Response to Working Group Comments on the Tropical Andes Ecosystem Profile

Working Group meeting, 15 April 2021

Working Group Comment	CEPF Secretariat Response
1. Clarify the definition of when a KBA is	The definition of fully/partially protected KBAs appears in Section 5.4 (p91) of the
considered fully and partially protected in the	ecosystem profile. Specifically, a KBA is considered fully protected when 80 percent of
profile.	its area overlaps with a legally established protected area, or as partially protected
	when 10 to 80 percent of its area overlaps with a legally established protected area.
2. From a presentational perspective, showing 22	We appreciate the perspective that may be conveyed by presenting 22 investment
investment priorities may not be a good idea,	priorities. Nevertheless, we would prefer to continue using the term "investment
as it could give the impression that the	priority", because this terminology has been used in all ecosystem profiles, is familiar
investment strategy is too diffuse, although	to our grantees, and is used in our grants management system. We understand that,
from a content perspective the 22 investment	from a messaging perspective, presenting the full list of investment priorities may
priorities do make sense. Rather than use the	give the misleading impression that the strategy is too diffuse, and we will be more
word "priority" CEPF may wish to consider	attentive to this possible perception in how we present the investment strategy in our
using the word "area".	communications. In particular, we will emphasize the five Strategic Directions.
3. Given the breadth of what is proposed and the	We recognize that the scale of the conservation challenges in the hotspot go beyond
urgent in the hotspot, is the \$14 million budget	CEPF's funding capacity. In response, the investment strategy is highly targeted,
sufficient to achieve the targets?	focusing on 10 percent of the KBAs and corridors in the hotspot, focusing on those
	where CEPF funding has the greatest added value. The overall impact in the previous
	investment phase was significant, and meaningfully advanced the conservation
	agenda in the hotspot. For the new phase, we propose the same level of funding for
	Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, and a significantly increased level of funding for Ecuador
	(where additional funding has been secured from KfW). We will continue to explore
	opportunities to leverage additional funding for the other three countries.
4. What are the implications of having the funding	Funding allocations currently favor investment in Ecuador because of the pledged
allocation so heavily weighted in favor of	funding from KfW, which is allocated solely for that country. We are actively fund
Ecuador in terms of benefits to the other three	raising to increase the budgets for Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, which would allow for
countries.	a better balance of funding across the hotspot. We believe the current budget is
	sufficient to initiate grant making for Phase III, to allow us to maintain our momentum
	with partners, the RIT and possible donors. We are very hopeful our fund raising
	efforts will be successful, to allow us to bring investment in the other three countries
	up to levels comparable with that in Ecuador.

5. The impacts of COVID-19 in the hotspot are profound and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future. Public funding for conservation has already decreased significantly. People are migrating back to rural areas because of high unemployment in the cities and to escape exposure to the virus, and this is putting great stress on the environment. The investment strategy is good with respect to addressing key challenges in the coming years related to COVID. Of particular emphasis should be facilitating land titling to avoid land invasions and short-term environmental damage. This is particularly important because it remains unclear when the situation in the Andes will improve, and, as time passes, the risk of environmental degradation will increase. Strong emphasis should be put on those investment priorities related to tenure security and illegal wildlife trade and hunting, and to supporting sustainable livelihoods to communities through NGOs.

The investment strategy places a strong emphasis on support to local communities to deal with the impacts of the pandemic. Promoting a green recovery from COVID-19 is a cross cutting theme across the entire strategy. In addition, Investment Priority 1.3 supports strengthening campesino and indigenous peoples to secure land tenure, Investment Priorities 1.4 and 1.5 support sustainable livelihoods and economic incentives for conservation, while Investment Priority 3.2 aims to reduce wildlife trafficking and hunting.

Based on the Working Groups recommendations, we have edited Chapter 12 on the investment niche and Chapter 13 on the investment strategy to strengthen the emphasis on the key elements recommended. For example, the following sentences have been added to the description of the CEPF investment niche (p320): "In the short term, the niche seeks to support local communities to cope with impacts of the pandemic and to stem environmental degradation by supporting secure land tenure for local communities, fostering sustainable livelihoods, and combating wildlife trafficking and hunting." Similar statements have been added to the investment strategy (p321 onwards).

6. It remains important to ensure flexibility in protected area designation to ensure the longterm needs of local people. In addition, it should be noted that the GEF is evaluating the appropriateness of the METT to measure management effectiveness of small, community protected areas. We concur that CEPF must maintain flexibility with respect to the kinds of protected area designations that it supports. Experience from the previous phase has shown the utility of working with local governments to protect their watersheds, which fall with KBAs. We look forward to receiving more information on the GEF's efforts to adapt the METT for smaller protected areas, as the updated METT would be a useful tool for CEPF as well.

7. It will be important to look at what CEPF and other donors are supporting in Ecuador and the other countries, to ensure strong coordination and to fund raise to meet the budgetary needs for the investment strategy.

We agree that seeking new collaboration with CEPF's existing global donors and other donors with programs in the Andes will be critically important as the strategy progresses to implementation. The Secretariat welcomes the support from the Donor Council and Working Group in making connections to regional staff in the Andean countries.

8. The level of Chinese investment in	CEPF has experience working with local civil society groups to improve the design and
infrastructure in the Andes is striking, although	execution of Chinese-financed infrastructure in several countries, including in Bolivia,
not surprising given the level of Chinese	Peru, and Jamaica (in the Caribbean Islands Hotspot). At the local level, CEPF has
investment globally. What are some examples	helped to empower local communities to engage in the planning and monitoring of
of where CEPF-funded grants can make a	large infrastructure projects by providing information and analysis to local people on
difference in ensuring the sustainability of	the project and its possible economic, social, and environmental impacts. CEPF has
these investments, particularly for	funded consultations and information exchanges and dissemination, so that local
infrastructure?	communities are better informed about possible options they may wish to pursue
	with respect to their engagement in the planning and monitoring of infrastructure
	projects. In addition, CEPF has funded technical assistance and studies on specific
	projects, so that government officials are better informed about options on how best
	to mitigate social and environmental impacts. This multi-pronged approach has led to
	several important conservation victories with respect to infrastructure projects.
9. What is CEPF's strategy to engage with the	CEPF grantees supported under the previous phase made important strides,
private sector?	particularly with respect to small and medium enterprises focusing on ecotourism,
	coffee, and cacao. In addition, CEPF grantees achieved important advances in
	promoting the adoption of better environmental practices by three mining
	associations in Bolivia and in establishing an alliance of environmental NGOs and
	mining companies interested in sustainability. In the new phase, we hope to forge
	stronger linkages with larger private sector firms to promote sustainable practice,
	which is reflected in the investment strategy. For example, the investment strategy
	specifically prioritizes Parque Nacional Natural Farallones de Cali because it presents
	an important opportunity to create partnerships with the private sector of Cali city. In
	addition, CEPF will reach out to several more established national NGOs that have
	experience in working with larger companies.

10. In the next few years, Andean countries will seek to revive their economies by emphasizing mining exports. CEPF has an important role to play to help Andean NGOs engage in the development of mining policies and projects in the next few years.

We agree that that helping local, national and international CSOs to engage in mitigating the environmental and social impacts of mining will be an important aspect of the CEPF portfolio in the new phase. In the previous phase, CEPF funded several grants that aimed to increase the sustainability of mining in the hotspot. For example, CEPF funded a regional project that compiled baseline data on the extent of mining in the priority corridors and KBAs, and developed national-level strategies and a regional strategy for increasing the sustainability of mining in the hotspot. Other projects worked with mining associations to help them adopt improved environmental practices in mining. We look forward to building on this experience to help civil society to promote social and environmental responsibility in the mining sector.