 2004 hotspot re-evaluation. It includes part of the former Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya Hotspot (specifically the Eastern Arc Mountains.)

**APPENDIX**

**Table 3. Closed CEPF Investment Portfolios, Ranked by Priority Formula for Closed Regions**

<b>Critical Ecosystem (Hotspot)</b>	<b>Number of Endemic Plant Species</b>	<b>Civil Society Capacity Score</b>	<b>Conservation Gains Under Prior CEPF Investment Score</b>	<b>Opportunities for Sustainability Score</b>	<b>% Remaining Habitat</b>	<b>Total GEF allocation, millions US\$</b>	<b>Priority Formula for Closed Regions</b>
Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands	11600	4	4	4	10	36.8	<b>201739.1</b>
Sundaland	15000	3	3	4	7	56.6	<b>136294.8</b>
Philippines	6091	2	3	4	7	21.3	<b>98044.3</b>
Cape Floristic Region	6210	2	4	5	20	22.5	<b>55200.0</b>
Mountains of Southwest China	3500	3	3	3	8	46.0	<b>25679.3</b>
Atlantic Forest	8000	1	4	5	8	79.4	<b>25188.9</b>
Tropical Andes	15000	3	3	5	25	143.4	<b>18828.5</b>
Guinean Forests West Africa	1800	5	2	3	15	34.7	<b>10374.6</b>
Mesoamerica*	2941	3	4	5	20	100.2	<b>8805.4</b>
Tumbes-Chocó-Magdalena	2750	3	3	3	24	96.3	<b>3212.6</b>

\* During CEPF's initial investment, Mesoamerica was divided into two hotspots, Southern Mesoamerica and Northern Mesoamerica. In this table, we consider just the southern region of the Mesoamerica Hotspot, which came to a close in December 2006.