

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund  
36<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CEPF Donor Council  
Conservation International  
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 600  
Arlington VA 22202, USA  
19 March 2020  
8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. Eastern Standard Time**

**Minutes**

- 1. Welcome by the Chair and Introduction of Participants (CEPF/DC36/1)**
- 2. Adoption of [Agenda](#) (CEPF/DC36/2)**
- 3. Presentation and Discussion of the [Executive Director's Report](#) (CEPF/DC36/3)**

- a) Action Points Review (**CEPF/DC36/3/a**)  
See [meeting document](#) for further information

**China:** The Donor Council thinks it is key to engage with China. Has the Secretariat thought what the obstacles would be for engaging China as a donor and make them comfortable to enter a multi-basket fund?

- The Executive Director visit in December 2019 was a first visit. It was made possible as a result of the support from the CI-China Program that created opportunities for CEPF to present the fund. The idea now is to circle back with China, who could join as a regional donor. Currently, it is on hold.

**Private Sector:** The Donor Council maintains that it is important to work with the private sector. The GEF is actively working with the private sector by bringing them into the strategy. That collaboration does not necessarily entail bringing them in as donors, but rather as a key stakeholder. Similarly, CEPF could also engage private sector stakeholders in its strategy, which could be quite important. Both the Secretariat and RITs could identify key corporate players and move ahead to engage with them.

- The ecosystem profiles that are largely based on stakeholders' consultations have been very useful for CEPF to engage with the private sector thus far.

**Action Item: The EU offered sharing contacts from corporations engaged with the CBD COP through their Biodiversity and Business for Nature forum.**

- b) Partnership Highlights (**CEPF/DC36/3/b**)  
See [meeting document](#) for further information

**Norway:** CI and the Government of Costa Rica have been helping CEPF to secure an opportunity for CEPF to present the fund to NORAD (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation) and to the Minister of Environment of the Norwegian Government.

**KfW:** What is the progress on getting KfW to join the DC meeting as an observer? KfW was invited they but could not attend at this time. KfW may attend the next meeting.

c) Financial Narrative (**CEPF/DC36/3/c**)  
See [meeting document](#) for further information

d) Financial Report (**CEPF/DC36/3/d**)  
See [meeting document](#) for further information

e) Q2 Approved Grants (**CEPF/DC36/3/e**)  
See [meeting document](#) for further information

#### **4. Results of the CEPF Impact Report (CEPF/DC36/4)**

See [meeting document](#) for further information

**All the Donor Council members greatly appreciated this year Impact Report. Comments were numerous:**

- The framework is by far the most extensive as it is clear and concise. When looking at the present situation, it would have been difficult to predict that an actual major crisis that could bring people and economies down would be biodiversity related. Looking forward, it is a good opportunity for highlighting biodiversity and importance of biodiversity to humanity. CEPF is centrally positioned to be a major mechanism for conserving biodiversity in the world. With the CEPF 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary coming up, it seems like an opportunity for CEPF to not only increase awareness of the importance of biodiversity, but also increase the profile of CEPF for advancing the biodiversity issue. It could be good to put together a small working group, bring in some experts and examine links between what is seen today and human well-being, and come up with series of communications products and scientific products to make the link so as not to lose the momentum of public concern about biodiversity issues created by the pandemic.
- The conservation world needs Impact Reports such as these. What is needed too is stability among these indicators: With the reduced number of indicators, there is a good balance and common ground between donors around the table. AFD is eager and able to use these impact indicators in their own report. But what are the rules on how to use the results so there is no double-counting of impacts between donors? Are the indicators (Protected Areas, Key Biodiversity, production landscapes) distinct or do they overlap?

- ✓ CEPF confirmed that there is indeed some overlap between indicators, and therefore each indicator is distinct, and the results for different indicators should not be combined.
- CEPF has set the bar very high. But did CEPF achieve the targets it hoped to achieve? Was it that methodical?
  - ✓ CEPF targets are set at the portfolio level and are reported on annually in the annual portfolio overviews, and in the final assessment reports.
- It is important to be careful on attribution by showing clearly where the evidence is, how it is collected and preventing any double counting issue, as it is difficult to untangle.
- This impact report is a powerful tool. It is important to make the connection between the information and communications. One crucial issue is on resource mobilization, as it is very difficult to measure actual impact on biodiversity and attribute success. Because it is so difficult, it has been used by others as an excuse to not act. However, it is still important to communicate, make do with some approximations, and look at the long term: what would have happened without intervention?

## **5. Conservation Achievements of the Investment in the Wallacea Biodiversity Hotspot (CEPF/DC36/5)**

See [meeting document](#) for further information

The Donor Council felt that the Regional Implementation Team, Burung Indonesia, had done important work and that it was key noting the strengthening of the civil society. They suggested that it would be interesting to see how those achievements articulate against other hotspots.

## **6. Any Other Business**

**-END-**