



## LLF Concept Note Phase 01.02. – 30.04.2022

**FAQ** – following Q&A sessions 22/24 March

<b>1. Prequalification and Program summary</b>	
<b>Partner / Country / Status</b>	
<b>Q:</b> The call for proposal document mentions Perpetual Grants are encouraged for a number of specific countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Haiti, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo). Is this geographic focus also relevant to Sustaining Grants? Or is there any other geographic focus to be aware of?	<b>A:</b> One donor to the LLF is interested in supporting ONE Program Area in a least developed country (LDC). Thus, the countries mentioned have a slightly higher focus under the Perpetual Grant than others. But in principle all ODA countries that fulfil the set of criteria as described in the Grant Program Guide are eligible for both grants, perpetual and sustaining.
<b>Q:</b> Are countries like South Africa, Mongolia eligible?	<b>A:</b> A proposed site in every ODA listed country is eligible to apply for the LLF grant.
<b>Q:</b> Are there any limitations in terms Perpetual and/or Sustaining Grants?	<b>A:</b> NGOs may submit up to three Concept Notes - provided that if three concept notes are submitted, at least one must be for a Perpetual Grant. If applicants want to go for three applications, we encourage them to submit 2 Sustaining applications and 1 Perpetual one, rather than 1 Sustaining and 2 Perpetual, or even 0 Sustaining and 3 Perpetual. In case of the Perpetual Fund (30 years to eternity), the NGO must present a match funder who is prepared to contribute at least USD 10 Mio to the perpetual LLF program of USD 30 Mio. For the Sustaining Grant (15 years run-time) the minimum contribution requirement is USD 5 Mio.
<b>Q:</b> Can 'Sustaining' grant be swapped into 'Perpetual' grants at some stage? How would this work	<b>A:</b> LLF might consider transferring Sustainable grants into Perpetual grants at some stage in the future. There won't be an automatism, this step will require an evaluation of the situation in terms of site, partnership, and in terms of LLF accumulated financial situation.
<b>Q:</b> When would the next LLF call be expected to be?	<b>A:</b> Future calls depend on incoming contributions to LLF. We are anticipating more incoming contributions, but we cannot confirm today when the next call will be issued.
<b>Q:</b> In one case in our country, the proposed area is under strict conservation status in the centre of a wider area under different regimes of protection. IUCN has not yet recognized the strict area as category one, but the national regulation clearly shows it is. Will it be eligible?	<b>A:</b> Yes, the proposed area of minimum 1000 km <sup>2</sup> under strict protection can also be an <b>equivalent</b> to IUCN category I / II.
<b>Q:</b> Our country is listed in the ODA recipients list as an upper middle-income country. Is this an obstacle?	<b>A:</b> As long as the country in question has ODA status it is fully eligible.
<b>Program Area</b>	
<b>Q:</b> What are the areas of intervention of the grant?	<b>A:</b> The LLF Program Area is explained by a graph in the <a href="#">Grant Program Guide</a> as well as in the supporting documents (especially the Grant Program Guide).
<b>Q:</b> What are the differences between landscape project and national parks?	<b>A:</b> There needs to be a PA under state law. If there is none, the site is not eligible as LL site.
<b>Q:</b> Does LLF have an approach to projects taking place in areas of high insecurity? Is there an approach to be aware of with regards to funding activities that address these insecurities?	<b>A:</b> Program areas in countries with high insecurity are not excluded from LLF grants as such. In general, we look at biodiversity value first and then evaluate the security situation and look at viable management options so that the program can be effectively implemented. ESDD studies will be conducted at Full Proposal stage and an ESAP will have to speak to respective risks.
<b>Q:</b> Can the LL span more than one country? e.g., transboundary areas where there may be national	<b>A:</b> Spending needs to be in one partner country, but transboundary collaboration and coordination is possible and welcomed. You might also bring forward two

## Legacy Landscapes Fund – Concept Note Template 2022

Parks on either side of the border (if =50% on total area in IUCN I and II)?	sites adjacent to each other in two countries. But each site would be administered and funded separately.
<b>Q:</b> Are Marine Protected Areas eligible? And is there any concertation with the Blue Action Fund?	<b>A:</b> LLF funds only terrestrial sites, which might even stretch to the coast or the coastal environment. The <a href="#">Blue Action Fund</a> , with whom we coordinate, funds respective Marine Protected Areas. If there is a LLF and BAF site in the same country, we encourage collaboration synergy wherever possible.
<b>Q:</b> The protected area (PA) in which we will work has 16,000. hectares, with high levels of intervention with mining. Do you finance projects for these types of areas?	<b>A:</b> A lot of PAs have threats such as mining. In the concept note it will be evaluated how those threats are addressed and how feasible it is to mitigate the risks to keep the future integrity of the site and the park. It is always a case-by-case decision whether a respective program can be implemented successfully.
<b>Q:</b> What about contiguous protected areas in the same country? If combined, are they eligible for the LLF?	<b>A:</b> Yes, they are eligible.
<b>Q:</b> Is there a part of the fund that should to the core zone and a part that should go to the buffer zone or other intervention area?	<b>A:</b> This is not pre-defined by LLF as the idea is that LLF steps in where the funding gap is. Hence, we follow a flexible approach. But it needs to be shown which areas of the program may be underfunded and where LLF contribution is needed and best utilized.
<b>Q:</b> Is it possible to fund projects in areas that are not protected areas but are Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)?	<b>A:</b> If at least 50% or the area is IUCN category I or II or equivalent, this is possible.
<b>Q:</b> Looking at the image of the components of the LL Program Area: Does 'core protected area' in this case refer to the LL core zone of the Protected Area that is IUCN Cat I or II? Or the LL Protected Area, that includes, but may be bigger than, the core zone.	<b>A:</b> The core zone in the image describes the core protected zone of the protected area which is IUCN Cat I or II or equivalent. The LL will include and be bigger than the core zone.
<b>Q:</b> An area under strict conservation by an NGO, but with no aval of the government: Could it possibly be considered, assuming robust documentation is furnished on the strict conservation protocols in place?	<b>A:</b> The proposed area of minimum 1000 km <sup>2</sup> under strict protection can also be an <b>equivalent</b> to IUCN category I / II. But it needs to be under a certain form of legal protection status. You could classify this area as a buffer zone around or next to a protected area. But there needs to be a state law which describes the protection.
<b>Financial scope of support</b>	
<b>Q:</b> What is the co-funding? What is the percentage of the contribution?	<b>A:</b> Co-funding is the match funding that comes from a private or corporate funder. It must be between 1/3 to 1/2 of the total amount (15 Mio USD for Sustainable Grant, and 30 Mio USD for Perpetual Grant). The match funding effectively mobilizes the LLF funding. NGOs need to bring match funding of 5-7.5 Mio USD for a Sustaining Grant and 10 to 15 Mio USD for a Perpetual Grant.
<b>Q:</b> Is the match funding (co-funding) contribution of the NGO to the total funding compulsory?	<b>A:</b> Yes, the match funding is compulsory for the application.
<b>Q:</b> How is the co-financing to be provided for each grant type, i.e., is it all to be provided up-front or through annual contributions?	<b>A:</b> The co-financing is possible up front or in annual instalments. In both grants the up-front option is preferred, but the option for annual instalments is also possible.
<b>Q:</b> What is the eligibility of in-kind co-financing. Would government co-financing be eligible?	<b>A:</b> Government co-financing and in-kind financing are both not qualifying as match funding. Only private funding (by corporate, philanthropic, individuals or other foundations) is eligible.
<b>Q:</b> Bringing private match to LLF will prompt questions from these private donors regarding tax exceptions they could receive or other arrangements. Can LLF clarify any detail?	<b>A:</b> LLF qualifies as U.S. NGO equivalent. Donations to the LLF are in principle eligible for tax exemptions. Details would need to be discussed in context with the respective match donors.
<b>Q:</b> Co-funding limitations aside, why would one apply for a sustaining grant over a perpetual grant? How many of the 7-12 grants are expected to be perpetual grants?	<b>A:</b> There is no fixed expectation. It depends on the context and the Concept Note as every situation is different. It is up to the applicants to decide which kind of funding model they want to apply for. LLF does not have a quota for one or the other funding model.
<b>Q:</b> Regarding Sustaining grants and match funding commitment to cover first 5 years: Is there any flexibility over that, so as to contributes over a longer period?	<b>A:</b> We look for monetary commitment for the match fund. And the idea is to spend the bulk of the match funding first so that LLF money can yield investment revenues in the meantime to grow long-term funding.

## Legacy Landscapes Fund – Concept Note Template 2022

<p><b>Q:</b> We understand that Match funding cannot be government contributions. Does this only refer to national or also international gov. contributions?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> International governmental contributions would not qualify as match funding. Those kinds of contributions would display as complementary funding in the budget of your program (see budget template) but would not count as LLF match funding.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> To ensure match funding, this needs to be a minimum of 5 years of sustaining and minimum of 10 years for perpetual grant? If consortia constellation changes, what would happen?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Yes, we look at LLF program as a joint program, jointly funded by LLF and the match funder (one contract). Once the match funding is secured, the LLF funding will come in. A 5-year review and external milestone audits will evaluate how the implementation is proceeding. If e.g., one consortium partner does not work out, we will need to talk and negotiate jointly, to review based on the signed Grant Agreement. Partners can be sub-grantees as well; they do not have to be consortium partners.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Is there a possibility to transit from a Sustaining Grant into a Perpetual Grant at some stage?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> The implementing grantee for a Sustainable Grant can apply at a later stage for a LLF Perpetual Grant, if the necessary (additional) match funding is provided.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> We understand that the implementing partner should not be the one providing the match funding from their own (limited) sources. In view of the timescale, we may not have level of confirmation by April 30<sup>th</sup> from the match funder. How can we demonstrate that?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> We would not like to compete with and absorb unrestricted funding from organizations. We would have to discuss the level and quality of the match funders commitment toward the end of April. It will be helpful to discuss then, in some cases, and in very particular constellations, how the matching fund situation can be solved.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Can match funding come in part from Government grants?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> No, match funding needs to come from private sources as described.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> How many co-funders can an applicant bring on board for the match?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Up to three match donors are possible.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Who is going to manage LLF Match Funder during the first 5 years? How is the 10 years allocation from LLF being allocated?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> There will be a joint contract between the match funder, the implementing lead NGO and LLF and it is expected that reporting and financial control will be the same, independent of where the money comes. Allocation is always 1 Mio USD per year, no matter where the funding comes from (match or LLF).</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Can a private business entity be a co-funder (match funder)?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Yes, we encourage private co-funders. A short due diligence process on the private funder will be conducted (ethical funding considerations, e.g., no use of profits from weapon manufacturing, harmful business practices, etc).</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Can we count funding through existing projects towards the USD 5M in co-financing requirement?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> No, already existing contributions are not considered match funding.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Who can provide tax lowering certificate for match funder?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> If it is a match funder with whom you have an existing relationship with, the NGO would receive the money directly, and this would be handled by the NGO. Otherwise funding towards LLF is preferred and donations to LLF are benefitting from respective tax exemption.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Is there a minimum amount that must go to the PA Management authority?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> LLF funding goes to the NGO directly, not to the PA Management authority. The PA authority will profit indirectly from LLF funding as some of the operational costs of the management plan will be taken over by the implementing NGO.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> The budget template covers 5 years; relatedly, must we provide proof of secured/pledged match funding for the first 5 years or for the entire grant period?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> It is expected that the match funding will be spent in the first 5 years, LLF funding will be spent in the last 10 years.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> The match question in the concept template asks for point of contact for matching funds – will LLF be contacting our donors?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Typically, LLF will only need to be in contact with the match donor when it comes to signing the match funding agreement.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> In the guidelines, it says max of 3 matching donors - does that mean only 3 donors for entire funding period?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> A total of max. three donors would need to provide the match funding of minimum 5 Mio USD (Sustaining Grant) all together as total with a letter of intent when submitting the concept note.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> What are the criteria for match funding (does it need to be new funding; can we use existing funding with donor approval)?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> It needs to be new funding in a sense that it is a new contract, but it is possible to bring the funding from a philanthropic or a foundation with which you already have contact or other funding agreements.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> According to the Grant Programme Guide, a separate grant of up to 25,000 USD from LLF will be</p>	<p><b>A:</b> 25.000 USD shall not be included into the budget of the concept note. This is a preparation grant that will be given by LLF for the development of the full proposal once the concept note has been selected for the final stage.</p>

## Legacy Landscapes Fund – Concept Note Template 2022

available. Does this grant need to be included in the budget of the concept note?	
<b>Q:</b> Can we count investment income (interest earnings) from a conservation trust fund's endowment capital as co-financing	<b>A:</b> No, as investment earnings are fluctuating and can not be secured upfront.
<b>Q:</b> Are funds from the sale of VCS carbon credits acceptable as co-financing?	<b>A:</b> This would be part of the business plan (potential income generation) that needs to be developed within the first five years to maintain sustainable funding, but income from Carbon credits will not be eligible for match funding.
<b>Q:</b> So, the private donor would have to transfer the 5 Mio USD at the beginning of the Project, and cannot (!) decide to transfer 1 Mio USD a year, correct?	<b>A:</b> Upfront payment is preferred, but annual instalments are possible depending on the specific constellation. But the commitment/ security through the binding letter of intent from the private match donor is needed upfront.
<b>Q:</b> If there is already an existing PA and funding instrument, would it be possible to create a window for LLF funding and could it be channelled through this agency?	<b>A:</b> We have currently different governance structure throughout our pilots, e.g., national public institutions joining with an NGO and creating an institution in the field. This could be the institution implementing the fund, but the transfer would be made to the NGO, and that is where the accountability lies.
<b>Q:</b> How will we need to prove/audit the contribution of the match funds?	<b>A:</b> A binding letter of intent for the match fund will need to be attached to the concept note (a <a href="#">template</a> can be found on the website). Incoming fund from the match funder will be audited in the same way as funding from LLF.
<b>Q:</b> Could the LOI committing match funds be signed only by the lead NGO initially, and explicitly state that (i) we are pursuing several large-scale private funding requests, but it will take further time for final commitment by the donors; and (ii) we will include the LOI(s) from private donor(s) at the full proposal stage.	<b>A:</b> We request a LOI from private match-donors over the full matching amount upfront.
<b>Q:</b> Is EU funding eligible to meet the co-financing need?	<b>A:</b> No, governmental funding is not eligible. LLF is about mobilizing and motivating funding from private, philanthropic, or corporate donors in order to unlock governmental funding for conservation. This synergy will create maximum leverage for all stakeholders.
<b>Q:</b> Are in kind donations eligible?	<b>A:</b> Match funding must be via cash transfer. In kind donations do not qualify under the Legacy Landscape grant format.
<b>Q:</b> Would LLF consider accepting more than 3 funding partners?	<b>A:</b> Three match funders are maximum under the LLF regulations.
<b>Q:</b> Would LLF accept that a funding partner (being the sole partner or jointly with one or two more funding partners) represents a pool of mid-level donors (around USD 500,000 each)?	<b>A:</b> If your funding partner (match funder) acts as one unit and one legal entity, LLF would accept this partner. But this pooling match funder needs to pool private funding, not public funding, since public (governmental) funding is not eligible under this LLF funding instrument.
<b>Q:</b> Co-financing from the match funder is possible up front or in annual installments and there is preference for the up-front option. Will projects with annual installments have the same chances to move forward to the second stage as those that do it up front?	<b>A:</b> While up-front payment is the preferred option, LLF will certainly not exclude grant applications for suitable program areas and partners if they require annual installments instead.
<b>Q:</b> Are the two options for match funder transfers to either LLF or to the NGO directly on equal footing? Or does LLF prefer match funding into the fund of LLF.	<b>A:</b> In case a match funder would require, for whatever reason, to transfer the funds directly to the implementing partner, and not the LLF, there would be typically two agreements to be signed by the match funder instead of one. Firstly a match funding agreement with LLF, effectively associating the match fund with the international 15(+) year LLF conservation program. Secondly with the implementing partner to spell out all the technical details. However, the long-term architecture of the LLF is designed to accumulate and mate funds from government & private funds in one LLF fund so as to provide a robust accumulative financial fund structure for the longterm.
<b>Q:</b> If the match funder gives the contribution into the LLF fund, and not to the NGO, will LLF deduct overhead or administrative cost (percentage).	<b>A:</b> No. The administrative and overhead costs for the LLF funds (salaries, office costs) are provided for by the German Government through a separate budget. Match funders contribution will go in full into the Sustainable / Perpetual grant.
<b>Q:</b> We understand that for the pilots, funding came from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation	<b>A:</b> LLF has received substantial start-up foundation capital from BMZ through KfW. Those funds are being used in the current call for proposals. Currently a wide

## Legacy Landscapes Fund – Concept Note Template 2022

and Development (BMZ) through KfW Development Bank. What are the sources for this new call?	range of discussions are held with a variety of potential international supporters and other governments. Consequently additional donors and funding institutions are coming on board as time progresses.
<b>Q:</b> Are LLF funds already committed?	<b>A:</b> No. So far only the required funds for the Pilot sites from 2020/2021 are committed.
<b>Implementing Partner in the field (e.g. proposing grantee or special purpose vehicle)</b>	
<b>Q:</b> How is the relation with funding authorities and the local representative of UNESCO?	<b>A:</b> Cooperative collaboration with UNESCO in an application process for WHS is encouraged. But it is not mandatory to coordinate with UNESCO WHS applications at concept note stages.
<b>Q:</b> All LL pilot projects so far are areas where there are existing co-management arrangements in place - is this an expectation or is it possible to include LL where that is not yet the case but where other agreements are in place e.g. MoU?	<b>A:</b> What we have right now in pilot sites is a fully delegated management model, an institutionalized co-management arrangement as conservation trust and looser forms of co-management. We are open to different formats. What is required is a trusted and tested relationship that does not start only now with the LLF funding application.
<b>Q:</b> How is reporting done, by the lead or the consortia?	<b>A:</b> The lead applicant will be responsible for complying with reporting requirements.
<b>Q:</b> Does the program fund Governmental institutions or is it more for NGOs, private institutions?	<b>A:</b> LLF only funds NGOs, but governmental institutions and their respective conservation ambitions can benefit indirectly in partnerships with NGOs.
<b>Q:</b> Can communities submit proposals, or must it be NGOs?	<b>A:</b> This depends on how institutionalized the community organization is. If the community organization is experienced and has the capacity and financial scrutiny mechanisms in place to handle funding of 1 Mio USD per year, this is possible. If not, we would recommend entering a consortium with an NGO.
<b>Q:</b> As one of the LLF donors is BMZ, and many of our local partners are already receiving funds from BMZ, will they still be eligible for LLF?	<b>A:</b> Partners already receiving BMZ funding through other budget lines will still qualify to be part of the LLF grant mechanism. There is no limiting factor or any other eligibility problem.
<b>Q:</b> Will partners already receiving e.g. BMZ or other governmental funding through other budget lines will still qualify?	<b>A:</b> Yes, there is no limiting factor or any other eligibility problem.
<b>2. Biogeographical value of the landscape</b>	
<b>Q:</b> Will the Senckenberg tool be used to evaluate a landscape and is it valuable for LLF support? It automatically seems to favor Tropical Areas and de-favor protected Areas in temperate zones.	<b>A:</b> The Senckenberg tool will be one layer for the evaluation of biodiversity significance of the sites presented at concept note stage, but it is not the only criteria tool that will be considered when selecting sites. LLF is aiming at a balanced portfolio of sites in different habitats and temperate zones.
<b>Q:</b> I'm seeing biodiversity and social issues very clearly addressed but not yet climate change. What is the LLF expectation or need for addressing climate change through the programmes?	<b>A:</b> We would expect to be able to report on impact on climate change both at LLF aggregated and at site levels. We will therefore develop a reporting and monitoring system which takes climate change impacts into account. This will be developed over 2022 and in discussion with the implementing partners.
<b>3. Social context in and around the landscape</b>	
<b>Q:</b> Is LLF's ESDD based on KfW's environmental and social safeguards requirements?	<b>A:</b> KfW does not have its own ESS guidelines but use the ones from IFC and the UN Guiding principles which will have to be implemented for all programs.
<b>4. Governance/oversight model of LL management, role of implementing partner(s)</b>	
<b>5. Implementing Partners and program management</b>	
<b>Q:</b> Can multiple NGOs (as creators) be submitted in one application?	<b>A:</b> There must be a lead NGO applicant and if there is synergy and added value, there can be a max. of two additional consortia partners.
<b>Q:</b> Can more details be provided on the co-development stage of the full proposal. Can consortia be established/refined during this phase?	<b>A:</b> At Concept Note stage, we expect a clear understanding of how the LLF funding would be implemented and how the governance structure looks like, e.g.,

## Legacy Landscapes Fund – Concept Note Template 2022

	leading implementer, consortia partners and their added value, etc. All details can be developed and defined at full proposal stage.
<b>Q:</b> Can a consortium be established with existing strategic partners?	<b>A:</b> Yes, if the option of consortia is chosen then we encourage to build such a consortium with trusted and tested partnerships.
<b>Q:</b> Can we (as a community organization) partner with WWF in country XY? If yes, can they come as a lead and can they provide the match funding as well?	<b>A:</b> It is not dictated by LLF who takes the lead. However, the lead partner would need to show implementing experience and capacity to deal with relevant organizational management and financial scrutiny. LLF would like most, if not all, of the match fund to come from a different/external source, not by the NGOs themselves as unrestricted funding is an extremely valuable asset for NGOs.
<b>Q:</b> Are consortia members free to decide on the internal structure of the consortium and flow of funds?	<b>A:</b> Yes, but there needs to be one lead applicant that receives the LLF contribution, and ensures overall accountability, reporting, etc. for the whole consortium.
<b>Q:</b> Are all the sub-grants only channelled through the lead applicant who receives the money? Or can the other consortium members also establish sub-grant agreements?	<b>A:</b> This will need to be looked at in detail. We want a clear set of responsibilities in the consortium and make sure that the consortium does not absorb too much funding or has over-complicated coordination mechanisms.
<b>Q:</b> Are e-signatures possible for consortia members on the Concept Note, in the case of representatives on different continents?	<b>A:</b> Yes, possible.
<b>Q:</b> The Grant Program Guide mentions the need to prepare a business plan that goes beyond the 15 years into the future. By when this needs to be done?	<b>A:</b> The business plan should be developed in the first 5 years and would need to be continuously updated to demonstrate strategies and sources for financial sustainability.
<b>Q:</b> What are the reporting requirements? How is reporting done in case of a consortium? Joint report submitted by lead or separately?	<b>A:</b> The lead applicant is responsible for reporting. A more detailed implementation guide, reporting requirements, and templates will be developed during the year. But in principle there will be one reporting regime (not consortia members reporting separately).
<b>6. Logical Framework</b>	
<b>Q:</b> Indicator 2 under the impact talks about abundance of site-specific indicator of key species. Should those species be listed or defined here?	<b>A:</b> Where data is already available, it can be filled in already at this concept note stage. The remaining information requirements can be complemented at the proposal stage.
<b>Q:</b> The development of a ESAP seems to be a key component of outcome 1, so one activity is the development of this evaluation and allocating funds to it as well. Is that correct?	<b>A:</b> Once a concept note is approved, then there will be a ESDD study jointly commissioned (paid by LLF) including the ESAP. What follows from this study will inform your full application. The findings and measures recommended by the ESDD study and the ESAP will be part of the Full Proposal, budget, implementation plan and personnel structure.
<b>Q:</b> In the Log frame please explain again the meaning of the blue and the black colors.	<b>A:</b> The blue text in the Logical Framework should be fully reflected in your own concept note. LLF will itself have to report on these minimum parameters (1 Impact, 1 Outcome, 1 Output) and respective indicators. Hence, you can copy/paste the blue parts as is to start your own Log frame. The text in black needs then to be populated by you. There should be only 1 Impact. Besides, in total you can opt to have a maximum of 3-5 Outcomes, with a maximum of 3-5 Outputs for each Outcome. But that is up to your own planning in your specific context and what you want to achieve in your program.
<b>Q:</b> On (mandatory) indicator the indicator itself seems to concern the entire Legacy Landscape. However: the 'target value' seems to relate to the "LL core protected area (IUCN I or II)" specifically. Is that correct?	<b>A:</b> That is correct. You can detail and add to the indicators as you see fit. And the full proposal will ask you for more specific indicators later.
<b>Q:</b> Should the targets in the log frame be for the first five years (like the budget), or do they speak to a different time period?	<b>A:</b> Yes, the Logical framework should look at the first 5 years, in sync with the 5-year budget (even if Impact and e.g. some of the more overarching Outcomes might perhaps not change). In the 5th year there will be an audit where the next 5-year period will be defined, and adjustment to the Log frame and budget can be agreed upon.

7. Program Budget – cost plan	
<p><b>Q:</b> The guidelines say: “The LLF is not positioned to reimburse or cover personnel costs at NGO headquarters level beyond the 5% overhead. 1. What is the definition of “headquarters”? 2. Will the overall 5% overhead be distributed among the consortium partners? Or is this 5% only applicable for the lead applicant?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> The 5% overhead refers to the total budget, which is possible to distribute amongst the consortia members. The definition of headquarters may differ amongst organizations. We consider “overhead” as money not located in the field (non-field expenses). Example: Salaries of NGO headquarters in Europe.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Would salaries for Eco guards in the field be considered overhead?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Ecoguard salary is certainly one example where we expect our funding to go to and it would not be considered overhead nor staff costs, but program implementation costs. Please check the explanations in the budget template for more information.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Is the required budget in the CN stage only for the first five year (even though we plan to run the project for 15 years)?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Correct. After the first 5 years there will be an audit and, provided that the program is on track, the next 5 year budget can commence.</p>
8. Applicant Information	
<p><b>Q:</b> Is the letter of support of the Government already needed for the concept note stage? If yes, what should be in that letter, is there a template available?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> LLF requires a letter of support from the government at concept note stage. More detailed assurances are needed for the proposal development only. Especially when conducting the ESDD, the respective content of the government letter is required.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Would the government need to contribute a minimum funding permanently?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Different sources of funding will have to be indicated (see budget template). We expect the government funding to continue - and to not be reduced – because of LLF funding. Within the letter of support, we would need a confirmation by the government to maintain integrity of the site and uphold funding and full political commitment for conservation for the site over time.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Does LLF need letters from the provincial and from the national government?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> This depends on the national and local governance structure. There are countries which are strongly centralized where you may need higher level involved, which could be different in more decentralized countries.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Could the LOI (letter of intent) committing match funds be signed only by the lead NGO initially, not by the match funder, if there is no firm commitment (yet) from a match funder?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> No. The commitment has to be there when the CN will be submitted (deadline 30.04.). The letter can of course say that the match funding will only be committed once LLF has made the selection for the concept note to go to full proposal. LLF decision on approval / non-approval will be taken within 8-12 weeks. If successful match funder money will unlock governmental funds by a 1:2 ratio. We trust the relative short waiting time until decision time will be acceptable for this innovative LLF finance instrument.</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> After the Letter of Intent, what will be expected from the funding partners?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> Once the concept note and the full proposal will be approved by the supervisory board, a contract will be signed and the match funder (funding partner) is expected to transfer their contribution (between 1/3 to 1/2 of the total grant) at the beginning of the grant to LLF. A match funding agreement will be provided by LLF to be signed with the match funder. In exceptional circumstances, a transfer direct to the implementing partner might be agreeable (to be discussed with LLF).</p>
<p><b>Q:</b> Can the letters of governmental support be executed in the official language and translated into English? Recommended content? Are free translations acceptable? When will the template be available?</p>	<p><b>A:</b> The governmental letter of support in the Concept Note phase can be freely formulated. It should reflect the commitment of the government to the program area and the LLF endeavour. For the full proposal phase LLF will provide guidance on the main components to be mentioned in the letter (plausible dedication to conservation, commitment to environmental and social safeguards, etc). The letters can be in local language. A non-notarized accompanying translation in English is sufficient.</p>
9. Grant agreements, Letters of Intent, other letters of support and/or endorsement	

<b>10. Financial and Organizational Due Diligence Questionnaire</b>	
<b>Any other topic</b>	