

## **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund**

Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the CEPF Working Group  
Conservation International, Arlington, VA  
18 June 2010  
8 a.m. – 11 a.m. EDT

### **Application review and recommendation for selection of the Regional Implementation Team for the Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany Hotspot**

#### **1. Summary of Regional Implementation Team Applications and Review Process**

Two organizations submitted letters expressing interest in becoming the Regional Implementation Team:

- Wildlands Conservation Trust – Wildlands (Hilton, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa)
- South Africa National Biodiversity Institute – SANBI (Pretoria, South Africa)

Only one organization – Wildlands – subsequently submitted a full proposal by an original deadline for proposals of 5 April 2010 and also a revised deadline of 21 May 2010.

A request for proposals was originally released on 1 March 2010 with a closing date of 5 April 2010, together with the draft ecosystem profile specifying that the allocation for the hotspot would be \$5.5 million and the maximum budget for the Regional Implementation Team would be \$550,000 following the budget allocation discussion of the Working Group meeting of 18 November 2009. The CEPF Secretariat held a conference call on 15 March 2010 to explain the purpose of the Regional Implementation Team and answer questions about the request for proposals from interested parties. Representatives from Birdlife International, Endangered Wildlife Trust and SANBI took part in the call. CEPF also accepted written questions through 17 March 2010. CEPF posted an audio recording of the conference call and answers to all written questions on its Web site on 22 March 2010 for view by all potential applicants. As of the closing date on 5 April 2010, Wildlands was the only organization to submit a full proposal.

Subsequent to the 5 April closing date, the Donor Council approved, on 23 April 2010, an overall allocation for the hotspot of \$6.65 million and a maximum budget of \$700,000 for the Regional Implementation Team. As such, CEPF released a new request for proposals to allow potential applicants to reconsider their decision to bid and to alter their approach and budget in relation to the increased budget. The revised solicitation was released on 23 April 2010 with a closing date of 21 May 2010. As of the new closing date, Wildlands submitted a new application. No other applications were received. It is worth pointing out that the Wildlands proposal states that the organization conferred with other leading conservation groups in the region – including Conservation South Africa, Endangered Wildlife Trust, the Peace Parks Foundation, SANBI and World Wide Fund for Nature, among others – and all agreed to support Wildlands in its proposal.

The CEPF Secretariat conducted a comprehensive review of Wildlands' proposal of 21 May 2010, the results of which are summarized in this document. The full proposal and supporting documents are provided separately. The review process relied on scoring each proposal against evaluation criteria based on seven rating categories, with each category reflecting, in aggregate, all the elements of the approved Regional Implementation Team Terms of Reference and Selection Process (Criteria for Evaluating Applications). The CEPF Secretariat assigned relative weightings to each of the categories. The categories and weightings are shown below. To ensure

transparency of the process, such that potential applicants would know how they were being evaluated, the entire scorecard was included in the Request for Proposals released on 23 April 2010.

Category	Weighting (percent)
1. Past organizational experience: technical	13.64
2. Past organizational experience: management	13.64
3. Personnel	13.64
4. Understanding of the ecosystem profile	9.09
5. Proposed technical approach	18.18
6. Proposed management approach	18.18
7. Budget	13.64
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

A team of Secretariat staff scored each subordinate element of each category according to the following rating system:

Excellent	5 points
Good	4 points
Average	3 points
Below average	2 points
Poor	1 point
Absent	0 points

## 2. Evaluation Scores for the Wildlands Proposal

The raw score for each question and the weighted score for each category are presented below. Raw scores represent the mean of the individual reviewers' scores.

	Question/Category	Raw Score	Weighted Total
<b>1</b>	<b>Past organizational experience: technical (weighting: 13.64%)</b>		
1.1	Does the applicant present experience with biodiversity conservation in the hotspot?	4.8	
1.2	Is the organization's mission statement congruent with the objectives and priorities identified for the region in the ecosystem profile?	5.0	
1.3	Does the applicant present experience working with and improving the capacity of civil society?	4.8	
1.4	Does the applicant present experience working with potential partner NGOs, academic institutions, local and national government agencies, and donors?	5.0	
1.5	Does the applicant demonstrate experience communicating missions, objectives, and lessons similar to those anticipated in the Ecosystem Profile?	4.6	
1.6	Does the organization have an existing sustainable conservation program in the region, demonstrated by its duration and record of support by other donors?	4.6	
	<b>Subtotal: technical experience (30 points)</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>13.1%<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Past Organizational Experience: Management (weighting: 13.64%)</b>		
2.1	Does the organization demonstrate experience managing programs of similar size, scale, and complexity as that of the Regional Implementation Team?	4.2	
2.2	Does the organization have a monitoring and evaluation system or methodology that it has used to manage its own or other programs?	3.4	

<sup>1</sup> The total is equal to the subtotal raw score (28.8) over the total assuming "excellent" for all the sub-categories (30) times the weight of the category (13.64%)

Question/Category		Raw Score	Weighted Total
2.3	Does the applicant have a proven financial and administrative system?	4.0	
2.4	Has the organization managed both the technical and financial elements of a small grants program in the past, and was this program of a size (e.g., total amount of money, total number of grants) and complexity (e.g., technical components and recipients) comparable to what it will undertake with CEPF?	4.2	
<b>Subtotal: management experience (20 points)</b>		15.7	<b>10.8%</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Personnel (weighting: 13.64%)</b>		
3.1	Does the applicant propose a clear and viable personnel plan, including names, resumes, position titles, job descriptions, level of effort, work location and reporting lines of authority?	3.7	
3.2	Does the applicant submit the name and resume a single, dedicated team leader, and does this person have the appropriate technical skills/experience and appropriate managerial skills/experience?	4.7	
3.3	Does the offer propose, by name and resume, personnel other than the team leader, and do these people have appropriate technical skills/experience and appropriate managerial skills/experience?	3.5	
3.4	Do the proposed team members have, individually or collectively, the language skills necessary to operate effectively in the hotspot?	3.3	
3.5	Does the applicant propose a plan for recruitment and/or mobilization of "to be determined" personnel, including job descriptions, job qualifications, and curricula vitae of personnel from the applicant's organization who will perform relevant duties while recruitment is pending?	3.3	
<b>Subtotal: personnel (25 points)</b>		18.5	<b>10.1%</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Understanding of the Ecosystem Profile (weighting: 9.09%)</b>		
4.1	Does the applicant demonstrate its understanding of the strategic directions in the Ecosystem Profile and the associated Investment Priorities and outcomes, targets, and indicators (other than the RIT strategic direction)?	4.0	
4.2	Does the applicant discuss the differing challenges of conservation and engagement with civil society in the countries in the hotspot, demonstrating an anticipation of the types of grants to be funded, the viability of targets, and the capacity of potential grantees?	3.4	
4.3	Does the applicant describe how its own organizational strategy will be advanced by the serving as the lead entity for CEPF in the region and how this will help to ensure sustainability of results beyond the CEPF implementation period?	3.6	
<b>Subtotal: understanding of the ecosystem profile (15 points)</b>		11.0	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Proposed Technical Approach (weighting: 18.18%)</b>		
5.1	Did the applicant address all five of the major components of the RIT as described in the Request for Proposals?	4.6	
5.2	Does the applicant demonstrate its plans to work with partners speaking relevant languages or with civil society organizations that have very different levels of capacity from one country or region to the next?	3.4	
5.3	Does the applicant explicitly address approaches that may make its efforts sustainable or likely to be replicated in the region?	2.8	
5.4	Does the applicant propose a method to effectively communicate and coordinate the funding opportunity, results and lessons learned?	4.0	
5.5	Does the applicant propose a system for soliciting proposals for projects conforming to the strategy described in the ecosystem profile and establish an effective, transparent review process to evaluate these applications?	3.4	
5.6	Does the applicant propose a system to monitor and evaluate individual projects and assist in monitoring portfolio performance overall?	3.2	
5.7	Does the applicant propose a system to directly award and manage all small grants for civil society of up to \$20,000?	4.2	
<b>Subtotal: technical approach (35 points)</b>		25.6	<b>13.3%</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Proposed Management Approach (weighting: 18.18%)</b>		
6.1	Does the applicant demonstrate its understanding of the legal requirements to make grants in the three countries, employ people or engage organizations in the three countries, and foreign exchange restrictions?	3.5	

Question/Category		Raw Score	Weighted Total
6.2	Does the applicant have defined administrative/financial roles demonstrating a segregation of duties and a chart indicating the leadership and employee structure of the organization?	2.3	
6.3	Does the applicant propose a method to track, record, and account for funds received and disbursed, and does it propose a method for regular completion of reconciliations of money received and disbursed in comparison with bank statements?	1.8	
6.4	Does the applicant propose a system for internal controls and objective criteria that guide the review of payment requests and other invoices, systematic record keeping, and fraud and embezzlement safeguards?	1.8	
<b>Subtotal: management approach (20 points)</b>		9.3	<b>8.4%</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Budget (weighting: 13.64%)</b>		
7.1	Is the budget complete and within the allocated amount named in the Request for Proposals?	4.5	
7.2	Is the amount for <u>salaries/benefits</u> presented clearly, tied to individuals for distinct amounts of money for distinct amounts of time, justified mathematically, appropriate relative to the experience and qualifications of the people proposed, and in accord with market rates in the region, and does the total amount for <u>salaries/benefits</u> correspond with the activities proposed?	3.7	
7.3	Is the amount for <u>professional services</u> presented clearly, tied to individuals for distinct amounts of money for distinct amounts of time, justified mathematically, appropriate relative to the experience and qualifications of the people proposed, and in accord with market rates in the region, and does the total amount for <u>professional services</u> correspond with the activities proposed?	3.2	
7.4	Is the amount for <u>rent and storage</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	4.3	
7.5	Is the amount for <u>telecommunications</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	4.0	
7.6	Is the amount for <u>postage and delivery</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	3.8	
7.7	Is the amount for <u>supplies</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	4.3	
7.8	Is the amount for <u>furniture and equipment</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	4.3	
7.9	Is the amount for <u>maintenance</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	3.7	
7.1	Is the amount for <u>travel</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	2.3	
7.11	Is the amount for <u>meetings and special events</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	2.7	
7.12	Is the amount for <u>miscellaneous</u> presented clearly and justified mathematically, does it correspond with the activities proposed, and distinct from any items covered by Indirect Costs?	3.2	
7.13	If the applicant claims <u>indirect costs</u> , does it clearly show the <i>base of application</i> and is this distinct from any previously enumerated direct costs; does the applicant provide an explanation of how the indirect cost rate has been determined (e.g., historical averages, audited financial statements, precedent contracts); and does the applicant provide supporting documentation and responses with its financial questionnaire?	3.8	
<b>Subtotal: budget (65 points)</b>		47.8	<b>10.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total (210 points)</b>		156.7	<b>72.4%</b>

### **3. Summary of Assessment Findings**

#### **Past organizational experience: technical**

Evaluators gave a general score between “good” and “excellent” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Wildlands is a nongovernmental organization (NGO) with 22 years of experience promoting biodiversity conservation in the region. It is headquartered in the hotspot, in Hilton, outside Pietermaritzburg, about 50 miles west of Durban. It has worked extensively in South Africa, and to a lesser degree in Mozambique and Swaziland. Its organizational mission is congruent with the ecosystem profile in that Wildlands aims to promote “the implementation/facilitation of innovative solutions which integrate socio-economic development into . . . regional biodiversity conservation.”

In 2008-2009, the organization had four overarching programs (called Conservation SPACE), Indigenous Trees for Life, Green Leaders, and Biodiversity Management Support) that together highlight much of the technical experience that CEPF seeks. Through these efforts, Wildlands has worked with several facets of civil society, including community-based organizations, larger NGOs, and private and communal owners of conservation areas. It has also collaborated with potential partners from government, academia and other conservation NGOs, as evidenced by being a founding member of the Climate Action Partnership ([www.cap.org.za](http://www.cap.org.za)) and by securing support from other conservation NGOs for the CEPF proposal. (*See*: Project proposal text under “Stakeholder Participation” and “Additional Information.”) Evidence of implementation of these programs also shows the organization’s ability to communicate missions, objectives and lessons as the Regional Implementation Team. Wildlands has also worked with various corporate donors and charitable trusts (e.g., BHP Billiton, Unilever, Newman’s Own Foundation), indicating its ability to manage multiple means of financial support to develop a coherent organizational program.

Evaluators note that, as one might expect of a purely South African organization, as opposed to an international conservation group, Wildlands’ work in Mozambique and Swaziland appears to be in transboundary areas, as opposed to conservation and civil society strengthening purely within those countries.

#### **Past organizational experience: management**

Evaluators gave a general score of “good” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Wildlands has an annual core and project budget of \$3.4 million (as compared to a potential Regional Implementation Team grant with an annual budget of \$140,000), manages a small grants fund, and has been engaged, or is engaged, in as many as 48 projects under its four overarching programs. For example, its Conservation SPACE program is working with seven communities toward consolidation of 75,000 hectares of land; the Indigenous Trees program is working with 2,500 individuals in 20 communities; the Green Leaders program engages 60 facilitators who build basic entrepreneurial skills in target communities; and the biodiversity program conducts species research and conservation interventions in KwaZulu-Natal. Given this diversity of experience, Wildlands appears readily capable of managing the tasks of the Regional Implementation Team.

Wildlands appears capable of managing the CEPF small grants fund (which may be in the range of \$500,000) based on its experience managing a \$7 million trust that disburses \$150,000 per year in small grants for conservation projects and through a program called Wild Series, which issues \$70,000 per year in grants.

Evaluators note that in relation to its small grants and conservation programs, Wildlands discusses its monitoring and evaluation systems, although not in extensive detail.

Wildlands appears to have a proven financial and administrative system based on the auditors' statements and response to the CEPF financial questionnaire (see Supplemental Documents attached). Additionally, CEPF held a reference telephone call with Wildlands' auditors at PricewaterhouseCoopers (conducted by the Senior Director for Finance and Information). Based on this preliminary call, Wildlands demonstrates a commitment to corporate governance with appropriate financial controls.

### **Personnel**

Evaluators gave a general score between "average" and "good" for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Wildlands has proposed a staffing structure that consists of:

- Project manager: Mr. Roelie Kloppers (75 percent level of effort).
- Project administrator: Ms. Nobuhle Buthelezi (full time).
- Project ambassador: Mr. Andrew Venter (5 percent level of effort).
- Financial controller: Ms. Shanitha Singh (10 percent level of effort).
- Mozambique Liason: Madyo Couto and/or Stewart Williams identified as potential candidates (approximately 25 percent level of effort).

Evaluators note some strengths of this team and personnel structure. Mr. Kloppers holds a Ph.D in anthropology and has worked on conservation efforts throughout the hotspot, including Mozambique and Swaziland. Mr. Venter, the CEO of Wildlands, holds a Ph.D in integrated conservation and development. Overall, the team has most of the qualifications necessary to fulfill the basic tasks of the Regional Implementation Team. Further, the basic structure of the team conforms to best practice from Regional Implementation Teams in other hotspots.

Evaluators also raised several concerns.

- a. The total level of effort appears inadequate to the tasks of being the Regional Implementation Team. CEPF experience from elsewhere suggests that the team leader must be full time on the program. Further, CEPF anticipates a greater need in Mozambique, which is the focus of two Strategic Directions in the ecosystem profile. If this person is only available at one quarter time, there could be a potential slow-down of grant management (e.g., proposal reviews) in that country. Also, experience from elsewhere suggests that 10 percent of a controller's time may be inadequate, at least once volume increases from the small grants program.
- b. Wildlands did not submit a resume for Ms. Buthelezi. Given that she is the only full-time person on the team, an evaluation of her qualifications is essential.
- c. Wildlands did not submit resumes for Mr. Couto or Mr. Williams, nor did Wildlands submit any type of statement from these individuals indicating their willingness to engage in the program. The evaluators could not adequately score this element of the team.

- d. Apart from Mr. Couto, none of the named individuals appear to speak Portuguese, which will be essential for evaluating proposals, conducting financial and programmatic risk assessments, and undertaking and guiding safeguard processes. (Ms. Buthelezi may speak Portuguese, but her resume was not submitted.)
- e. Wildlands did not submit individual terms of reference for each position. Given the limited level of effort, the evaluators could only assume the responsibilities of each person. Evaluators expressed concern that the Project Manager (who appears to be responsible for South Africa and Swaziland) and the Administrator (who may also be responsible for the CEPF small grants fund) will not be able to adequately fulfill their responsibilities. Absent terms of reference for the Mozambique Liaison, evaluators could not determine if the named candidates are appropriate.

### **Understanding of the ecosystem profile**

Evaluators gave a general score between “average” and “good” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Wildlands’ proposal documents show that it understands the ecosystem profile and associated investment priorities. Mr. Kloppers was a member of the profiling team and Mr. Venter participated in stakeholder workshops and consultancy studies during the profiling period. The proposal shows an appreciation of the differing challenges of civil society engagement in the three countries. The proposal also shows a concurrence between Wildlands’ own organizational mission and the overall objectives of the ecosystem profile, enhancing the chance of sustainability.

Evaluators noted that overall discussion of this topic was not extensive, but accepted this given the structure of the request for proposals and proposal files.

### **Proposed technical approach**

Evaluators gave a general score between “average” and “good” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Evaluators noted several strengths. Wildlands addresses all five of the major components of the Regional Implementation Team in its logical framework. It addresses that it will engage partners with differing levels of capacity and it discusses in detail its plans for communication, including stakeholder outreach meetings, electronic newsletters, a web page, and print media. Wildlands clearly discusses plans and a timetable to issue three separate calls for proposals for grants in excess of \$20,000 and a plan for small grants, but only provides minimal detail as to how it will conduct proposal reviews. Wildlands proposes to use its own monitoring and evaluation systems combined with those described in the CEPF Operational Manual, although this discussion is limited.

Evaluators also raised issues of concern:

- a. The subordinate elements of the logical framework (i.e., Products/Deliverables and Activities) lack precision and specificity. There is limited discussion of *who* will perform tasks, *when* these will occur, *how* they will be effected or what other partners will be engaged.
- b. There is a disconnect between the activities proposed, the limited staffing (discussed above) and the limited budget (discussed below).

- c. Wildlands appears to have conceptualized the communications component as one of communications only with potential grantees (about funding opportunities), but ignores the need to communicate the broader goals of CEPF with other partners (e.g., government, donors, private sector) or promote ecosystem programmatic objectives at a hotspot level.
- d. Wildlands does not discuss activities or challenges related to monitoring grantee compliance with CEPF social safeguard policies.
- e. Wildlands does not discuss or anticipate the potential balance of awards or targets by country or target.
- f. Wildlands seems to be making many assumptions about its ability to adequately reach potential grantees in Mozambique without Lusaphone personnel or a budget for language translation/interpretation.
- g. Greater discussion is required for how Wildlands will compose review teams and conduct reviews for proposals in excess of \$20,000.

### **Proposed management approach**

Evaluators gave a general score between “below average” and “average” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Evaluators recognized that many of the Criteria for Selection in this category need to be scored based on Wildlands’ auditors’ statements and the response to the CEPF financial questionnaire, as well as inferred from past organizational experience. Evaluators did review all of the financial information provided. Nonetheless, evaluators would like to see:

- a. More explicit discussions of the roles and responsibilities of the team members and other senior or financial officers of the organization in relation to the tasks required of this CEPF grant.
- b. More explicit discussions of the challenges and legal requirements of Wildlands (i.e., a South African entity) working in the three countries in the hotspot, including transferring of funds, employing people, engaging organizations, and foreign exchange restrictions.
- c. More explicit recognition of the tasks related to tracking, recording, and accounting for CEPF funds received and disbursed (e.g., within a logical frame, performance tracking worksheet, or GANTT chart).
- d. More explicit recognition of the tasks related to review of payment requests, invoices, record keeping, and fraud and embezzlement safeguards (e.g., within a logical frame, performance tracking worksheet, or GANTT chart).

### **Budget**

Evaluators gave a general score between “average” and “good” for this element of the Wildlands proposal.

Wildlands completed the budget worksheet and also submitted an Excel file breaking down costs to be funded by CEPF versus costs funded by Wildlands. According to Wildlands calculations, it will contribute \$119,000 beyond the CEPF budget of \$700,000, an increase of 17 percent. Wildlands also represents an efficient engagement of CEPF financial resources by not charging for indirect costs and by not charging for items such as utilities, essentially allowing CEPF (in the form of the Project Manager and Administrator) to occupy the Wildlands office facility at minimal marginal cost. Evaluators note the following regarding the budget.

- a. Budget calculations and split between costs borne by CEPF and Wildlands should be made more explicit via an Excel spreadsheet clearly showing all unit costs, total units, inflation factors, and related calculations.
- b. In general, calculations are “straight line” over five years, rather than reflecting a management flow over the period. For example, Wildlands suggests that the bulk of grantmaking will be completed in three years, yet unit amounts for personnel time, travel and meetings are the same each year. This suggests that Wildlands has not constructed a budget in relation to the actual anticipated implementation effort.
- c. As discussed in relation to personnel, total level of effort may be low (e.g., for the Project Manager at 75 percent effort; for the Administrator, whose terms of reference might exceed a full-time position; and the Mozambique liaison at 25 percent effort), suggesting that this budget is not realistic.
- d. Salaries for staff whose resumes were included appear correct based on the South African market rate for people with their qualifications and job responsibilities. However, evaluators would like to see explicit breakdowns of base salary and any fringe benefits or other charges to ensure that Wildlands has appropriately budgeted for personnel costs.
- e. The total budget for non-US consultants (e.g., the Mozambique liaison) is \$97,800. If this ends up being a single person, CEPF may have to determine appropriate operational guidance because of current limits on contracts in excess of \$50,000.
- f. Amounts allocated for printing services, rent, telecommunications, postage, supplies all appear appropriate.
- g. The absence of costs for furniture and equipment, maintenance, and indirect costs (even as an enumerated contribution from Wildlands) is troubling, suggesting that the budget may not be realistic.
- h. No money is allocated for Portuguese translation/interpretation (e.g., of financial documents, safeguard documents, advertisements, outreach materials), and Wildlands’ contention that the Mozambique liaison will handle such tasks is unrealistic.
- i. While the budgets for travel and meetings are substantial, without making undue assumptions, evaluators are unable to determine the appropriateness of these budgets in relation to the activities in the proposal (which themselves require further elaboration).

#### **4. Summary Evaluation**

Evaluators discussed the competitive value of receiving only one application. CEPF has been long active in South Africa through the Cape Floristic Region and Succulent Karoo portfolios. As such, potential applicants are aware of the challenges of serving as the Regional Implementation Team, the financial costs of doing so, and the programmatic cost in being precluded from receiving other grants for work in the hotspot. Wildlands is transparent in stating that it has had discussions with the other potential applicants, and that they are aware of the Wildlands submission.

Indeed, Wildlands is a longstanding conservation NGO with 22 years of experience; it is based in the hotspot; it has a diverse and appropriate technical portfolio that combines conservation with civil society; and it has appropriate financial strength. Wildlands is not so large that taking on this CEPF grant will be subsumed by a broader organizational agenda or ignored as not a core activity, and Wildlands is not so small that the CEPF grant will overwhelm its organizational capacity.

Wildlands has submitted a well-written proposal that reflects a good understanding of the Regional Implementation Team’s functions to provide technical and organizational leadership to achieve CEPF’s strategic directions. It also brings a network of established relationships within

South Africa, and the foundation for future partnerships in Mozambique and Swaziland. The Regional Implementation Team would complement Wildlands' existing portfolio of projects.

However, if selected for recommendation, several aspects of the proposal require refinement to address the concerns expressed in this memo, including specificity on Products/Deliverables and Activities; links between deliverables, personnel level of effort and tasks, and the budget; and the proposed management approach.

Subsequent to CEPF Working Group review of this application and analysis, the CEPF Secretariat recommends negotiation with Wildlands over the issues discussed here, proceeding toward award of a grant for Wildlands to serve as the Regional Implementation Team in the Maputaland-Pondoland-Albany Hotspot and in preparation for the Donor Council review and approval.