

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
30th Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council
Washington, D.C.
12 January 2017
8 a.m.-11 a.m. EST

Approved Minutes

1. Welcome and introductions (Doc. CEPF/DC30/1)

Olivier Langrand, CEPF Executive Director, welcomed the Donor Council members and representatives participating in the meeting. Mr. Langrand welcomed Donor Council Chairperson, Julia Marton-Lefèvre, to her first Donor Council Meeting. Ms. Marton-Lefèvre introduced herself and thanked the Donor Council members for appointing her the new CEPF Chairperson.

The CEPF-Secretariat requested that the Donor Council 30th meeting be recorded for better and more transparent meeting minutes.

- The Donor Council agreed to the recording of the 30th Donor Council meeting.

2. Adoption of agenda (Doc. CEPF/DC30/2)

Mitsutoshi Kajikawa, Director of Development Issues International Bureau, Ministry of Finance, Japan, requested that the order of the agenda be changed to move agenda item 5 before agenda item 4 to ensure that he could participate in the discussion on the in-depth fiduciary assessment and the value-for-money assessment. Due to the late hour in Japan, the representatives from the Government of Japan would not be able to participate for the full duration of the meeting.

- The 30th Donor Council Meeting Agenda was changed per Japan's request and the Donor Council approved the revised agenda.

The Draft Minutes reflect the new order of the agenda.

3. Adoption of Minutes of the 29th Meeting of the Donor Council (Doc. CEPF/DC29/3)

The Donor Council adopted the minutes of the 29th Meeting of the Donor Council, which took place on 10 June 2016 with the following adjustments:

Julia Bucknall, Acting Senior Director of Environment and Natural Resources Global Practices for the World Bank, requested a clarification of the reporting of CEPF administrative costs in the minutes to reflect specifically that the CEPF Secretariat reports 15 percent in administrative costs. The World Bank would also like for the meeting minutes to reflect that the World Bank expressed concern over the administrative costs.

- The CEPF Secretariat will amend the 29th Donor Council Meeting minutes to reflect that the CEPF Secretariat reports 15 percent in administrative costs for the CEPF. The World Bank noted that the actual costs are much higher.
- Jennifer Morris, Chief Operating Officer of Conservation International, requested that, in addition to the list of attendees of the 29th Donor Council Meeting, the minutes also list Donor Council members who were absent.
 - The minutes of the 29th Donor Council Meeting will be updated to reflect the complete list of attendees and those absent.
- Ms. Morris also requested that the Donor Council revisit the CEPF governance arrangements discussed during the 29th Donor Council Meeting since CEPF is governed by consensus and Conservation International was not present during that discussion and therefore was not able to participate in the discussion.
 - The CEPF governance arrangements will be addressed by email.

4. “In-depth fiduciary assessment” and the “value-for-money assessment”

- a. Update by the World Bank
- b. Possible implications of the assessments for the CEPF

Ms. Bucknall provided an update from the World Bank regarding the two assessments. Ms. Bucknall explained that to provide additional financing to an ongoing Bank-supported project, there are criteria that must be met, namely: (i) the project should be well performing, i.e. the ratings need to be at least moderately satisfactory; (ii) it should be efficient; and (iii) there is no alternative to the project. When the World Bank did conduct the June 2016 Supervision Mission, they identified a few areas of concern. The World Bank rated the CEPF project not satisfactory for financial management and procurement. To determine corrective measures, the World Bank decided to conduct further reviews. The in-depth fiduciary assessment, which has already started, is assessing the CEPF Secretariat and three samples of the Regional Implementation Teams and associated beneficiaries. The complete report will be ready by April 2017. At the time of the 30th Donor Council meeting, there were no interim findings available to present to the Donor Council members.

Ms. Bucknall noted that the reporting team confirmed that there are issues of concern. The World Bank wants to make sure there are no ineligible expenses, in accordance with the relevant legal agreements. Ms. Bucknall noted that the World Bank understands that it might be a difficult situation, but issues of concern should be rectified before additional financing is provided to the project. The results from the value-for-money assessment will inform the design of the new additional financing project, and address, if necessary, efficiency gains. It is standard procedure for the World Bank to conduct a mid-term review, which is a bit late in the case of CEPF. A firm has been hired for the value-for-money assessment. The World Bank indicated that the value-for-money assessment would not delay anything. Once the in-depth fiduciary assessment is done, the World Bank will determine what action to take regarding the additional contribution from the Government of Japan that will be processed as additional financing to the project by the World Bank. Ms. Bucknall also stated that if some transactions were ineligible expenditures under the World Bank policy, then those transactions would have to be reimbursed to the World Bank. Ms. Bucknall agreed to receive comments from the Donor Council on the terms of reference for the value-for-money assessment, but noted that significant changes may trigger the need for a contract amendment for ICF International, the firm hired to conduct the assessment.

Multiple Donor Council members expressed concern over the period the World Bank has had the funding from the Government of Japan without disbursing it and the amount of time the assessments are taking.

Government of Japan:

Mr. Kajikawa stated that the Government of Japan was shocked last September to find that the US\$15 million had not been transferred to CEPF, since Japan had transferred that money to the World Bank in April 2015. The Government of Japan expressed its frustration to the World Bank and sought justification for the delay of the transfer and the due diligence process. Mr. Kajikawa emphasized that while the Government of Japan understands the rationale for the ongoing assessments commissioned by the World Bank based on its fiduciary responsibilities, he wonders if the Bank recognizes the importance the Ministry places on supporting CEPF's activities in the hotspots and the responsibility of the Government of Japan to report publicly on the usage of said funds. The Government of Japan requested an explanation regarding why the funds transfer had been so delayed despite a communication from the Bank to CEPF (reported in an October email from the CEPF Executive Director to the Donor Council) that indicated the funds would be committed in May 2015, and why the estimated period of the assessments had been expanded by more than three months. Mr. Kajikawa also expressed support for suggestions from other Donor Council members that the value-for-money assessment be de-linked from the fiduciary assessment.

European Commission:

Mr. Daniel Calleja Crespo requested further explanation of the situation, noting that the meeting's discussion was only increasing confusion, and noting that since the fiduciary assessment started months ago, and the Donor Council will get the final result in April, he found it incredible that in January the Bank was unable to share some indication of the findings. Also, Mr. Calleja Crespo asked for affirmation that the value-for-money assessment would not delay further the release of the funds.

Mr. Roberto Ridolfi stated that the delays were very difficult to justify, noting that the day of the Donor Council meeting, he had received from the World Bank the supervision mission report completed in July 2016 that triggered the assessments. He said the report should have been shared with the Donor Council at the beginning of the in-depth fiduciary assessment as a matter of transparency. Mr. Ridolfi stated that

aid money is scarce, and it must be used immediately, because if it is not used immediately it means that it is not needed. Mr. Ridolfi requested for the preliminary findings to be shared soon, in January, with all Donor Council members and for the Donor Council to be given the opportunity to provide input on the terms of reference of the value-for-money assessment, because value-for-money is the business of all the donors. He said it is not acceptable that the World Bank declined previous donor requests to be permitted to comment on the value-for-money assessment terms of reference. Mr. Ridolfi also commented that it is extremely important to know the fiduciary assessment findings as soon as possible so that any problems can be dealt with quickly. Mr. Ridolfi requested an extraordinary video conference of the Donor Council to discuss the preliminary findings of the fiduciary assessment.

Conservation International:

Ms. Morris said that for the contribution of the European Union, by comparison, it took only nine months from letter to actual disbursement, and she asked what had changed to make this a two-year process. She also stated that while the World Bank said that the in-depth assessment will be concluded by April, there will be added delays such as response time. She also noted that the value-for-money assessment will basically double the work the Secretariat has already put into the assessments. As the largest donor, currently, Conservation International's funds are now being used to cover for the missing funds from Japan to allow planned field work to move ahead. She said CEPF is looking at a situation where it will have to delay commitments on the ground for regions the Donor Council agreed to finance, putting CEPF and the donors at risk. She said CI does not feel the value-for-money assessment is necessary. She asked why the results of the fiduciary assessment wouldn't provide sufficient information to determine what is needed for the new grant agreement. Ms. Morris also noted that CI and the EU requested to review the terms of reference for the value for money assessment previously and were told "no" by the World Bank. In the spirit of the partnership of the CEPF, she said, it's very important that this Donor Council be used for the intent when it came together 16 years ago, which is to create a fund for the conservation of biodiversity, and there is a feeling that currently that has been a little bit difficult in terms of this assessment process. Ms. Morris requested for the two assessments to be de-linked so once the in-depth assessment is closed there is no need to wait for the value-for-money assessment to release the Japanese funds. Ms. Morris also pointed out that there would be an assessment done for the DGF closeout at the end of the year.

Global Environment Facility:

Mr. Gustavo Fonseca, Director of Programs – Natural Resources, added that each donor is accountable to their donor countries and the public. For this reason, Donor Council members should be in full agreement of the terms of reference for the value-for-money assessment because the consequences are not only for the World Bank. Therefore, both assessments should be looked at separately. He noted, however, that the World Bank continues to view the value-for-money assessment as the second part in a two-part process, and even if it transfers the funds after completion of the fiduciary assessment, it may want to restructure the whole agreement again based on the value-for-money findings.

Secretariat:

Mr. Langrand quoted from the World Bank's July 14, 2016, Aide Memoire resulting from its Supervision Mission, page 2, "The mission takes note of the good progress with the implementation of the CEPF and progress against the objectives remains satisfactory." He also quoted from page 3 of that report, "The financial management of the CEPF continues to be satisfactory." But he noted that a July 21 letter from the World Bank, signed by Paula Caballero, concluded that the project had been rated unsatisfactory because of

noncompliance with the World Bank policies and procedures. The Secretariat then requested clarification regarding the cause of the unsatisfactory rating, and has received no response.

He noted that the in depth fiduciary assessment started in September, and continues, with field visits still being planned. The Secretariat has uploaded to the secure website of the World Bank 1,543 documents, and the Secretariat staff have so far spent more than 200 hours of senior director, director and executive director time working on the assessment. Mr. Langrand said he hopes this investment of time and money will lead to the unlocking of the US\$15 million from Japan that was designated for CEPF Phase II, while CEPF is now in its Phase III.

Mr. Langrand also stated that the Secretariat was prompted by the Donor Council to present spending plans based on committed funding and pledged funding, and thus, the \$15 million from Japan has been programmed. The work plan CEPF has in place relies on the \$15 million that has been stuck for 18 months.

Mr. Langrand also shared that the Secretariat shared the terms of reference of the value-for-money assessment to the Donor Council members as this had not be done by the World Bank.

World Bank responses:

- Regarding the amount of time being spent on the assessments: Ms. Bucknall noted that she had gone through the related documents and did not see that there was a previous commitment from the Bank regarding how long the assessments would take. She noted that the fiduciary assessment is taking a long time, and that the Bank didn't commit to how long it would take because it did not know exactly what would be involved. She said the investigators were finding things that need to be investigated. She stated that the World Bank has been told there are issues of concern related to procedural accounting and what money was allocated for, as well as issues of eligible expenditure. But the investigators have not shared findings yet, despite pressure from the project team to do so. The assessment covers 15 years of work in several different places, and so it is significantly complex. She said the Bank wished it wasn't taking longer, but the Bank doesn't control the assessment because it's an Bank-internal independent review. She assured the Donor Council that many people are working on the assessment, so there is no lack of attention to the matter. While Ms. Bucknall reiterated that the Bank had previously committed to a deadline, she said it was now committing to be finished with the fiduciary assessment in April.
- Regarding the delay in disbursement of the Japanese funding: Ms. Bucknall said she did not have a copy of the May 2015 email cited by the CEPF Executive Director and she would clarify after getting a copy of it. She added that she would be surprised if the World Bank would have made an indication that funds could be disbursed within a matter of weeks because of the procedures required for such a transfer always take a period of some months. She suggested that what the email may have been indicating is that within two weeks the letter would be prepared. She noted that in the Aide Memoire of July 2016, the World Bank indicated the funds would transfer no later than January 2017. Ms. Bucknall stated that once the World Bank has the results of the fiduciary review, there will likely be things that need to be addressed, and then once the Bank's criteria have been met, it can move ahead with processing the additional financing. With the fiduciary

review completed in April, Ms. Bucknall noted that if solutions could be found regarding whatever issues surface in the assessment findings, and terms can be negotiated for the new grant agreement, then possibly by sometime in May money could become available. The grant agreement would work out things like what counts as Eligible Expenditures, such as, for example, incremental operating costs (i.e. administrative costs), what amount of such costs is reasonable, and other details of the project. But when the value-for-money assessment is completed, the project may need to be restructured based on those findings.

- Regarding comparison of disbursement process for the European Union funds: Ms. Bucknall pointed out that World Bank procedures had changed since the European Union funds were disbursed, and now there is the requirement to demonstrate that a project has been rated satisfactory in the past, is efficient, and that there's no alternative to the project.
- Regarding the terms of reference for the value-for-money assessment: Ms. Kutter, Senior Operations Officer, Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice at the World Bank, noted that the value-for-money assessment is part of the Bank's regular due diligence process and the World Bank usually does not share documents such as the terms of reference with donors. Ms. Bucknall, however, said the World Bank does not have any objection to getting comments, though they might require a contract amendment and delay completion of the value-for-money assessment.

The World Bank agreed to:

1. Present initial findings, focused on the Secretariat, from the in depth fiduciary assessment by the end of January, to be discussed with Donor Council members at an extraordinary meeting via video conference in early February.
2. Receive Donor Council member input on the terms of reference for the value-for-money assessment, and consider adjustments to the study based on that input.
3.
 - The Secretariat will poll the Donor Council to determine the day/time of the February meeting.
 - The CEPF Secretariat will send the Terms of Reference of the Value for Money Assessment for the Donor Council to send their comments on those Terms of Reference of the Value for Money Assessment by COB Monday 16 January.

5. Report from the Executive Director* (Doc. CEPF/DC29/4)

- Financial commitments and potential commitments from regional donors:
 - \$900,000 received from the Helmsley Charitable Trust to be invested in Myanmar.
 - MAVA Foundation and the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation contributed each \$100,000 for the re-profiling of the Mediterranean Basin Hotspot, 2/3 of the \$300,000 cost of the ecosystem profile process. These contributions demonstrate the commitment of these partners to continue working with CEPF in the Mediterranean Basin Biodiversity Hotspot.

Note: Ms. Marton-Lefèvre mentioned, for the sake of transparency, that she is on the board of the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation, and recused herself from discussions relating to CEPF and the Foundation. She noted that the Foundation has a very serious scientific advisory committee, and CEPF has been seen in a most favorable light.

- o €5,000,000 from AFD are in the pipeline and will hopefully be available to CEPF for investment in September 2017. Those funds are directed toward implementation of activities in the Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands and Guinean Forests of West Africa biodiversity hotspots. Hopefully this is an indication that AFD may come back as a global donor of CEPF.
 - o CEPF is working on a possible partnership with Rainforest Trust to match every single investment made by CEPF for the establishment of new protected areas. It would be \$16,000,000 over the next 4 years. At this time, the legal aspect is still being worked on.
 - o KFW, the German Bank, is considering a regional investment in the tropical Andes, and they have been kept informed about the progress made toward the granting in this hotspot, where Germany has a specific interest, especially Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.
- Hotspot profiling:
 - o The Mediterranean Basin ecosystem profile has been updated, and the first draft will be reviewed by the Working Group on February 3rd.
 - o The first draft for the Mountains of Central Asia Ecosystem Profile is also being finished. It is being prepared by a Swiss-based NGO called Zoï Environment, which has worked a lot with the European Commission.
 - o The contract for the Caribbean re-profiling was just signed and the profiling team will start very soon.
 - Communications:

Two new videos were created and released: one presents the overview of CEPF that informs the public who is CEPF, what we are doing.

The other highlights the hotspot heroes. It is linked also with a story map that is posted on CEPF website. It tells the story of these hotspot heroes and hopefully it will inform and inspire people regarding CEPF-funded projects.

Grants Management Update:

Foundation Connect is the name of the new grants database that CEPF has been building during the last year and a half. CEPF has been using a custom-built grants database for about the last 12 years. It is an outdated platform, and multiple systems were used to collect and track information. This new system is based on the Salesforce platform. One great feature is that the system is available in multiple languages. The grantee side of the system, called the portal, and the database are integrated such that when the grantee enters information, it will immediately be available within the database. Also, the system will easily integrate with the CEPF website. At this time, there are three regions that are piloting the system: Eastern Afrotropical (Africa), and two of our newer regions, the Cerrado in Brazil and Guinean Forests of West Africa. The plan is that other CEPF regions will be migrated into the system during the calendar

year.

Centralized Grants and Contracts Unit:

Conservation International is creating a centralized grants and contracts unit to standardize and centralize the administration of grants and contracts. The goals are to strengthen risk assessment and risk management practices, standardize monitoring protocols, and strengthen and support our grantees and staff with targeted training. To that end, Conservation International has recently hired a new procurement specialist who will begin on 1 February. CEPF will also hire a fourth grants manager to help manage a portfolio of about 225 grants, reducing the load for grants managers who currently manage about 75 grants each. This will allow better risk management and closer monitoring of the grants throughout the life cycle. To make this new position cost-neutral, Director of Grants Management Megan Oliver, who had been 100% CEPF, will now work on other programs within CI as well. Some of Finance Senior Director Kevin McNulty's time also will be moved to other programs as the new procurement specialist takes on some of Kevin's work in procurement.

Global Impact Report:

This report represents the work of 16 years of CEPF grantees, more than 2,000 in 92 countries and territories. It covers 10 of the 23 indicators that were approved in 2012, but it also incorporates additional information that CEPF has been able to collect since the 2014 Donor Council decision to increase the emphasis on monitoring and evaluation for CEPF's Phase III.

Comments on the Global Impact Report

European Commission:

- The report is in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals and with the consensus for development that the European Union has recently launched. The EC will distribute this consensus, which centers on five P's: people, peace, partnership, prosperity and planet. People and planet will be the two key elements that interface with CEPF's work. The paper now is under consideration of the European Union Council and the European Parliament, and will be discussed to become a common consensus within the EU community and the 27-member states.
- The EC welcomes this impact report very much. It shows very clearly some encouraging improvement in terms of conservation, objectives, number of hectares of protected areas, and clear linkages with Aichi targets.
- However, Mr. Ridolfi noted that the Global Impact Report does not show how CEPF has improved livelihoods of local population. This is an important point as funding for environmental conservation come from development budgets which are for poverty eradication. Mr. Ridolfi also stated he would like to see in this report how resilience in terms of socioeconomic conditions is brought about by effective management of natural resources.

- The CEPF Secretariat will provide an addendum to the Global Impact Report to elaborate on socioeconomic benefits and resilience.

The Donor Council authorized the CEPF Secretariat to engage the CEPF Working Group on the revision of the indicators used to define the CEPF global impact.

6. Review of CEPF administrative costs over the past five years

CEPF Executive Director Olivier Langrand told the Donor Council that 81 percent of the CEPF budget goes to grant work on the ground, 4 percent goes to ecosystem profiling and 15 percent goes to administrative costs. The Secretariat also analyzed how the 15 percent of administrative costs are split between true administrative expenses and technical costs. It was noted that:

- 25 percent of the executive management work qualifies as technical;
- 90 percent of program management qualifies as technical;
- 15 percent of grant management qualifies as technical;
- 90 percent of monitoring and learning qualifies as technical;
- 5 percent of finance and information management qualifies as technical.

This means that CEPF secretariat purely administrative work is about 10% of the total amount that is committed to CEPF. The figure of 15 percent administrative costs for the Secretariat that has been reported is not precise regarding the part of the Secretariat's function that is technical. The Regional Implementation Teams (RITs) also provide a mix of technical and administrative functions. Seven percent of the RIT work is dedicated to administrative functions.

To clarify the above:

- The Secretariat will provide the definitions of administrative and technical inputs for the CEPF Secretariat and the RIT.
- The World Bank will provide the definition of "Incremental Operating Costs"/"Project Management Costs" as stipulated in the Grant Agreement between the World Bank and Conservation International pertaining to the EU grant provided through a World Bank project in support of CEPF objectives.

7. The Regional Implementation Team (RIT): Discussion on the RIT role and purpose

There are five key points that define the Regional Implementation Team.

- They coordinate the investment.
- They develop the portfolio of grants.
- They build civil society capacity.
- They have the local knowledge and insight to make CEPF implementation happen.
- They are the long-term structures that implement the CEPF vision.

The RITs started off as coordination units, but their terms of reference have evolved throughout the years. Today, they are selected on a competitive basis: applications are reviewed by the Working Group and approved by the Donor Council. RIT grants are the first grants that the CEPF Secretariat implements in a hotspot. The RITs do some administrative work. Specifically, they administer a small grants program. But they are selected because of their technical prowess and technical knowledge. They are the leaders who are leading the strategy in the hotspot, so this is not an administrative function. RITs are viewed and guided as primarily technical partners in implementing CEPF strategy.

- The Secretariat will provide an analysis of the RIT technical vs administrative inputs to accompany the

- analysis provided for the Secretariat cost presented at the Donor Council meeting.¹
- This topic will be discussed at greater length at a future Donor Council meeting.

8. Frequency and timing of CEPF Donor Council meetings, and date and place of next meeting:

The date and place of the next meeting will be discussed at the February Donor Council meeting.

9. Any other business:

European Commission: Mr. Ridolfi commented on a new investment plan from the European Union.

The external investment plan is a €65 billion operation that will be rolling out private sector investments in several areas. For this the help of the Donor Council and the help of CEPF will be required to consider and build a window for investments. Billions of euros could be mobilized. At this time, this European external investment plan is only in Africa and in the neighborhood of Europe, but Turkey is very much included. This plan will provide private operators with partial guarantees covering the investments. It could be in renewable energy, smart agriculture and addressing climate change. But it could potentially mobilize millions for biodiversity as well. It will be in addition to the work done with small, local NGOs.

Mr. Ridolfi said he will be in D.C. in March visiting CI and hopefully the World Bank and other partners.

¹ Note: The World Bank offers its analysis of the planned and actual Incremental Operating Costs for FY16 as per definition in the above-mentioned Grant Agreement between the World Bank and Conservation International.

List of Attendees

Donor Council Members

Julia Marton-Lefèvre	Chairperson, CEPF Donor Council	Attended
Laurence Breton-Moyet	Executive Director, Operations, Agence Française de Développement	Did not attend
Jennifer Morris	Chief Operating Officer, Conservation International	Attended
Daniel Calleja Crespo	Director General for Environment, European Commission	Attended
Roberto Ridolfi	Director Sustainable Growth and Development – DEVCO, European Commission	Attended
Gustavo Fonseca on behalf of Naoko Ishii (CEO)	Director of Programs, Natural Resources, Global Environment Facility	Attended
Chris Holtz	Director Conservation and Sustainable Development, MacArthur Foundation	Did not attend
Mitsutoshi Kajikawa	Director of Development Issues International Bureau, Ministry of Finance, Japan	Attended
Julia Bucknall	Acting Senior Director Environment and Natural Resources Global Practices, World Bank	Attended

Working Group Members and Donor Staff in Attendance:

Agence Française de Développement

*** **Tiphaine Leménager**, Project Manager, Agriculture, Rural Development, Biodiversity Sustainable Development

Conservation International

***Yves Pinsonneault**, Vice President, Field Program

*****Yasushi Hibi**, Vice President, CI---Japan

***Patricia Petty**, Counsel

European Commission

****Anne-Theo Seinen**, Policy Officer, Directorate---General for the Environment

*****Philippe Mayaux**, Head of Sector, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, DEVCO

****Patrice Moussy**, DG Coopération internationale et Développement - DEVCO

Unité C2 – Environnement, Écosystèmes, Biodiversité et Vie sauvage

Global Environment Facility

- ***Yoko Watanabe**, Senior Biodiversity Specialist
- ***Claude Gascon**, Manager, Programs Unit
- ***Sarah Wyatt**, Biodiversity Analyst

Government of Japan

- *****Akiko Tabata**, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment
- *****Ken Goto**, Section Chief, Ministry of Finance

World Bank

- ***Andrea Kutter**, Senior Operations Officer, Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice
- ***Sofia De Abreu Ferreira**, Legal Counsel, LEGEN
- ***Sachin Shahria**, Consultant, Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice
- ***Toshiyuki Shimano**, Advisor to Executive Director World Bank

CEPF Secretariat:

- *Olivier Langrand, Executive Director
- *Nina Marshall, Senior Director, Monitoring, Evaluation and Outreach
- *Kevin McNulty, Senior Director, Finance and Operations
- *Megan Oliver, Grant Management Team
- *Julie Shaw, Communications Director
- *Céline Desbrosses, Executive Assistant

- * **Physically present in DC**
- ** **On the phone or Visio conference**
- *** **Did not attend**