

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund  
32<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council  
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500  
Arlington, USA  
6 February 2018  
8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

**Action Points Review**

The 31<sup>st</sup> CEPF Donor Council meeting took place on 27 June 2017 at the European Commission office in Brussels, Belgium. The agenda included discussion and decisions related to the approval of a new set of global indicators, approval of the new Operations Manual, and approval of the governance arrangements. The agenda also included the reporting from the World Bank on the “In-depth Fiduciary Assessment,” “CEPF Management Response to In-depth Fiduciary Assessment” and “Value-for-Money Assessment.”

**During the meeting, the Donor Council:**

- 1) Agreed to record the meeting.
- 2) Approved the minutes of the 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Donor Council with no changes.
- 3) Approved the new 16 global indicators.
- 4) Approved the updated Operations Manual.
- 5) Disagreed with increasing the threshold of large grant to \$500,000, proposed by the World Bank, as this would defeat one purpose of CEPF, to grant to small and local civil society.

**The Donor Council also requested that the Secretariat:**

- 1) Provide a one-page document with infographics on the CEPF contribution to the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals and the Aichi Targets of the U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity.
- 2) Revise the governance arrangements with the new recommended changes for final approval.

**The Donor Council also requested that the World Bank:**

- 1) Work with the Government of Japan and the European Union to pursue having their grant agreements retro-actively extended.
- 2) Check with its management whether the World Bank will provide a written note to each donor that will include the following points:
  - a. Explain why the World Bank finds some expenses ineligible.
  - b. Explain why CEPF finds these expenses eligible.
  - c. For the Government of Japan, identify the pertinent text in the financing agreement.
- 3) Provide a revised action plan that includes what each donor must do. Will be sent by June 30th.
- 4) Change the wording of the action plan from “fraud” to “ineligible expenses,” and include amounts and a short text on what happened.

- 5) Adjust the wording in its report to cite:
  - a. Two confirmed instances of ineligible expenses, in which the organizations were defrauded by an employee. Some text would have to be added that the funds for the IUCN case were returned.
  - b. One instance of ineligible expenses under investigation.
  - c. One instance where investigators determined there was no ineligible expense.
- 6) Remove from its record any wording referencing "Some conflict of interest on CI's part when selecting CI as a grantee." This is not true as CI is removed from any discussion on CI's applications as a grantee.
- 7) Provide clarification on whether the new satisfactory rating was changed from B to A by consulting its Safeguards Committee, and explain why this new rating was given.