Response to comments received from the 81st Working Group on the updated Ecosystem Profile for the Wallacea Biodiversity Hotspot, 24 September 2025

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
1. Update Section 2 (Table 1) and related text to ensure specific reference to consultations with Indigenous Peoples.	Section 2 has been updated to include reference to consultations with civil society organizations that represent traditional/ customary (*adat*) communities. The priority given to the presence of customary rules and practices for natural resource management in the selection of priority geographies for CEPF investment is shown in Tables 66 and 71). It is also reflected the Investment Strategy (Table 76) and subsequent discussion of Investment Priorities 2.1 (collaboration with Indigenous communities), 3.1 (community rights over resources) and 3.3 (existing policies and safeguards for Indigenous rights), as well as Strategic Direction 4 on capacity and organizational development.	Changes made to Section 2 (p4) Attention is brought to Tables 66 (p214), 71 (p221) and 76 (p225)
2. Will there be a differentiated approach to grant making to engage different groups, including Indigenous Peoples groups and smaller CSOs, who many not be experienced with writing proposals to international funders?	Section 5.1 has been updated to include a discussion of the need to balance the desire for short-term results (biodiversity, human well-being, organizational development) with the capacity of the recipients and the managerial limits of the RIT and Secretariat. The lessons of previous phases (Section 3.10), the independent evaluation of lessons learned by the RIT (Section 3.11.1) and recommendations drawn from those (Section 3.11.2) emphasize the need for accessibility and the important role of the RIT in ensuring that CEPF support is accessible to small and emerging organizations. As noted above, the selection of priority geographies gave weighting to geographies of interest and accessible to customary and traditional (*adat*) communities, while the Investment Strategy emphasizes grants promoting Indigenous rights and the actions of smaller communities and CSOs.	Changes made of Section 5.1 (pp223-224) Attention is brought to Sections 3.10 (pp19-21) and 3.11 (pp21-23)

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
3. Consider revision to Portfolio Indicator-Biodiversity 1, the "number of communities with change in behavior in relation to threats to species" to "the number of individuals, private companies, and communities with change in behavior resulting in a reduction of threats to species."	Portfolio Indicator-Biodiversity 1 has been changed to "Number of communities with change in behavior intended to result in a reduction in illegal wildlife trade and/or other threats to globally threatened species". This shows emphasis on reduction in threats, specifically, as opposed to behavior change more generally. It also recognizes that, while behavior change can happen within the lifetime of a grant, this will not necessarily translate into measurable reduction in threat within this timeframe. We have not included "private companies" as a measure of change for this indicator. While changing the behavior of the private sector is important for the broader cause of conservation, it is not a focus of the next phase of CEPF investment, because experience from Phases I and II has shown that this work is not suitable for grants of typical CEPF size and scope in the region or for many of the target CSOs. Separately, Global Indicator-Enabling Conditions 3 counts the number of companies adopting biodiversity-friendly practices. We have not included "individuals" as a measure of change for this indicator, in order not to mix different metrics. The emphasis will be on entire communities, which are the locus of intervention of most grants and have an element of constancy and broader ownership for behavior change. Nonetheless, each grant will have its own project-specific impacts, which may include tracking behavior change by companies and/or individuals. CEPF will monitor and report on these as relevant.	Change made to the biodiversity indicator table (pp235-236) in Chapter 14

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
4. Could CEPF consider measuring impacts on ecosystems that are no longer, or less affected, by the threats? For example, measure change in behavior by measuring the reduction in use of chemical pesticides (by hectares).	If Strategic Direction 2 speaks to better management of sites without official protection (what CEPF terms "production landscapes"), Strategic Direction 3 speaks to community benefits from these sites, including from sustainable agricultural practices. Both strategic directions anticipate promoting changes in agriculture, particularly around cacao and coffee in sensitive watersheds (e.g., Lake Poso, Malili Lakes) and support for permaculture and organic products. Impacts will be captured by Global Indicator-Biodiversity 4 (number of hectares of production landscapes with strengthened management of biodiversity), which would include hectares of land showing reduction in use of chemical pesticides, among other positive changes.	Attention is brought to the biodiversity indicator table (pp235-236) in Chapter 14
5. Chapter 7 on policy makes reference to the Indonesian Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (IBSAP) 2025-2045. Please ensure alignment between the ecosystem profile and IBSAP.	Changes have been made to Sections 7.1.13 and 13.3 to underline the alignment between the ecosystem profile and IBSAP. This alignment has ensured that the CEPF Investment Strategy feeds directly into relevant elements of the 13 strategies of the IBSAP. There is strong intellectual and institutional alignment between the authors and implementers of the IBSAP and this ecosystem profile. Burung Indonesia, the CEPF RIT in Wallacea, was one of the primary organizational contributors to the IBSAP, and Burung's head of biodiversity monitoring, Ria Suryanthi, is a named author of the IBSAP. To some degree, CEPF's work in Phase I and Phase II influenced the IBSAP, and the IBSAP, in turn, influenced this profile. Further, Burung, while serving as the RIT, ensured collaboration and endorsement from BAPPENAS, the national development planning and coordinating authority. BAPPENAS was the lead author of the IBSAP and its Director of Environment chaired the Wallacea Phase II final assessment workshop in Jakarta in September 2024.	Changes made to Sections 7.1.13 (p117) and 13.3 (p225)

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
6. Presidential Instruction No. 1/2023 states that biodiversity conservation must be mainstreamed across all ministries and local governments, but to date, follow-up actions have been limited. Budget allocations for conservation remain limited. Can the ecosystem profile include an analysis of innovative financing mechanisms, including the mobilization of private sector resources?	Changes have been made to Section 11.2, to include a brief summary of innovative financing mechanisms for conservation in Indonesia. Changes have been made to the description of the RIT's role under Investment Priority 5.1 to describe how the RIT will monitor funding gaps in specific regional government entities and support granting or collaborations to overcome these.	Changes made to Section 11.2 (pp203-204) and the description of Investment Priority 5.1 (pp232-234) in Chapter 13
7. Related to the two items above on IBSAP and presidential decrees, discuss the alignment between the ecosystem profile and government plans.	As mentioned above, alignment between the ecosystem profile and government plans (in particular the IBSAP) is robust. Changes have been made to the description of the RIT's role under Investment Priority 5.1 to make explicit that the RIT will ensure alignment of the CEPF grant portfolio with government plans.	Changes made to the description of Investment Priority 5.1 (pp232-234) in Chapter 13
8. Similar to organizational development, which is embedded in the Wallacea profile, will the Social Sustainability Policy be included in future ecosystem profiles or updates to this profile?	The Social Sustainability Policy is still under development. Future CEPF ecosystem profiles, and any update to the Wallacea profile, will incorporate the principles of social sustainability as one of several mechanisms to operationalize commitments under the new policy. These commitments and mechanisms will become clearer after the policy has been reviewed by the Working Group and approved by the Donor Council.	No changes made
9. Comment further on your experience from the first two investment phases in terms of networking and mentoring as these relate to specific examples of organizational development.	Changes have been made to Section 3.9 to provide further information about experience with support for networks during Phases I and II. Both phases included explicit support for networks, capacity building, and mentoring. Section 3.9 discusses these, as they influence the subsequent lessons and recommendations in this chapter, as well as the emphasis of Strategic Direction 4.	Changes made to Section 3.9 (pp16-19) Attention is brought to Sections 3.10 (pp19-21) and 3.11 (pp21-23)

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
10. Comment further about Indonesia's efforts to promote Other Effective Conservation Measures in production landscapes and how these relate to the Investment Strategy. Please describe how CEPF will share experience with these initiatives with relevant people.	As opportunities to expand the national protected area estate in Indonesia are limited, particularly on land. The government, with the inputs of many international and national NGOs, including Burung Indonesia, has been actively considering how OECMs can help it achieve its conservation goals. There is now a large typology of different conservation designations; in relation to OECMs, the most recent are *Area Preservasi* (an area to be "preserved" while used) and *Kawasan Bernilai Keanekaragaman Hayati Tinggi* (High Biodiversity Value Area, to be used for production). Designation of OECMs will be eligible for support under Strategic Direction 2, while activities to promote sustainable natural resource management in production landscapes will be eligible under Strategic Direction 3. The descriptions of these elements of the Investment Strategy have been edited to make this clearer. Experience from these initiatives will be shared with conservation practitioners inside and outside Indonesia, including by producing knowledge products on best practices developed by grantees, and by supporting grantees to share their experience at seminars and events, such as those organized by IUCN and its commissions.	Changes made to the descriptions of Strategic Directions 2 (pp227-228) and 3 (pp228-229) in Chapter 13
11. Discuss how you will balance awards between grants for terrestrial sites/species and marine sites/species.	The initial focus of work will be on three land-and-seascapes, which themselves contain six priority terrestrial KBA clusters (Lindu, Poso, Malili, Sulawesi Timur, Togean-Banggai and Seram) and two priority marine corridors (Togean-Banggai and Buru seascape). Per the interests of the funders, the grant portfolio for Strategic Directions 1, 2 and 3 might be split 3:1 between terrestrial and marine. Strategic Direction 4 on capacity building and organizational development will likely be split more evenly between organizations working in each realm.	Changes made to Section 13.3 (p. 224)

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response	Page or Section in Revised Document
12. In the Investment Strategy, discuss if behavior change is limited to the issue of wildlife trade or does it apply to other issues as well; your experience with this; and possibilities for exchange of regional experience.	Changes have been made to the Investment Priority that elaborates on behavior change in relation to species (Strategic Direction 1) and sites (Strategic Direction 2).	Changes made to Strategic Directions 1 (pp226-227) and 2 (pp227-228)
13. Is there a structure to allow other donors to join the program during this phase, and thus expand the reach of this profile?	The CEPF Secretariat will request a spending authority of US$8 million to implement the Investment Strategy set out in the Ecosystem Profile, reflecting contributions from Fondation Hans Wilsdorf and the Hempel Foundation. This will be sufficient to support conservation actions in six out of 12 priority terrestrial KBA clusters and two out of five priority marine corridors. There exists space for more donors to join the program during the current investment phase and allocate additional funding, without any need to modify the Investment Strategy. The Secretariat actively engages potential funders for all biodiversity hotspots. Should another donor wish to direct funds to Wallacea, the Secretariat will request the approval of the Donor Council to increase the spending authority.	No changes to the document
14. Is there a way to develop a strategic network for each landscape or KBA cluster to build a consortium of partners with impact greater than the sum of its parts?	Section 3.10 discusses lessons from Phase I and Phase II. The first lesson specifically relates to the importance of concentrating investments in particular geographic priorities for greater efficiency and impact.	Attention is brought to Section 3.10 (pp19-21)
15. Discuss how the Ecosystem Profile might be used beyond as only a guide to grant making by CEPF.	A new section (Section 15.4) has been added to explain how this document, like all CEPF ecosystem profiles, is meant to be a public good, to guide grant making by other funders.	New section added (Section 15.4, p240)