

EVALUATION OF CEPF LONG-TERM VISION EXERCISES.

11th May 2018

Julia E. Latham

+44 (0) 7772 368184 | julialatham@gmail.com

Suggested citation: Latham, J. E. (2018) Evaluation of CEPF Long-term Vision Exercises. An unpublished report for the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund.

The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund or its donors.

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	5
Long Term Vision Exercises	5
Evaluation objective, approach and methodology	6
EVALUATION RESULTS	6
Relevance	8
Effectiveness	9
Efficiency	11
Enabling factors	12
Constraining factors	12
LESSONS LEARNED	13
RECOMMENDATIONS	14
Institutional arrangements	14
Relevance	14
Timing	15
Value for money	16
ANNEXES	17
ANNEX 1. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	17
ANNEX 2. EVALUATION MATRIX	19
ANNEX 3. KEY INFORMANTS CONSULTED	23
ANNEX 4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION	24

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CEPF	Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
EAM	Eastern Afromontane
EP	Ecosystem Profile
EU	European Union
LTV	Long-term Vision
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
RIT	Regional Implementation Team

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation assesses CEPF's Long-term Vision Exercises. CEPF is a global programme that provides grants to engage and strengthen civil society in the conservation of biodiversity within the global biodiversity hotspots. CEPF does not plan to become a permanent presence in each hotspot, but to define and work toward an endpoint at which local civil society can transition from support with sufficient capacity to operate independently. CEPF has recently piloted 'long-term visions', strategic documents that set out a pathway for transitioning civil society from CEPF-support in each hotspot that it works. It is critical that visions are relevant to the local context in each hotspot and that civil-society feel ownership of the visions to ensure sustainability, yet visions must also have some level of consistency to be of global strategic relevance to CEPF. To achieve this, long-term vision (LTV) exercises were piloted in three areas between 2015 and 2017: the Balkans subregion of the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains subregion of the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot, and the Indo-Burma Hotspot. This evaluation assesses the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the pilot LTV exercises, and provides a synthesis of lessons learned and makes recommendations for future LTV exercises.

Each LTV pilot exercise involved its own unique set of enabling and constraining factors, highlighting the differences in issues depending on the hotspot and scale of the region. Respondents for this evaluation all understood the relevance of the exercises in their aim to provide a vision for the region that goes beyond the usual short-term framework of conservation activities. However, the degree to which the exercise was deemed relevant to each stakeholder group varied. There were differences in opinion with regard to the purpose of the exercise, and who was responsible for implementing the LTV recommendations going forward. Overall, it was felt that the LTVs were too broad and reflect the strategy of CEPF, limiting the ability for other actors such as the RIT, CSOs and other donors to engage with and own the vision, thus diminishing their utility. Notwithstanding the first EAM LTV, that required updating, the LTVs largely fulfilled their scope of work in terms of identifying long-term milestones and targets, and defining a financing plan. In most regions they have proved effective for some near-term benefits such as assisting with RIT implementation plans. However, their effectiveness in terms of achieving the wider objective of mobilizing strategies and engaging wider non-CEPF actors was limited. Whilst it was felt that the LTV exercises provided value for money in terms of the breadth of consultations and documents produced, determining their efficiency at creating results depends on what measure of utility is adopted: CEPF and partner implementation, or wider non-CEPF actor engagement and ownership of the vision.

For each LTV exercise there is a trade-off between providing a macro scale roadmap for the region and addressing the multiple and varied issues at the national scale. One recommendation to assist with this trade-off is to begin each exercise by establishing a clear picture of the stakeholder landscape, as it will help to identify the LTV audience relevant to that scale. In this way, the scope of work for each LTV would vary and be dependent on the hotspot. A number of additional recommendations are also presented to help guide the implementation of future LTV exercises.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1. Long Term Vision Exercises

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International, the European Union (EU), the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank, established to safeguard the world's biodiversity hotspots. CEPF's mission is to engage and strengthen civil society in the conservation of biodiversity within the global hotspots, and it delivers this mission by providing grants and associated capacity building to non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community-based organizations, academic institutions and other civil society organisations (CSOs). This support is guided by 'ecosystem profiles' which detail the investment strategies for the hotspot over a five-year period, informed by extensive stakeholder consultation.

CEPF does not plan to become a permanent presence in each hotspot but to define and work toward an endpoint at which local civil society can transition from support with sufficient capacity, access to resources and credibility to respond to future conservation challenges. CEPF has recently piloted 'long-term visions' (LTVs), strategic documents that set clear transition targets to describe the conditions under which CEPF can withdraw support from a hotspot with confidence. CEPF's framework for LTVs identifies five conditions which need to be met for a hotspot to transition from CEPF support:

- 1) Conservation priorities and best practices for their management are documented, disseminated and used by public and private sector, civil society and donor agencies to guide their support for conservation in the region.
- 2) Local civil society groups dedicated to conservation priorities collectively possess sufficient organizational and technical capacity to be effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development, while being equal partners of private sector and government agencies influencing decision making in favor of sustainable societies and economies.
- 3) Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities.
- 4) Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity.
- 5) Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation challenges.

To achieve this aim, LTVs should be prepared with the participation of stakeholders from civil society, government, private sector and the donor community. It is critical that visions are relevant to the local context in each hotspot and that civil society feel ownership of the visions to ensure sustainability, yet visions must also have some level of consistency to be of global strategic relevance to CEPF. To achieve this, LTV exercises were piloted in three areas between 2015 and 2017: the Balkans subregion of the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains subregion of the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot, and the Indo-Burma Hotspot.

1.2. Evaluation objective, approach and methodology

This evaluation was commissioned by CEPF with the objective of providing a comprehensive and systematic evidence-based evaluation of the three pilot LTV exercises, to inform the scope of work for future exercises. This includes an assessment of each exercise's design, implementation and outputs, as well as a synthesis of lessons learned to make recommendations for future LTV exercises. In particular, the purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the pilot LTV exercises. For each LTV, the evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

- Whose interests and needs are the LTV most relevant to?
- Did the LTV meet the scope of work and achieve its objective?
- What were the main enabling or constraining factors that helped or hindered the LTV exercise?
- Will the LTV be sustained going forward? By whom?
- What key lessons can be learned for future LTV exercises?

To achieve the evaluation objective, a participatory and consultative approach was adopted. This began with a desk review of the key documents pertaining to the three pilot LTV exercises, listed in Annex 1 of this report. As a data collection and analysis tool, an evaluation matrix (Annex 2) was formulated based on the questions included in the scope of work for this evaluation. Key informant questionnaires were developed based on this matrix, and interviews with a total of 15 key informants were conducted remotely between 12th and 24th April 2018. A complete list of persons interviewed is presented in Annex 3 of this evaluation report. This 15-day evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant over a period of four weeks in April-May 2018.

2. EVALUATION RESULTS

The three pilot LTVs each had different experiences in their approach and outcomes, summarised in Table 1 which outlines key features of each LTV. The first LTV to be undertaken was in the Eastern Afrotropical (EAM) in late 2014. Alex Muhweezi, an independent consultant, was hired to lead this LTV. For reasons that are discussed in this evaluation, this first EAM LTV did not fulfill all the requirements of the exercise and so was updated in 2017 by the Regional Implementation Team (RIT - Birdlife). This updated EAM LTV had a narrower scope, with the focus reduced from seven to four countries. National workshops were held in all four countries, and interviews with key regional actors were held. This updated EAM LTV was recently approved by the CEPF Secretariat and is awaiting submission to the Donor Council. The two remaining LTVs, in The Balkans and Indo-Burma have both been approved by the CEPF Donor Council. The team leading the LTV in the Balkans is unique amongst the pilots, in that it was chaired by Janez Potocnik, former European Commissioner for the Environment. In addition, the LTV team was composed of external consultants and led by Mojmir Mrak, a Professor of Economics, supported by Milan Ružić, a biodiversity specialist. Stakeholder consultations were conducted in each of the four countries during three-day country visits and the exercise concluded with a meeting of senior stakeholders in Postojna, during which the LTV findings were discussed. In Indo-Burma, the LTV was conducted by the RIT (IUCN) and a large number of stakeholders were consulted during one to two day national workshops in each of the six countries.

Table 1. Overview of each LTV.

	Balkans	EAM (1st)	EAM (update)	Indo-Burma
Date conducted	Sept. 2015	Nov. 2014	May-Nov. 2017	July-Nov. 2015
Date completed	Jan. 2016	June 2015	Dec. 2017	August 2016 (after peer review)
CEPF approved	April 2016	June 2015	Jan. 2018	August 2016
Donor Council approved	Oct. 2017	Not submitted	Not yet submitted	Oct. 2017
Timing wrt. CEPF funding phase	During Year 4 of 1st investment	Mid-way through 1st investment	Shortly after 3 year (2017-2019) investment extension granted	Mid-way through 2nd investment
LTV Team	External consultants & high profile Chairperson	External consultant	RIT	RIT
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-day visits in each country • Concluded with a high level meeting in Postonja • Short video describing the LTV available online • Suggests two phases of CEPF graduation: strengthening phase and towards the phasing out phase. • Useful executive summary • Graduation conditions, their targets and funding estimates are clearly presented in individual tables per country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven countries (Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda) • National workshops in all countries except South Sudan (due to instability), and regional-level workshop held • Graduation conditions and targets for all countries are presented in individual tables for each condition (NB. incomplete) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four countries (Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania) • National workshops in all countries, and interviews with key regional actors • Graduation conditions and targets for all countries are presented in tables per condition • Priority actions to reach targets for the graduation conditions are clearly summarized in chapter 7 of the report • Clear financing plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National workshops held in all six countries • Graduation conditions and targets are presented in individual tables for each condition • Graduation conditions and targets in the tables are regionally specific (not by country) • A series of standardized recommendations to accelerate progress towards transition are clearly presented • Clear financing plan

2.1. Relevance

Overall, the informants for this evaluation understood the relevance of the LTV exercise in terms of providing a longer-term strategy for the region, beyond the usual short-term thinking of conservation activities. However, the degree to which the exercise was deemed relevant to each stakeholder group varied. There were differences in opinion with regard to the purpose of the exercise, indicating a lack of agreement on who the intended audience for the LTV is, and thus who is responsible for implementing the LTV recommendations going forward.

2.1.1. Relevance to CEPF and its donors

It is clear that the LTVs are relevant to CEPF and its donors. For CEPF, the purpose of the LTVs is to provide a legacy beyond the five-year investment model, to improve the long-term capacity of civil society. As one respondent stated “The LTV is for the CEPF, it is a document written to advise the CEPF on engaging civil society and to indicate long term timelines and milestones”. In this sense, the LTV has more near-term benefits for each iteration of the ecosystem profile (EP), by providing the overarching strategic framework within which each five year profile provides the workplan. However, this benefit of the LTV is only possible if the document is available for each iteration of the EP, which was not the case in the Balkans due to timing. In the Balkans, the LTV did serve the use - additional to its purpose - of raising the profile of CEPF by demonstrating their role as a significant donor in the region.

LTVs are relevant to CEPF donors in that they provide assurance that the organisation has a long-term strategy, and is being effective in its aim to improve civil society capacity for independent operation. Given the timescale and funding required for such long term strategies, to be effective LTVs need to be relevant to stakeholders beyond CEPF, as one respondent stated “achieving the LTV is only possible if CSOs can be supported by other donors or agencies in the area”. As such, the purpose of LTVs is to “build a roadmap to attract other donors”. However, for both the EAM and Indo-Burma LTVs it was felt that donor engagement in the process was missing at the national and regional scale, and that the responsibility for leveraging this engagement was with CEPF through the donor council. As such, there is room to make the LTVs more relevant to CEPF donors active at the regional and national scale to help unite this long-term strategising, and make it more effective across scales.

2.1.2. Relevance to RIT

The LTVs are relevant to each RIT as the implementer of these work plans. However, there is concern that RITs return to “business as usual” once the exercises are completed. RIT informants stated the LTV recommendations are beyond their scope, and so it is not clear who is supposed to be implementing these recommendations in the long term. The LTVs are perceived as being a CEPF strategy and, given that RIT organisations have their own strategy, if the RIT is no longer funded by CEPF in the future this LTV strategy would essentially no longer exist. This recurring concern illustrates a lack of ownership for the LTV, and confusion with regard to who is responsible for the LTV going forward. Examples of how the LTV being used by the RIT are evident in all three pilot regions, however the degree to which the LTV is being used for its intended purpose is debatable, as discussed further in section 2.2.

2.1.3. Relevance to CEPF grantees and other CSOs

Each LTV consulted with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. However, some respondents felt that the consultations involved the “usual suspects”, and did not capture the wider perspective that was the intention of the exercises. LTVs are relevant to grantees and other CSOs because they demonstrate to these organisations how CEPF is aiming to be more effective in the long term. However, this message was misconstrued by some: in the Balkans and EAM in particular there was an unease amongst CSO participants that this exercise meant CEPF were planning on withdrawing from the area, and so the exercise acted as an incentive for CSOs to demonstrate their dependence on CEPF funding and that transition was premature, diminishing the purpose of the exercise. In addition, there are concerns that these exercises can raise expectations amongst CSOs by providing the impression that CEPF are committing to the area for these long timeframes.

2.1.4. Relevance to other donors active in the hotspot

The LTV financing plans indicate large sums are required for the long-term strategies, and these were highlighted as being beyond the capacity of CEPF, the RIT and other CSOs. As such, the LTV is only possible if CSOs can be supported by other donors in the region. Within the CEPF secretariat this is considered a key objective of the exercise, to identify what the funding needs will be and how they can be sourced. In this way the LTV will act as a roadmap for funding, helping to engage other donors and potentially aid the development of a common strategy. Yet, excluding the unique situation in the Balkans with the EU, a number of respondents identified a lack of engagement and/or ownership by other donors with the LTV, bringing into question the utility of the exercises for this purpose. In addition, there is a lack of clarity with regard to who is responsible for engaging other funding sources, and at what stage of the process this engagement should take place.

2.2. Effectiveness

Assessing the effectiveness of the LTV exercises requires consensus on its objective, however there is conflicting opinion amongst stakeholders with regard to this. Notwithstanding the first EAM LTV that required updating, the LTVs largely fulfilled their scope of work in terms of identifying long-term milestones and targets, and defining a financing plan. However, their effectiveness in terms of achieving the wider objective of mobilising strategies and engaging wider non-CEPF actors is more questionable. A common concern amongst respondents was not regarding the LTV methodology, but what their purpose was and who was responsible for taking the vision forward.

The first EAM LTV was the very first of the pilots to be conducted, and there was a lot of discussion within CEPF, the LTV consultant and advisory panel at the time with regard to the objective of the exercise and how best to conduct it. This confusion is evident in the first LTV, as it was too broad and required updating. It was a very challenging exercise for the consultant given seven countries were included in the exercise and he was acting alone, plus the consultant was not overly familiar with CEPF and was not best-placed to act as a convener of key

stakeholders in the region. The updated LTV benefited from being conducted by the RIT, as they were well-placed to conduct the exercise given their knowledge of both CEPF and the region. Except for a reduction in countries included, the scope of work for each EAM LTV is not significantly different. The difference in outcomes can be attributed to the team conducting the LTV update, as well as the combined learned experiences based on the other pilots accumulated by that time. The updated LTV consulted a broad range of stakeholders and fulfilled the scope of work, and is being used by the RIT to help prioritise targets for the next call for proposals, as the EP has expired since a funding extension was granted. It is also being used by the RIT to help identify commonalities with other donor strategies to help fundraising. However, there is concern amongst the Grant Director and the RIT with regard to its real purpose and use, “is the LTV a desk study contributing to global knowledge, or is it to be used by CEPF donors and other donors? Is it a plan or a rallying cry?”. The scale is thought to be too broad to be useful to CSOs given the variety in policies between countries, and the financing plan outside the capacity of CEPF, RIT and CSOs, and so there is confusion as to how the LTV is to be used and by whom. A repeated concern is that the LTV will be perceived as a CEPF strategy, in which case other external actors are unlikely to see the relevance. In addition, it was felt that donor engagement in the process was lacking, affecting the overall utility of the LTV, and that in place of lengthy consultations a more targeted analysis of key donors and actors in the region would be more beneficial, so that the primary audience is identified and the LTV can be designed to be of maximum relevance to that audience.

The Balkans LTV benefited greatly from having Janez Potocnik act as Chairperson, as his influence helped to attract key stakeholders to the consultation and the high-level meeting that concluded the exercise. Such a “high-level convener” is cited as essential for LTVs to help attract and engage the key stakeholders required for the LTV exercise. In addition, the LTV team contributed combined economics and biodiversity expertise to the exercise, which provided the broad perspective that is evident within the LTV. The Balkans LTV was particularly well-received by the European Commission, and has been very effective at raising the profile of CEPF in the region. However, this team for the Balkans LTV is unique amongst the pilots and these factors might be difficult to replicate in other regions, with the geographic proximity to the EU and the accession process dominating the LTV narrative. The Balkans LTV was effective at engaging key stakeholders in the region, however the LTV also demonstrated the pitfalls of the process as the LTV highlights the case for extended support rather than CEPF being able to withdraw. This was largely due to the timing of the exercise, towards the end of the first phase of funding, combined with the stalled EU accession process, as CSOs understood the exercise to mean another donor was withdrawing from the region before EU status is awarded. In this sense, the LTV was an effective fundraising exercise as phase two of funding has since been secured. Additional near-term benefits include the LTV being used for the Natura 2000 extension to the Balkans. However, the Grant Director for the region believes these outcomes could have been achieved in a more efficient way, and are unique to the region and additional to the objective of the LTV. Indeed, the RIT stated that while the LTV provides timelines that they can implement, it does not provide a clear assessment of other donors in the region and opportunities for future funding, and so limiting the effectiveness of the vision going forward.

A large number of stakeholders were engaged in consultations the Indo-Burma LTV, and it achieved a very good understanding of the threats in the region and forecasting into the future. As such, the Indo-Burma LTV gives clarity to the timeline of CEPF engagement in the region, and it is being used as part of a wider analysis of the region by the Mekong Network on the Environment, a new regional group of key stakeholders to address conservation issues. However, while the LTV is detailed, there is concern that its message is less clear given CEPF have a less obvious niche in the region than in the Balkans, as there are many donors and actors active in the area and the situation is very different in each country. Thus, if the LTV is to achieve a shared vision for the region then it would be more effective if it provided an overall picture of the donor landscape, to be used to identify shared strategies and areas where additional funding can be leveraged. A limitation with the Indo-Burma LTV is how it is being used, with concerns that, post-exercise, the RIT and CSOs have returned to “business as usual”. This concern is warranted, with the RIT themselves questioning how the LTV is being used, “The LTV needs to be used to diversify funding, to identify and attract different funding streams but it is unclear who should be doing this going forward”. This is partly due to recent staff turnover in IUCN, as well as the high demands on time and resources limiting the ability for dedicated strategic thinking. The LTV also lost some momentum with the RIT, as there was a two year delay between the exercises being conducted and the document approved, and some members of the LTV team had not yet received a final copy at the time of this evaluation.

2.3. Efficiency

Again, an assessment of efficiency requires consensus on the purpose of the LTV and its utility going forward. In terms of the exercises and the documents produced, it was felt that the LTVs have provided good value for money given the number of consultations held at each region, the number of stakeholders involved and the detail provided within the reports. Of course, the first EAM LTV had to be updated and so arguably this did not prove to be an efficient use of resources, however it was the first LTV to be conducted and thus was somewhat of an experiment.

In all cases, the teams leading the LTVs felt the budget and timeframe was tight, but possible. In terms of managing the LTV process, the Grant Director for the Balkans stated the process was very time-consuming and not an efficient use of resources given the subsequent utility of the LTV. Each LTV’s effectiveness as a roadmap to attract and engage other donors and key stakeholders has been called into question, and if this is a key objective of the LTV then the exercises might be conducted more efficiently.

Overall, LTVs need to have realistic expectations. Most stakeholder groups can agree on broad aspirational goals, but when these are narrowed and become more specific it will be difficult to align conflicting interests. These conflicts will be specific both between and within regions, in some regions it might be easier to engage different stakeholder groups than in others. From the perspective of one donor, the recommendation was that CEPF should not try to reach perfection with these exercises, they are very ambitious and based on many assumptions, and so it is not worth spending too much time trying to be exact. Instead, “the LTVs should be used to steer thinking and used as a tool for cooperation in the region”.

2.3.1. Enabling factors

The enabling factors varied for each LTV. In the Balkans, the LTV team was very effective at capturing a broader perspective given the diverse specialities of the team, and the exercise benefited greatly from Janez Potocnik acting as chair. This reflects the unique situation in the region given the dominance of European politics, and could be difficult to replicate elsewhere. In the EAM, the task proved to be too challenging for a sole consultant and the update benefitted from the knowledge and expertise of the RIT, as did the Indo-Burma LTV. However, there are limitations with a RIT-led team, in terms of being able to engage stakeholders beyond the “usual suspects” and attract the senior-level stakeholders envisioned for these exercises. In addition, the Indo-Burma LTV required an additional peer-review process after completion, as there was concern for the level of self-referencing by the RIT in the document which added extra time and cost to the exercise.

2.3.2. Constraining factors

Across the board respondents cited being able to engage the right stakeholders in the exercise as a challenge, with the exercises being “conservationists talking to conservationists”. This was less problematic in the Balkans, given the broader expertise of the LTV team and the ability of the chairperson to convene government and donor stakeholders. However, the inclusion of private sector was lacking in all cases, with it cited as being very difficult to engage the private sector in these types of activities, and if that is required then a different approach is necessary.

A significant constraining factor for all of the exercises was the difficulty in explaining the aims and purpose of the LTV succinctly to all those involved. Confusion in the LTV objective and whose responsibility it is to take the LTV forward is apparent both within CEPF, amongst those leading the exercises, and those and taking part. In addition, there was concern that CSOs taking part construed the exercise to mean CEPF were withdrawing from the region, or that CEPF were committing to the region in the long term. It seems clear there is confusion both within and between stakeholder groups as to the purpose of the LTV exercises, and in how best to explain the aims of the exercise succinctly.

Scale was also frequently cited as an issue, with many respondents stating that the diversity of issues and stakeholders between countries makes it difficult to capture a regional strategy that all stakeholders can own and receive use from. To be of more use to CSOs at the national level, a narrower scope is needed. This implies a trade-off is necessary, between capturing sufficient detail at the national scale to be of utility to CSOs, while retaining a broader vision in the region. Assessment of this trade-off depends on the desired utility of the LTV, and how it will be used going forward and by whom. Time was also a constraining factor, with long delays between the exercises and the LTV approval being responsible for a loss of momentum at the regional level, potentially affecting the utility of the vision going forward. This delay may be challenging to overcome given the competing priorities of CEPF communications with the donor council, to minimise the demands on donor council time given the large number of decisions and approvals they are required to make.

3. LESSONS LEARNED

The aim for clarity in a long-term strategic vision for a region is moderated by the inherent complexities of the problems within each country in that region. This pragmatism is evident in many of the interview responses, that the LTV is useful, but each area has unique issues that cannot be generalized. However, if the purpose of the LTV is to provide a macro scale roadmap for the region it must accept that it cannot solve the minutiae of the issues at the micro scale. This is a trade-off that needs to be clearly communicated and agreed on at the onset of each exercise. Establishing a clear picture of the stakeholder landscape can assist with this trade-off, as it will help to identify the LTV audience relevant to that scale. For example, the position of CEPF is clearer in the Balkans than in Indo-Burma, where there are many actors and many donors. The more actors, the more complex and the more important it is to map the stakeholder landscape and define the LTV audience.

This evaluation has identified a number of lessons learned during the pilot LTV exercises, summarised here into five key points:

- 1. Confusion in objective:** The perceived relevance of the exercise altered depending on the stakeholder group. For example, grantee/CSO stakeholders commonly perceived unease that the exercise indicated CEPF were withdrawing prematurely from the region, or raised expectations that CEPF were committing long term to the region. The RITs perceived the LTVs as helping to define and monitor each five year investment phase according to a longer plan, but there was confusion with regard to who was responsible for implementing this going forward. LTVs are perceived by the CEPF secretariat as a roadmap to increase their effectiveness and attract other funders to the region. These differing perceptions indicate the main objective of the LTV requires clarification, and as such as revision of the scope of work is required.
- 2. Audience not clearly defined:** While the LTVs might have relevance for the different stakeholders, it isn't very clear who the intended audience of the LTV is. It is not clear who the institutional actor is that will take this forward and have responsibility for ensuring it is used.
- 3. Scale:** The complexity of issues and actors varies greatly both between and within hotspots. As such, for the LTV to have utility beyond CEPF the necessary audience to achieve this utility will vary both between and within hotspots. It was felt that the scale of the exercises was very broad, and the financing plans were beyond the scope of the current LTV audience, which diminishes the utility of the LTV going forward.
- 4. LTV Team:** There are pros and cons to the RIT leading the LTV versus external consultants. An external consultant is beneficial if they are influential in the area and can convene the necessary stakeholders to the exercise. In addition, a team of consultants with differing expertise provides the LTV with broader regional context. Conversely, the RIT know the CEPF well which aids communication, and if they are to be instrumental in using the LTV it is advantageous to have the RIT engaged in the process. However, the RIT are limited in their capacity and might be limited in their contacts, so that a broader perspective beyond that of biodiversity conservation is harder to achieve.

5. **Lost momentum:** The time delay between the LTV exercises and approval by CEPF creates lost momentum and contributes to a lack of stakeholder engagement post-exercises. The LTV documents are long and detailed, and won't necessarily be read by external actors, potentially impacting the utility of the LTVs if they aren't being read and used by the intended audience.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the lessons learned from this evaluation and guided by the scope of work, the following are recommendations for future CEPF LTV exercises:

4.1.1. Institutional arrangements

Based on the complexity of the task and the lessons learned by this evaluation, the LTV exercises should be conducted by a team. Ideally, given the trade-offs outlined in section 3, a combination of the RIT and an external consultant acting as Chairperson would be most beneficial, if a high-level figure that can convene the necessary stakeholders is easily-identifiable in the region. This would depend on budget, and the region in question. Including the LTV exercise into the Terms of Reference for the RIT will help to foster ownership of the vision by the RIT going forward, especially if the RIT organisation already plan to remain in the region for that timeline. To achieve this, it will be necessary to communicate clearly in the LTV scope of work that the role of the RIT goes beyond the exercise and encompasses implementation of the vision. This would help to clear confusion in objective and audience, and a requirement of the scope of work could be that the RIT work with the Chairperson to identify and engage potential funding streams for that implementation. This point is elaborated on in 4.1.2., below.

4.1.2. Relevance

In their current form, the LTVs are most useful for the CEPF, as they are written from their perspective. To be more broadly owned, and go beyond the reach of the "usual suspects", the exercises will likely require a different approach. A common suggestion was one of needing to identify the intended audience at the beginning of each exercise, to ensure that the LTV targets are owned by that audience. This evaluation has identified the importance of two key stakeholder groups as the primary audience: the implementers of the LTV (the RIT) and the funders of the LTV (CEPF donors and other donors). Recommendations 4.1.1. and 4.1.3. both help to increase ownership and implementation of the LTV by the RIT. To assist with identification of the second audience group, the donors, an assessment of the stakeholder landscape is recommended, to define the key actors so that CEPF can navigate this landscape and extend relationships beyond its usual partners and collaborators. Engaging the CEPF donor council in this exercise would be beneficial, given their influence with other donors and senior figures in the region. The donor council might also be best-placed to identify the external consultant that can act as the LTV Chairperson and convene senior figures, which will also ensure CEPF donor council engagement in each LTV from an early stage.

Following this recommendation would require a revision of the LTV scope of work. In their current format, the scope of work for the LTVs were achieved given that they each identify targets and milestones and have developed a financial plan. However, if the objective is to convene senior figures and encourage long-term cooperation, as described above, then the scope of work needs to be revised to reflect this. This might mean a two-step process if required: the first, as described above, being a collaboration between the RIT and the CEPF secretariat and donor council to identify the key actors in the region and potential candidates for the Chairperson role. Then, the second step remains similar to the current LTV format, except the scope of work more clearly defines the intended audience of the LTV based on the results of the first step. An iterative approach such as this would also help to provide clarity to the purpose of the exercise, with the role of the intended audience defined during step one and the LTV objective more clearly defined to reflect that audience.

All of the pilot LTVs cited difficulty in engaging the private sector, yet respondents also disputed whether this affected the utility of the LTV given the conflicting interests their engagement would pose. The ability to engage private sector will vary by region, and the interests at stake. The iterative approach recommended here would help to determine whether key actors within the private sector are necessary to achieve the LTV objective in that region.

4.1.3. Ownership

It is important to identify the institutional actor who is responsible for maintaining momentum and ensure all participants know who this is. Given recommendation 4.1.1., the RIT is best-placed to act in this role and it would further serve to improve their ownership of the LTV and implementation of its recommendations. Delays in approval will be difficult to avoid, and so re-convening key actors after approval to discuss findings and ensure ownership could help to mitigate lost momentum. Options include holding a side session at other events in the region where stakeholders are already gathered, or producing additional outputs that are simplified and convey the right message to the target audience such as short videos (as the Balkans produced), or infographics.

The transition tables and milestones within the LTV are quite academic, and potentially difficult for non-CEPF actors to engage with. To help foster ownership amongst those not involved in the exercises, a series of more accessible recommendations might be best. For example, in the Indo-Burma LTV a series of recommendations are presented in a standardized manner that focuses on key outcomes, each identified to help accelerate progress towards CEPF transition in the region. Such brief summaries that are consistent in design can be more easily circulated and useful for CEPF promotional activities.

4.1.4. Timing

The timing of the LTV presents a number of trade-offs. At the beginning of a funding phase, CEPF might not necessarily have harnessed the necessary knowledge, connections and credibility in the region to effectively achieve the LTV. In addition, the RIT are potentially overwhelmed during the beginning of a funding phase to conduct the LTV. However, as evidenced here, if conducted towards the end of the funding phase it creates concern for CSOs that CEPF are withdrawing,

and creates an incentive to showcase the need for support rather than a long-term vision for withdrawal. In addition, the LTV would not be available for the next EP which is arguably a significant use of the document.

Given a large number of stakeholders are consulted at the beginning of a funding phase for the EP, it seems wise to utilize this opportunity for the LTV. This would need careful planning, as if an iterative approach is adopted (as per section 4.1.2) the targeted consultations could take place before the EP, to allow national consultations to occur alongside the profiling. In addition, timing the LTV exercise at the beginning of a funding phase will mean the first EP effectively reflects the first five years of the LTV, and the LTV can then be used to help define the following 5 year workplans in each reiteration of the EP.

The optimal timing of the exercise might vary from region to region, depending on the stage of CEPF investment at the time. Therefore, to help determine the timing of the LTV a number of criteria could be used to identify the optimal timing for that region, meaning it could vary between regions. These criteria could include:

- What phase of funding the region is currently in
- What stage of the 5 year funding phase the region is currently in
- CEPF knowledge and influence in the region
- Relationship with RIT
- Upcoming events in the region for which key stakeholders may already be convening

4.1.5. Value for money

To ensure value for money, it is important that the objective of the LTV exercise is clarified, and the institutional actor responsible for the vision going forward is identified (see sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3). Whilst engaging a senior figure as a Chairperson as well as the RIT to lead the LTVs could add extra cost, the return on investment would be beneficial if the right figure is identified. This extra cost could be negated with the use of more targeted methods tailored to each region, for example conducting initial conversations with key stakeholders to define the scale and scope of work will be more efficient than lengthy consultations, especially if these consultations are taking place already for the EP.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

ID	Document Name	Document Description
LTV GENERAL		
LTV1	Ops Manual Section 3.9_LTVs.	Section of CEPF operations manual describing the intended purpose and content of LTVs
BALKANS		
B1	Balkans Long-term Vision	Balkans LTV
B2	ToR Lead Consultant Balkans LTV	Scope of work for the LTV lead consultant
B3	ToR support team Balkans LTV	Scope of work for the LTV support team
B4	Postojna list of participants	List of LTV participants in consultation in Postojna 8.12.15 (31 people total)
B5	Contacts for Balkans	Main contact details for the Balkans LTV
B6	CEPF-LIST OF PEOPLE-INSTITUTIONS	List of institutions and people visited during LTV exercise
EASTERN AFROMONTANE		
EAM1	EAM LTV.Attempt 1	1st version of EAM LTV
EAM2	EAM.LTV Update..Final	2nd version EAM LTV
EAM3	EAM.Instructions to Consultant.LTV Update	Instructions for 2nd version LTV consultant (how to apply)
EAM4	EAM.LTV Update.ToR	Scope of work for LTV consultant (for the update of LTV)
EAM5	Contacts for EAM	Main contact details for Eastern Afromontane
EAM6	FDI SOW	Scope of work for 1st LTV
INDO-BURMA		
IB1	Indo-Burma Long-term Vision	Indo-Burma LTV
IB2	RfP.Indo-Burma LT Vision.CEPF	Scope of work for the LTV consultant

IB3	Indo-Burma CEPF Long-Term Vision Stakeholders consulted	List of institutions and people consulted for LTV (103 total)
IB4	List of contacts for LTV Indo-Burma	Main contact list for Indo-Burma LTV
IB5	Attachment 1 - Financing plan for Indo-Burma long-term vision	LTV financing plan for Indo-Burma

ANNEX 2. EVALUATION MATRIX

Q.	Evaluation criteria questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1	Relevance: Was the LTV exercise relevant to the interests and needs of: (i) CEPF grantees and other civil society organizations; (ii) the regional implementation team; (iii) CEPF and its donors; and (iv) other funders active in the hotspot?			
1.1	To what extent was the LTV exercise in line with the interests and needs of CEPF grantees and other CSOs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Number and type of CEPF grantees and other CSOs involved in the LTV exercise ● How were these agencies consulted? ● Level of participation of these agencies in the exercise activities ● Consistency with CEPF grantees and other CSOs priorities and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scope of work documents ● LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Desk review ● Key informant interviews
1.2	To what extent was the LTV exercise in line with the interests and needs of the RIT?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level of RIT input in the exercise ● Consistency with RIT priorities and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scope of work documents ● LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Desk review ● Key informant interviews
1.3	To what extent was the LTV exercise in line with the interests and needs of CEPF and its donors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level of CEPF and donor input in the exercises ● Consistency with CEPF and donor priorities and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CEPF's Operational Manual. ● Scope of work documents ● LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Desk review ● Key informant interviews
1.4	To what extent was the LTV exercise in line with the interests and needs of other funders in the hotspot?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Number and type of other funders involved in the LTV exercise ● Were other funders consulted? How? ● Level of participation of other funders in the exercise activities ● Consistency with other funders priorities and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scope of work documents ● LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Desk review ● Key informant interviews

		strategies		
1.5	To what extent was the LTV exercise in line with the interests and needs of region/sub-region?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were stakeholders identified? • How were stakeholders consulted? • Number and type of stakeholders (incl. government and private sector) involved in the LTV exercise • Appropriateness of stakeholders/scale of representation (regional, national, sub-national) • Level of participation of these stakeholders in the LTV exercise • Consistence with national targets and commitments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPF's Operational Manual. • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews
1.6	What are the overall strengths and weaknesses of the LTV exercise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the key strengths and weaknesses of the LTV exercise and its outputs? • Who are the key benefactors of the LTV documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEPF's Operational Manual. • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews
2	Efficiency: How efficiently was the budget allocated to the LTV exercise converted into results?			
2.1	To what extent was the LTV exercise achieved according to the proposed budget?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the exercises completed within budget? • Extent of over- or under-budget (%) • Were the exercises completed within the timeline? • Suitability of the budget for the LTV exercise • Suitability of the timeline for the LTV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews

		<p>exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability of the methodology for the LTV exercise 		
2.2	What was the quality of management of the LTV exercise?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and why was LTV team chosen? RIT or external? • Suitability of LTV Team expertise • Costs and benefits of RIT-led vs. externally-led • Quality of communication within team • Quality of communication between team and CEPF • Degree of adaptation required during LTV exercise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews
3	Effectiveness: Was the scope of work for the exercise fulfilled? What were the factors that influenced the effective completion of the scope of work?			
3.1	How appropriate was the scope of work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the Scope of Work clear and comprehensive? • What influenced the timing of the LTV? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews
3.2	To what extent was the scope of work fulfilled?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the scope of work objectives achieved? • Clarity of LTV document in particular the recommendations/n ext steps • Utility of LTV document going forward • Are the LTVs for each region comparable? • Barriers/obstacles to achieving the exercise • Key factors that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of work documents • LTV document & associated outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review • Key informant interviews

		facilitated the exercise		
--	--	--------------------------	--	--

ANNEX 3. KEY INFORMANTS CONSULTED

ID	Name	Organisation	Position/LTV role	Stakeholder group
LTV GENERAL				
1	Nina Marshall	CEPF	Senior Director, Monitoring, Evaluation and Outreach	CEPF
2	Olivier Langrand	CEPF	Executive Director	CEPF
3	Patricia Zurita	Birdlife	CEO Birdlife, previous Executive Director CEPF	CEPF
BALKANS LTV				
4	Pierre Carret	CEPF	Grant Director	CEPF
5	Borut Rubinic	DOPPS	RIT Sub-regional Coordinator	RIT
6	Mojmir Mrak	Independent consultant and Academic	Professor - LTV Team Leader	LTV Team
7	Anne-Theo Seinen	EU DG ENV	Policy Officer, European Commission	Participant/CEPF Donor
EASTERN AFROMONTANE LTV				
8	Dan Rothberg	CEPF	Grant Director	CEPF
9	Maaike Manten	Birdlife	RIT Leader	RIT
10	Julius Arinaitwe	Birdlife	Regional Director for Africa / LTV Update Team Leader	(2nd) LTV Team
11	Alex Muhweezi	Independent consultant	1st LTV writer	(1st) LTV Team
INDO-BURMA LTV				
12	Jack Tordoff	CEPF	Managing Director	CEPF
13	Scott Perkin	IUCN	RIT Leader	RIT
14	Robert Mather	Independent consultant/Previous Head of IUCN SouthEast Asia Group	LTV Team Leader	LTV Team
15	Jake Brunner	IUCN	RIT / LTV Team	LTV Team

ANNEX 4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
Call for Proposals
Evaluation of Pilot Long-term Vision Exercises**

Opening date: Monday, 19 February 2018
Closing date: Monday, 19 March 2018, 4:00 p.m. (U.S. EST)
Submission: Applications should be sent by email to nmarshall@cepf.net.
Location: CEPF, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA

1. Invitation

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International (CI), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Government of Japan, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank. CEPF is a global program that provides grants to civil society to safeguard the world's biodiversity hotspots. As one of the founding partners, CI administers the global program through a CEPF Secretariat. CEPF's mission is to engage and strengthen civil society in the conservation of biodiversity in the global hotspots.

Long-term visions are strategic documents that set out a pathway for transitioning civil society from CEPF support in each hotspot where it works. CEPF intends to conduct an independent evaluation of three pilot, long-term vision exercises for the Balkans sub-region of the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot; the Indo-Burma Hotspot; and the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains sub-region of the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot. Interested parties should submit a proposal by the closing date listed above, in compliance with this call for proposals and the scope of work described herein.

2. Submission Requirements

The proposal shall comprise of the following parts:

- Part 1: Technical approach, methodology and detailed work plan – This part must not exceed 5 pages in length.

The technical proposal should describe in detail how the offeror intends to carry out the requirement described in the scope of work. The technical proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and present a methodology and detailed work plan.

- Part 2: Consultant – The offeror should demonstrate the following experience and qualifications, or equivalent:
 - a) Master's degree in relevant natural resources-related field (e.g., monitoring and evaluation with 3 years of experience, or Bachelor's degree with 5 years of experience).
 - b) At least 3 years of experience in relevant technical areas (i.e., monitoring and evaluation).
 - c) Experience working with CEPF or similar grant-making programs.
 - d) Proficiency in English.

- Part 3: Cost proposal – Cost is used to determine which proposals represent the most advantageous and serves as a basis of negotiation for award of a contract. The price of the contract to be awarded will be an all-inclusive, fixed price. No profit, fees, taxes or additional costs can be added after award. The cost shall also include a budget narrative that explains the basis for the estimate of every cost element or line item. Supporting information must be provided in sufficient detail to allow for a complete analysis of each cost element or line item. CEPF reserves the right to request additional cost information if the evaluation committee has concerns about the reasonableness, realism or completeness of an offeror’s proposed cost. Under no circumstances may cost information be changed after the submission of the proposal. Please note that the total amount of time for the assignment is 15 days.

4. Process and Basis for Award

The evaluation of the pilot long-term vision exercises will be undertaken by an independent consultant, selected through a competitive procurement process. Selection of consultants will be overseen by the Monitoring, Evaluation and Outreach Unit within the CEPF Secretariat.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-criteria	Weigh Points
Technical Approach, Methodology and Detailed Work Plan		
	Technical know-how – Does the proposal clearly explain, understand and respond to the objectives of the project as stated in the terms of reference or scope of work?	15
	Approach and Methodology – Does the proposed program approach and detailed activities and timeline fulfill the requirements of executing the scope of work effectively and efficiently?	30
Management, Key Personnel and Staffing Plan		
	Consultant’s Qualifications – Does the proposed consultant have necessary experience and capabilities to carry out the scope of work?	20
Cost (Including travel, fees, charges and any other expenses)		
	Lowest Cost Proposals	35

Scope of Work

Evaluation of Pilot Long-term Vision Exercises for the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

1) Background

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International, the European Union, the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank designed to help safeguard the world's biodiversity hotspots. As one of the founding partners, Conservation International administers the global program through the CEPF Secretariat.

CEPF's mission is to engage and strengthen civil society in the conservation of biodiversity within the global hotspots. CEPF delivers this mission by providing grants and associated capacity building to NGOs, community-based organizations, academic institutions and other civil society organizations. This support is guided by 'ecosystem profiles': investment strategies, informed by detailed situational analyses, prepared through extensive consultations with stakeholders. These ecosystem profiles typically cover a period of five years.

CEPF does not plan to become a permanent presence in each hotspot but to define and work toward an end point at which local civil society can transition from its support with sufficient capacity, access to resources and credibility to respond to future conservation challenges. Experience to date shows that, in most hotspots, reaching a point at which civil society transitions from CEPF support will take more than five years. In order to plan for longer engagements in the hotspots where it invests, CEPF has recently piloted the concept of "long-term visions." Long-term visions are prepared with the participation of stakeholders from civil society, government, private sector and the donor community. They set clear transition targets (i.e., the conditions under which CEPF can withdraw from a hotspot with confidence that effective biodiversity conservation programs will continue in a self-sustaining manner).

According to the framework for long-term visions developed by CEPF, five conditions need to be met in order for a hotspot to transition from CEPF support:

- 1) Conservation priorities and best practices for their management are documented, disseminated and used by public and private sector, civil society and donor agencies to guide their support for conservation in the region.
- 2) Local civil society groups dedicated to conservation priorities collectively possess sufficient

organizational and technical capacity to be effective advocates for, and agents of, conservation and sustainable development, while being equal partners of private sector and government agencies influencing decision making in favor of sustainable societies and economies.

- 3) Adequate and continual financial resources are available to address conservation of global priorities.
- 4) Public policies, the capacity to implement them, and private sector business practices are supportive of the conservation of global biodiversity.
- 5) Mechanisms exist to identify and respond to emerging conservation challenges.

A critical element in the development of long-term visions is relevance, to ensure that they are relevant to the local context in each hotspot. Related to this, it is also important that civil society in each hotspot feels ownership of the vision. At the same time, this emphasis on local relevance and ownership needs to be tempered by some level of consistency across hotspots to ensure the utility of the visions for informing strategic decisions by CEPF at the global level. To this end, pilot exercises were undertaken for the Balkans sub-region of the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains sub-region of the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot, and the Indo-Burma Hotspot between 2015 and 2017, with the intention of informing a revised scope of work for future exercises. The purpose of this consultancy is to distill experience from the pilot exercises, and to make recommendations for future long-term visions, which will be prepared from 2018 onwards.

2) Objective of the Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to inform the scope of work for future long-term vision exercises. During 2018, long-term visions are scheduled to be prepared for the following four hotspots: East Melanesian Islands; Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands; Tropical Andes; and Wallacea. In 2019, long-term visions will be prepared for an additional two hotspots: Cerrado and Guinean Forests of West Africa.

3) Criteria for Evaluation

The evaluation will look closely at the scope of work for the three pilot exercises, the consultation exercises and the resulting outputs. These exercises will be evaluated against the following criteria:

i) Relevance

Was the long-term vision exercise relevant to the interests and needs of: (i) CEPF grantees and other civil society organizations; (ii) the regional implementation team; (iii) CEPF and its donors; and (iv) other funders active in the hotspot?

ii) Efficiency

How efficiently was the budget allocated to the long-term vision exercise converted into results?

iii) Effectiveness

Was the scope of work for the exercise fulfilled? What were the factors that influenced the effective completion of the scope of work?

Informed by experience from the three pilot exercises, the evaluation will then go on to formulate recommendations for future long-term vision exercises:

i) Institutional arrangements

What are the optimal institutional arrangements for preparation of long-term visions? When is it most appropriate to engage the regional implementation team to lead the exercise versus an independent third party or some other arrangement?

ii) Relevance

How can long-term visions be made more relevant to the needs and interests of stakeholders in each hotspot?

iii) Ownership

How can the ownership of long-term visions by key stakeholders be enhanced, both during and after their preparation?

iv) Timing

At what point(s) during the five-year investment cycle is it most appropriate to prepare long-term visions?

v) Value for money

How can long-term visions be prepared in a cost-effective manner? Are current plans to combine these with mid-term assessments appropriate?

4) Duties

An individual consultant is required to undertake an evaluation of the pilot long-term vision exercises for (i) the Balkans sub-region; (ii) the Indo-Burma Hotspot; and (iii) the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains sub-region. The evaluation will consider the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the three exercises, and capture lessons learned. Based on these lessons, the consultant will then formulate recommendations that will inform future exercises.

The evaluation will begin with a desk review based on the following documentation:

- The framework for long-term visions contained in CEPF's Operational Manual.
- The scope of work for the three pilot exercises.

- The long-term visions for the three pilot hotspots.

The desk review will be followed by interviews with members of the teams that led the three pilot exercises, staff of the CEPF Secretariat, staff of the regional implementation teams in the three hotspots and other relevant stakeholders (e.g., participants in the consultations, CEPF donors, etc.). All interviews are expected to be by phone or Skype; the consultant will not be required to travel as part of the evaluation.

5) Deliverables

There will be two deliverables from the consultancy. The consultant will prepare a short report (maximum 10 pages) summarizing the findings of the evaluation and presenting recommendations for future long-term vision exercises. The consultant will also deliver a two-hour debriefing to the CEPF Secretariat and regional implementation teams.

6) Timeframe

The evaluation will be conducted during April 2018. A draft report will be prepared by 21 April 2018 and submitted to the CEPF Secretariat for review. A final report, incorporating comments from the CEPF Secretariat, will be completed by 30 April 2018.

The consultant shall also provide the CEPF Secretariat with periodic verbal briefings to provide updates on progress, as requested.

The total amount of time for the assignment is 15 days, comprising two days for the literature review, eight days for interviews, three days for preparation of the draft report, and two days for incorporation of comments, finalization of the report and delivery of the debriefing.

7) Reporting

The consultant will work under the close supervision and direction of Nina Marshall, senior director for monitoring, evaluation and outreach, or such other individual that the CEPF Secretariat may designate.