

Annual Portfolio Overview
Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot
October 2013

This report covers the first nine months of Eastern Afromontane investment from inception (September 2012) until June 2013 (end of Fiscal Year 2013).

1. Introduction

The Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot — which stretches over a curving arc of widely scattered but biogeographically similar mountains, covering an area of more than 1 million square kilometers and running over a distance of more than 7,000 kilometers — is remarkable for both its high level of biological diversity and the life-sustaining systems it maintains for millions of people. Characterized by a series of montane “islands” (including the highest peaks in Africa and Arabia) and extensive plateaus, the Hotspot is home to several ecoregions, including the East African Montane forests, Southern Rift Montane Forest-Grassland mosaic, the Albertine Rift and the Ethiopian Upper Montane Forests, Woodlands, Bushlands and Grasslands, as well as the ecoregions of the Southern Montane “islands” in Malawi, Zimbabwe and Mozambique. The result is a region suitable for a wide range of vegetation types, with an estimated 7,600 plant species, of which at least 2,350 are endemic, or unique, to the region.

The hotspot covers fifteen countries, from north to south: Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Eritrea, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Kenya, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe.

The challenge for CEPF in the region is one of sheer geographic breadth and diversity of the socio-political landscape. Fourteen of the countries in the hotspot – all except Saudi Arabia – are eligible for CEPF investment, and eleven of the countries – all except Saudi Arabia, Eritrea, Kenya, and Uganda – have priority KBAs. Grantees are operating in English, French, Portuguese, Arabic, and Amharic (as well as kiSwahili). The countries in which they work have very different economic outlooks and very different operating environments for civil society. The issue for CEPF and its Regional Implementation Team (RIT) is creating a grants program that is more than the sum of its parts.

CEPF grant-making in the region formally began in September 2012. This portfolio overview is cumulative, but focuses on second year of implementation, from September 2013 through October 2014.

2. Niche for CEPF Investment

2.1. Overview

The ecosystem profile for the region was formally approved in January 2012 and the five-year investment period began in September of that year with the commencement of the RIT grant, led by BirdLife International. The total allocation to the region is \$9,800,000 with the plan being that all money is obligated and all grants are closed by August 2017.

In 2011, a team led by BirdLife International and Conservation International consulted more than 200 stakeholders from civil society, government, and donor institutions to gather and synthesize data on biodiversity, socioeconomic and institutional context, climate change, ecosystem services, and ongoing and planned conservation investments in the three countries in the hotspot. This team identified 261 terrestrial KBAs, 49 freshwater KBAs, and 14 corridors, which include representative elements of the Hotspot's 2,350 endemic plant species, 157 endemic bird species, 90 endemic reptile species, 100 endemic mammal species, 100 endemic amphibian species, and 181 globally threatened freshwater fish species.

In order to match the level of funding available from CEPF with a concomitant geographic scope, CEPF and the consulted stakeholders prioritized 37 terrestrial sites, ten freshwater sites, and eight corridors. The terrestrial sites represent 5.5 million hectares, or 18 percent of the total key biodiversity area and 5.5 percent of the total surface of the hotspot. Criteria used to prioritize these targets include: number of globally threatened species, presence of threatened habitat types, resilience to climate change, status of protection, provision of ecosystem services, threats, and opportunities for conservation action.

Being so geographically vast, the CEPF thinks of the hotspot in terms of five units, from north to south: the Arabian Peninsula, the Ethiopian Highlands, the Albertine Rift, the Eastern Arc Mountains, (including the Kenyan and northern Tanzanian volcanic mountains) and the Southern Highlands (including the Northern Lake Niassa Mountain Complex). *CEPF's niche in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot to support civil society to apply innovative approaches to conservation in under-capacitated and underfunded protected areas, key biodiversity areas, and priority corridors thereby enabling changes in policy and building resilience in the region's ecosystems and economy to sustain biodiversity in the long term.* This is expressed via four Strategic Directions:

1. Mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors.
2. Improve the protection and management of the KBA network throughout the hotspot.
3. Initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors.
4. Provide strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment through a regional implementation team (the RIT).

The CEPF Donor Council has made initial allocations to each of the Strategic Directions, as follows:

Strategic Direction 1: \$3,200,000
Strategic Direction 2: \$2,800,000
Strategic Direction 3: \$2,300,000
Strategic Direction 4: \$1,500,000

2.2. Portfolio Status

CEPF grant-making formally began with the RIT Grant, which ultimately took the shape a set of “programmatic” and “administrative” grants for a combined \$1,500,000. These grants are for the full amount of the Strategic Direction, with no plans for any further obligation as of this time.

The Secretariat and RIT have released calls for Letters of Inquiry to solicit applications for the other strategic directions. Table 1 summarizes the calls released to date. Note that the RIT accepts small grants on a rolling basis, and thus has received more total applications than those itemized in open calls for proposals.

Table 1. EAM Calls for Letters of Inquiry

Release Date	Due Date	LOIs Received
September 7, 2012	October 19, 2012	50 [46 core / 4 small]
February 21, 2013	April 1, 2013	175 [66 core / 109 small]
Total		225

Table 2 shows the status of grants, by strategic direction, awarded before end of FY13.

Table 2. Awarded (Active and Closed) Large and Small Grants by Strategic Direction

Strategic Direction	Title	Allocation	Obligation	Percentage obligated
SD 1	Mainstream biodiversity	\$3,200,000		0%
SD 2	Protect KBAs	\$2,800,000	\$ 719,749	25,7%
SD 3	Sustainable financing	\$2,300,000		0%
SD 4	RIT	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	100,0%
Total		\$9,800,000	\$ 2,719,249	22,7%

Table 3 shows the status of grants, by country, that were positively reviewed and moved beyond the LOI stage.

Table 3. Awarded (Active and Closed) Large and Small Grants by Country

Country	Dollars	Number of grants
Burundi		
DRC		
Eritrea		
Ethiopia	121,797	1
Kenya		
Malawi		
Mozambique	253,045	3
Rwanda		
Saudi Arabia		
South Sudan		

Tanzania	158,207	1
Uganda		
Yemen		
Zambia		
Zimbabwe	129,390	1
Regional	57,310	1
RIT	\$1,500,000	3
Total	\$2,719,249	7

2.3. Coordinating CEPF Grant-Making

The RIT has a complex contractual and organizational structure. At the time of the RIT competition in mid-2012, standard operating procedure for CEPF was to split RIT grants between administrative and programmatic components. BirdLife International, via its East and Southern Africa Programme Office based in Nairobi, submitted the highest ranked paired proposals for the two components, with IUCN, via its offices in Nairobi and Maputo, and the Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society (EWNHS), based in Addis Ababa, in subordinate roles. Normally, this would have yielded three separate agreements for BirdLife: RIT administration, RIT programs, and a small grants fund. However, due to unique elements of Ethiopian law on organizations being required to have a maximum of one third of donor funds allocated to “headquarters” versus two thirds of funds disbursed to the “field,” EWNHS needed its own direct engagement with CEPF as both RIT and as the manager of small grants funds (whereas IUCN falls under the BirdLife agreement). The resulting arrangement is as follows:

Table 4. RIT Contract Structure

Agreement Holder	Administration	Programs	Total RIT	Small Grant Allocation	Total Agreement Value
BirdLife	\$919,395		\$919,395		\$919,395
BirdLife		\$477,717	\$477,717		\$477,717
BirdLife			\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000
EWNHS	\$60,606	\$42,282	\$102,888	\$250,000	\$352,888
Total	\$980,001	\$519,999	\$1,500,000	\$750,000	\$2,250,000
Percent	65%	35%			

The BirdLife agreements run from September 2012 through August 2017; the EWNHS agreement runs from October 2012 through August 2017.

The scope of work of the RIT is ambitious in all hotspots, and is especially so in the Eastern Afromontane. Very few organizations have the capacity or mission to undertake the RIT role in this region. Of those, BirdLife International, with network partners in several of the EAM countries (including EWNHS), and IUCN, with multiple program offices and network partners, are among the best-suited, for the job. BirdLife and IUCN are able to make use of their network partners for country outreach to potential grantees and as a pool of experts for proposal review. Table 5 shows the staffing structure of the RIT.

Table 5. RIT Staffing Structure (full time positions in bold)

Position	Name	Organization	Base of Operation
Team Leader	Maaike Manten	BirdLife	Nairobi
Francophone Lead	Jean Paul Ntungane	BirdLife	Nairobi
Mozambique Lead	Richard Dixon	IUCN	Maputo
Ethiopia Lead	Zewditu Tessema	EWNHS	Addis Ababa
Yemen Lead	Sharif Jbour	BirdLife	Amman
Technical Coordinator	Leo Niskanen	IUCN	Nairobi
Overall Supervisor	Julius Arinaitwe	BirdLife (Regional Director)	Nairobi
Science Advisor	Ademola Ajagbe	BirdLife	Nairobi
Senior Accountant	Dalphine Adre	BirdLife	Nairobi
Finance/Admin	Edith Onyango-Hongo	BirdLife	Nairobi
Financial Controller	Chris Wuestner	BirdLife	Cambridge, UK
Ethiopia Advisor	Mengistu Wondafrash	EWNHS	Addis Ababa
Ethiopia Accountant	Tesfaye Gebresenbet	EWNHS	Addis Ababa
Mozambique Advisor	Regina Cruz	IUCN	Maputo
Yemen/Saudi Arabia Advisor	Ibrahim Khader	BirdLife	Amman
M&E Advisor	Mine Pabari	IUCN	Nairobi

Only the names in bold are billed full-time to CEPF. All other staff listed have a CEPF budget of between 10-35 percent full-time, but actually contribute far more time to the work effort. BirdLife, EWNHS, and IUCN all also contribute or bill small amounts of time of senior advisory personnel who are of great value to the program.

2.4. Performance Assessment

In terms of the biophysical and socioeconomic indicators in the logical framework, after less one year of operations, it is more appropriate to speak of progress toward those goals than achievement, *per se*. Performance can be assessed by several managerial and qualitative measures.

- **Efficiency of operations.** The RIT grant was awarded in September 2012. In the subsequent nine months, the team released two calls for proposals, reviewed 225 letters of inquiry, and awarded the first 7 individual grants. This result is already quite impressive given the limited time and the fact the RIT has just been set up and is still building their experience. About 15 proposals are under preparation, with support from RIT and Secretariat, which should allow the portfolio to be at full speed during the coming fiscal year.
- **Progress toward goals.** It is too early to measure any tangible progress against the goals set up in the Ecosystem Profile.

3. Portfolio Highlights by Strategic Direction

Strategic Direction 1: mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors

No on-going project

Strategic Direction 2: improve the protection and management of the KBA network throughout the hotspot

This Strategic Direction is meant to (1) improve the protection status of KBAs, (2) facilitate the engagement of civil society in environmental impact assessments and other processes meant to protect sites, and (3) identify new KBAs in the hotspot.

Strategic Direction 2 Highlights to Date

- CEPF has one ongoing grants to protect chimpanzee habitat in the Greater Mahale Landscape of Western Tanzania. The grant, to Fauna & Flora International (FFI) will allow to continue long-standing promotion of better management of Mahale National Park and community co-management in the surround.
- CEPF has also signed three grants on the Chimanimani Moutains, two in Mozambique (Royal Botanical Garden, Kew, with a parallel grant to local organization MICAIA) and one in Zimbabwe with BirdLife Zimbabwe. These projects open the door for enhanced regional cooperation between civil society organizations in this part of the hotspot.

Strategic Direction 3: initiate and support sustainable financing and related actions for the conservation of priority KBAs and corridors

No on-going project to date.

4. Collaboration with CEPF Donors, Other Donors, and Local Government

CEPF works with donors at the level of the Secretariat, the RIT, and via individual grantees. For the Secretariat and RIT, the challenge has been, with so many countries and relatively little money in any single place, finding the right party with whom to interact. For example, the RIT is based in Nairobi, a country with no priority KBAs, and countries like Tanzania and the DRC have KBAs that are far from areas of major donors' current interest, at least in terms of conservation. The two countries where this is not true are Ethiopia, home to RIT member EWNHS, and Mozambique, home to RIT member IUCN. In Addis Ababa and Maputo, respectively, the RIT has maintained regular contact with CEPF and other international donors.

5. Conclusion

The CEPF grants portfolio in the Eastern Afromontane is proceeding appropriately considering the limited time since inception. The first seven grants have been awarded, while about 15 are under preparation with applicants and should be signed in first weeks/months of FY14 . The challenge in the coming year will be to build on those, create networks, and position the portfolio to ensure long-term sustainabi

6. Update of the Logical Framework

Objective	Targets	Results
Strengthening the involvement and effectiveness of civil society in achieving conservation and management of globally important biodiversity in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot	At least 60 civil society actors participate in conservation programs guided by the ecosystem profile	10 separate organizations receiving grants to engage in the goals of the profile (large grants, and RIT).
	The conservation community in the Hotspot is better organized, shows improved capacities, and has improved collaboration with development stakeholders.	
	At least 25 priority key biodiversity areas with strengthened protection and management, representing at least 1.2 million hectares, and including at least 500.000 hectares of new protected areas.	
	At least 1.7 million hectares of production landscapes under improved management for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.	
	New sustainable financing schemes exist for at least one priority site in each of the priority corridors.	

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Results
<p>Outcome 1: Biodiversity mainstreamed into wider development policies, plans and projects, delivering the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in 4 priority corridors (and associated KBA groups) and 7 countries.</p> <p>\$3,200,000</p>	<p>Number of local and community development plans or other processes in which biodiversity conservation priorities and actions are incorporated through civil society engagement in the process</p>	
	<p>Number of national development plans or other processes in which biodiversity conservation priorities and actions are incorporated through civil society engagement</p>	
	<p>Amount of funding directed at livelihood activities (using CEPF investment as leverage) which also benefit biodiversity conservation in and around KBAs in priority corridors</p>	
	<p>Number of private sector ventures which benefit biodiversity and local livelihoods</p>	
<p>Outcome 2: Improved protection and management of the KBA network through involvement of civil society</p> <p>\$2,800,000</p>	<p>Number of terrestrial KBAs under enhanced protection status and number of hectares covered.</p>	
	<p>Number of management plans developed or improved, with enhanced implementation underway, and number of hectares covered.</p>	
	<p>Number of engagements of civil society in EIA and site safeguard processes resulting in strengthened implementation at the most urgently threatened sites</p>	<p>One grants were provided to ARCOS to train and establish a network of EIA practitioners in the Albertine Rift.</p>

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Results
	Number of new KBAs identified and changes in KBAs status resulting from an improved knowledge and information (including sites for irreplaceable plant diversity)	
<p>Outcome 3: Financing mechanisms established in 4 priority corridors and 2 additional sites ensuring substantial long-term financing for conservation activities in the most important sites, and conservation community enabled to raise funds and develop similar mechanisms in the Hotspot.</p> <p>\$2,300,000</p>	Number of forest carbon partnerships and projects established and achieving biodiversity conservation objectives in each of three priority corridors and in two individual KBAs	
	Increased levels of CSO capacity in all Hotspot countries for conservation fund raising and project management	
	New conservation community developed and playing an effective role in KBA conservation in Eritrea, South Sudan, and Yemen	
<p>Outcome 4: Strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment provide, and a broad constituency of civil society groups built across institutional and political boundaries, through a regional implementation team (RIT)</p> <p>\$1,500,000</p>	All groups receiving grants achieve a satisfactory score on final performance scorecard	
	RIT performance in fulfilling approved terms of reference	The RIT is fulfilling all elements of its terms of reference
	All civil society groups in investment areas know CEPF and are given equal chance to participate to in call for proposals	Impossible to say if “all” civil society groups know about CEPF, but over 200 unique groups have applied for CEPF funding
	Amount of co-funding (for activities implemented by CEPF grantees) that have been facilitated by the RIT	Data will become available as grants close

Intermediate Outcomes	Intermediate Indicators	Results
	At least 60% of the CEPF grantees have improved management capacities thanks to RIT capacity building activities.	

7. All Awarded Grants, by Start Date

Country of Implementation	Sub-Region	Strategic Direction	Applicant/ Grantee	Title	Total
REGIONAL	Albertine Rift	SD2	Albertine Rift Conservation	Civil Society Alliance for Enhanced Implementation of EIAs in KBAs of Albertine Rift	57 310
RIT	All-Hotspot and Others	SD4	BirdLife international	Eastern Afromontane 1, RIT-programmes	477 717
RIT	All-Hotspot and Others	SD4	BirdLife international	Eastern Afromontane 1, RIT-Administration	919 395
Zimbabwe	Southern Islands	SD2	BirdLife Zimbabwe	Stakeholder capacity building for KBA management planning in the Chimanimani-Nyanga Mountains	129 390
RIT	Ethiopian Highlands	SD4	Ethiopia Wildlife and Natural	Regional Implementation Team, Administration and Programme in Ethiopia	102 888
Mozambique	Southern Islands	SD2	Fauna and Flora International	Mount Mabu Conservation Project (MMCP)	127 140
Tanzania	Albertine Rift	SD2	Fauna and Flora International	Securing the Ntakata Forest as a Community-Owned Village Land Forest Reserve in	158 207
Mozambique	Southern Islands	SD2	Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew	Biodiversity Conservation in the Chimanimani Mountains (with MICAIA)	43 919
Ethiopia	Ethiopian Highlands	SD2	MELCA-Ethiopia	Strengthen the Sheka Forest Biosphere Reserve and MELCA-Ethiopia institutional	121 797
Mozambique	Southern Islands	SD2	MICAIA Foundation	Biodiversity Conservation in the Chimanimani Mountains (with KEW)	81 986