

*

"#\$%&' " ()&*+

*

" ,.-/01+#/2343.56+\$0,.75,38-9%: 7; +

*

01 -234567839*: --372, . /*39- * &. 2. ;! . <2=7>

? ; <@@->@A*? ->, 7<B*

' C*D+2<+;4*' EFG*

FE*+HBH5GI HBIH*! "0*

+

<; 29.-27+2=+.85+>-7: .53+2=+.85+(?.8+>55.-7@+2=+.85+' 272,+ "2: 7/-1+

+

A5/26657; 5; +</.-27#.56+

09- * &. 2. ;! . <2=7>*7@*+@J-K*3. *+K. 13*39- *: 72<3-@. /*39- *' G39*: --372, . /*39- * &. 2. ;! . <2=7>*197=9*3. . J*

!>+=-*. 2*' L*D<2-*' EFLH*

*

*

*

*

*

! " # \$ % & ! ' (%) *

*

*

#+, -!* . /*! *

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Donor Council
Washington, D.C.
24 June 2014
8 a.m. – 11 a.m EDT

Draft Minutes

1. Welcome and introductions (Doc. CEPF/DC25/1)

Donor Council Chairperson Jean-Michel Severino welcomed Donor Council members and representatives participating in the meeting.

2. Adoption of agenda (Doc. CEPF/DC25/2)

The Executive Director proposed that the agenda be revised in order to have the report from the Executive Director and the update on the Phase III Business Plan development as one order of business.

The Donor Council approved the agenda with this change.

3. Adoption of Minutes of the Twenty-fourth Meeting of the Donor Council (Doc. CEPF/DC25/3)

The Donor Council adopted the minutes of the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Donor Council, which took place on 28 January 2014, with corrections in the list of attendees from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Government of Japan (GOJ).

4. Report from the Executive Director (Doc. CEPF/DC25/4)

- Includes follow-up to the decisions taken at Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Donor Council

The Executive Director reviewed highlights from her written report on activities since the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Donor Council on 28 January 2014.

The partnership highlights included:

- *World Wonders Exhibit*: In May, the photo exhibit was displayed at the 5th GEF Assembly in Cancun, Mexico. The exhibit was also displayed at the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 5th meeting of the Working Group on the Review of Implementation (WGR15) in Montreal, Canada, in June.

The exhibit, which showcases the natural beauty of the hotspots, is presented by CEPF, Nature Picture Library and nature magazine *Terre Sauvage*. Working with l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the League for the Protection of Birds (Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux – LPO) and the French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, CEPF plans to display the exhibit at sites and upcoming events around the world throughout the year, including the CBD COP and World Parks Congress. CEPF will make sure the Donor Council members are aware of when the exhibit is on display.

- *Annual Report Update:* The Donor Council members were provided copies of the 2013 CEPF Annual Report, which showcases the global progress of the partnership, demonstrating the impact CEPF and its grantees have had on a global scale via the four pillars of CEPF: biodiversity, human well-being, civil society capacity and enabling conditions. This is the first attempt to graphically capture the global results of CEPF against the monitoring framework. The Annual Report also showcases the regional results, demonstrating the progress made in achieving the strategic directions in regions where CEPF invested in 2013.

The Executive Director noted that the CEPF monitoring report is being updated to better incorporate the Aichi Targets. The partnership highlights in the Annual Report includes the Aichi Target icons to show how CEPF grantees contribute to the targets. CEPF is currently working with the CBD Secretariat and other partners to plan an event at the 12th CBD Conference of the Parties in Pyeongchang, South Korea, in the fall that further showcases how civil society is advancing the Aichi Targets.

- *Profiling Update:* The Donor Council was asked on 15 May 2014 to approve on a no-objection basis the ecosystem profile for the Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands biodiversity hotspot. The deadline for the no-objection approval is 30 June 2014.

On 10 June 2014, the Donor Council was asked to approve on a no-objection basis the ecosystem profile for the Wallacea biodiversity hotspot. The deadline for the no-objection approval is 25 July 2014. Per the request of the Working Group, Burung Indonesia prepared an approximately 30-page summary of the full ecosystem profile, which was provided to the Donor Council at the meeting.

The financial overview highlights included:

- CEPF has secured \$270 million since inception, with an additional \$18 million pledged. The Executive Director thanked the Government of Japan for noting at the beginning of the meeting today their efforts to disperse their remaining commitment (\$15 million) by the end of the year. The remaining pledged funds also include one more contribution from the World Bank (approximately \$3 million).
- CEPF expenses have totaled \$211 million, with 80 percent (\$170 million) of the funding going to grants. Through May, 90 percent (\$15.8 million) of the total 2014 spending plan has been granted.
- In CEPF's Phase II, 50 percent of the value of all grants, including those to RITs, was awarded to local organizations. In terms of the number of grants, 62 percent were awarded to local groups.

4a. Update on Phase III Business Plan development (Doc. CEPF/DC25/5) and approval of:

-Framework and draft scope for long-term strategic visions for graduating civil societies (Doc. CEPF/DC25/5a)

-Revised terms of reference for regional implementation teams (Doc. CEPF/DC25/5b)

The Executive Director provided a review of progress on components of CEPF Phase III, and the Donor Council was asked to approve the framework and draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions for graduating civil society from CEPF support, as well as the updated terms of reference for the Regional Implementation Teams (RITs).

The Executive Director reminded the Donor Council of the results of their meeting in Paris, during which the draft strategic framework for Phase III was approved. To align with the Sustainable Development Goals and the Aichi Targets, CEPF's Phase III will launch in 2015. The four key outcomes expected from the new phase include: (1) a revamped, scaled-up and transformational CEPF, (2) long-term strategic visions developed and implemented for at least 12 hotspots, (3) strengthened implementation structures for each investment hotspot, led by the RITs or similar organizations, which become the stewards of the long-term strategic vision for the hotspot, and (4) an improved delivery model with more efficient operations, stronger communications and more effective impact reporting and monitoring.

The Executive Director noted that during the 5th Assembly of the GEF in Cancun in May, the GEF Council approved the CEPF project concept that would provide \$9.8 million in bridge funding to help CEPF transition from its second to third phase. The objective of the project is to develop models that effectively mainstream biodiversity conservation into government policy and private sector practice in selected biodiversity hotspots by empowering civil society in three pilot hotspots: Cerrado, Eastern Afrotropical and Indo-Burma. This will help the Secretariat build up the foundation of CEPF, jump starting the implementation of CEPF's Phase III strategy.

The Secretariat is currently testing an opportunity with Mars, Inc., which is sourcing 80 percent of its cacao from Sulawesi in the Wallacea Hotspot. The company is thinking about the next generation of cacao plantations and a landscape approach that considers biodiversity. CEPF is working with Burung Indonesia to determine areas that Mars could restore to maintain production levels, combining restoration and cultivation.

The Secretariat reviewed the progress report on the CEPF Phase III components, noting the ongoing progress on improving the model of delivery. This includes upgrading the operational systems of CEPF, revising the communications strategy and updating the monitoring system to be better aligned with the Aichi Targets.

The Executive Director provided an overview of the revised terms of reference and selection process for the RITs, noting:

- The revision includes the addition of key functions that will allow the RITs to become effective stewards of the long-term visions of the hotspots. This includes roles in supporting civil society organizations in engaging with private sector actors and governments as well as seeking the financial sustainability of the long-term vision.
- The challenge was to design terms of reference that build an evolution and transition, incorporating the extremely different realities of civil society capacity, policy frameworks and private sector engagement.

- The Secretariat is asking the Donor Council to help CEPF test the revised terms of reference and selection process for the RITs in Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands, the Guinean Forests of West Africa and the Cerrado.

The Secretariat gave an overview of the framework and draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions for graduating civil society from CEPF support, noting:

- *Purpose:* CEPF's Phase III strategy will be a seven-year investment phase, during which at least 12 biodiversity hotspots will have long-term strategic visions developed.

The purpose of the long-term strategic visions is to define and work towards an end point at which local civil society "graduates" from its CEPF support with sufficient capacity, access to resources and credibility to respond to future conservation challenges.

The length of the long-term strategic visions will vary from region to region, and some hotspots have already reached graduation (Atlantic Forest). The average length of investment is expected to be 10-15 years. The ecosystem profiles will continue to focus on a five-year investment, and will be updated every five years for investments lasting longer than this amount of time.

- *Graduation Targets:* The long-term strategic visions will set clear graduation targets, which individual investment phases will work toward, guided by detailed strategies set out in the ecosystem profiles that will be renewed on a periodic basis. This does not mean that biodiversity is no longer threatened, but only that the conservation movement, collectively, is able to respond to all present threats and possible future threats.

They will also include financing plans describing the funding requirements for implementation of the long-term visions.

The five conditions that need to be met in order for a hotspot to graduate from CEPF support are knowledge, capacity, financial management, enabling conditions and mechanisms to adapt. These five graduation conditions are detailed in the revised terms of reference for regional implementation teams (Doc. CEPF/DC25/5b).

The first step will be to take the five graduation conditions and make them locally relevant for each hotspot (or sub-region) by setting specific criteria and targets. According to the current framework, five criteria are suggested for each condition, making 25 criteria in total.

The second step is to build a timeline, showing when each of the graduation conditions is expected to be met, and by extension, how many investment phases will be required to achieve graduation.

The third step is to prepare a list of actions that CEPF can take to prioritize action into phases. This goes beyond granting to include convening and training of civil society organizations, supporting RITs to integrate the results of pilot projects into public policy and private sector business practices, and developing shared strategies that align investments by multiple donors. This also includes networking, capturing lessons learned and providing facilitation that amplifies results.

The fourth, and final, step is to set financial targets for each action. These targets will be broken down by investment phase and by cost category, and will form the basis for financing plans for the implementation of the long-term visions and meeting of the graduation targets.

- *Process:* A team of consultants with extensive relevant experience in the hotspot in question will work with civil society and selected government and private sector stakeholders in the hotspot to develop each long-term vision, while the Secretariat will ensure consistency and quality control. Once developed, the long-term visions should be endorsed by the Donor Council and made available through CEPF's website.

Each long-term vision is expected to take four months to develop, followed by a two-month period of review and revision. The timeline for the preparation of long-term visions for hotspots in CEPF Phase III includes the Eastern Afromontane and Cerrado hotspots developed from July through December 2014 as part of the GEF bridge grant. The Mediterranean Basin (Balkans, Levant and North Africa) and the Tropical Andes will also be developed in this timeframe.

The Secretariat suggested that an initial experiment be done to test out the rollout of the long-term visions. This could then be presented at the next Donor Council meeting for feedback. The Secretariat also noted that the Working Group will be instrumental in helping with the rollout of the long-term visions.

The Donor Council discussed the revised terms of reference for the RITs and the framework and draft scope for long-term strategic visions for graduating civil societies, noting:

- *Long-Term Visions:* Conservation International (CI) noted that although the long-term vision is very clear and well-thought out, additional work needs to be done on the graduation conditions to make sure they are locally relevant. A few considerations that emerged include how development impacts conservation in the region and how this will affect the conditions; what is the capacity of government to include biodiversity conservation terms in laws and policies and how much are governments spending to fund these; whether we should measure where natural capital has been secured and protected; and where the development strategies of the regions have been modified.

The MacArthur Foundation noted that as the investment periods are extended over a timeframe of 10-15 years, changes in political context are possible but will not always be achieved. There should be adjustments to the graduation targets that allow the fund to decide if factors have changed to the point that we should pull out of the region.

AFD reiterated that development needs to be considered in the graduation targets, and it is critical to think locally rather than globally. By getting involved with civil society, private sector and government stakeholders should become better engaged in sustainable development. But it is unclear how civil society will get the participation of private sector and government stakeholders. And there should be criteria to measure the results and the economic impacts.

The GEF noted that key components of the GEF bridge grant are thinking about how to achieve a sustainable system of impact at scale; mainstreaming the goal of natural capital; and involving public policy and the private sector. These components are well incorporated into the graduation targets.

The European Commission noted that flexibility will be critical for the long-term visions to achieve success. The European Commission suggested that it will be important to involve the European Union delegations, other donors and local stakeholders in the process of developing the long-term visions to ensure inclusion of a wider political context and the role of the government.

The World Bank suggested that the long-term visions explain how the Secretariat will work differently with development and the private sector and identify grants that engage these stakeholders. The World Bank also suggested that the graduation targets include goals for funding to local versus international NGOs, and asked how grants to international NGOs will help with graduation conditions.

CI asked whether a region or hotspot will graduate when all the graduation targets are met or only specific ones, and if the amount of investment per region will change throughout the graduation time period.

The GEF noted that the graduation criteria are too complex and should be more concise. The GEF also suggested that the implementation of the Strategy process begins with 3-4 long-term visions at first, which will allow an opportunity for learning in a staged rollout.

- *Revised Terms of Reference for the RITs:* The World Bank asked for clarification on how things will be done differently moving forward in regard to the operational aspects of CEPF. The Secretariat should think about how to engage development NGOs and local NGOs to apply for the RIT.

CI noted that the revised terms of reference for the RITs does not clearly support the long-term visions, and it should include how the RITs can contribute to the long-term visions. CI also noted that the Secretariat should more clearly define who should apply to serve as the RIT, and the terms of reference should emphasize strategic learning over administrative support for CEPF. The Secretariat should also consider how we can feed this information to other donors to learn from what the fund is doing.

The GEF noted that the RITs should facilitate networking to connect civil society to private sector and government stakeholders, but that they should not necessarily be responsible for implementing capacity building. CEPF should instead partner with relevant NGOs to do the capacity building.

The Secretariat thanked the Donor Council for their suggestions, noting:

- *Graduation targets:* Not every single criterion will have to be met to reach graduation. Instead, these will be prioritized during the development of the long-term vision for each hotspot.

The Secretariat tried to include development in the criteria, to make sure they are adapting along with civil society, but the Secretariat needs to continue determining how to further incorporate elements of development and specific targets. These will be expanded in the final framework and scope for long-term strategic visions for graduating civil societies.

- *Timelines:* There will be hotspots where the fund will have to leave without reaching graduation. We have invested in regions with extreme conditions, such as Madagascar, where CEPF was able to maintain the power of civil society to protect key areas and retain a certain level of stability, but during each investment we have the opportunity to adjust the strategy as needed. The long-term visions can also be updated every five years, as the ecosystem profiles will be.
- *Operational Changes:* The Secretariat has some initial ideas about this, allocating a specific percentage of granting to designing guided interventions. The work with Mars is only in initial discussions and we will not be subsidizing their work. Instead the idea is for CEPF to provide funding to civil society while Mars funds cacao conservation as a partner donor.

As for the procurement of the RITs, it will be necessary to remember how each of the regions is expected to evolve to ensure the long-term visions map this, including how to harness the capacity of the RIT to gain new funding and steward conservation in the region. Another idea is to partner organizations together so that a local NGO without the full capacity to serve as the RIT can build capacity to become the steward over time.

- *Process:* Testing of the long-term visions is important and the Secretariat would like the Working Group to be involved in the rollout, to determine who should be involved in the development process. The Secretariat will reach out to the Working Group members in early fall to see who from each of the pilot regions we should talk with.

The Donor Council approved the updated terms of reference for the RITs. The Donor Council also approved the framework and draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions for graduating civil society from CEPF support for a pilot in three hotspots (Eastern Afromontane/Great Lakes, Mediterranean Basin and Tropical Andes), with comments from the Donor Council and Working Group to be incorporated.

The Secretariat will revise the draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions to incorporate the Donor Council and Working Group comments, which are due to the Secretariat by 11 July 2014. The Secretariat will also engage the Working Group in the development of the long-term visions for the pilot hotspots. The Secretariat will then present the long-term vision for the pilot hotspots during the next Donor Council meeting.

The World Bank asked about the budget, noting that CEPF appeared to be over budget in a few hotspots. The Executive Director explained that this is because the East Melanesian Islands RIT was projected to be contracted in fiscal year 2014, but actually occurred this fiscal year. The total amount will not exceed the total percent, since the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot will be under target; and CEPF will not exceed the annual spending plan.

The Chairperson noted that the next Donor Council meeting should include a discussion on learning and knowledge generation and how CEPF can communicate this information to communities and donors.

The Executive Director introduced the Spherical team, a group of communications consultants who presented their vision of the communications strategy and how to showcase stories while capturing knowledge and sharing lessons learned, noting:

- *Branding*: The Spherical team emphasized the need for CEPF to become a global brand and raise its profile. CEPF should also brand the hotspots and visualize these in compelling communications. This can make static reports come to life and content can then be repurposed for web and other channels. There is also an opportunity to refocus storytelling at big global events to showcase CEPF.
- *Context*: The communications strategy for Phase III of CEPF should include a big picture goal to share the successes of CEPF and its donor partners. To avoid homogenization, each hotspot needs its own look and feel with innovative communications that disperse information to civil society, media and other stakeholders in each region.

The Donor Council did not have time to discuss the communications presentation, so a longer session will be planned for the next Donor Council meeting to determine what the donors would like to see in the Phase III communications strategy.

5. Review of AFD evaluation* (Doc. CEPF/DC25/6)

Following the completion of the contribution of AFD to CEPF's Phase II in 2012, AFD contracted with the consulting firm Baastel to conduct an independent evaluation of CEPF. The consulting team met with the Secretariat, the Donor Council, Working Group members, RITs and grantees and visited four hotspots while analyzing CEPF's products and reports. The independent evaluation is in its final stages with a draft report produced in April 2014.

AFD presented the preliminary results of the evaluation as well as the key recommendations given by the consulting group, noting:

- *Process*: The evaluation is of AFD's participation in the Secretariat, which began in 2008. The evaluation's conclusions are already validated, but the recommendations are still being validated. The final evaluation in French should be available in July.

The evaluation looked at five components: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. At this time, there is a lack of independent data confirming CEPF's impact, but the civil society tracking tool is expected to help with this.

- *Conclusions and Recommendations:* The relevance and coherence of the AFD commitment to CEPF received a positive rating in regard to priorities, finance and the French development goals. Although CEPF works in regions that are outside of French priority areas, the fund is coherent in mainstreaming development issues within projects. However, improvements are needed to raise the level of involvement of local stakeholders compared to international organizations.

The CEPF-added value is different but complementary to AFD, with the fund achieving concrete results. Although effective, CEPF needs improvement in terms of capacity building and improved livelihoods.

The management cost of CEPF is quite efficient and overall CEPF is recognized as adding value to AFD. There are synergies of CEPF with bilateral tools, and the fund provides significant and targeted support for conservation.

The return effect of benefits to France is weak, in terms of local visibility and strengthening partnerships with international conservation NGOs. There is also a low level of French civil society participation, but this is because few French organizations are active at the international level in regard to biodiversity.

Some of the questions AFD was interested in discussing with the Donor Council about the return effect of CEPF to AFD included whether the expectation of AFD in terms of benefits was relevant, whether the low impact result was unpredictable and how could CEPF improve this situation.

In terms of influence, it is difficult to link the French contribution to CEPF's performance, but improvements may come in the future as LPO is now involved in the Mediterranean Basin investment.

The evaluation suggested three graduated scenarios as recommendations for AFD's future investment in CEPF, which vary by the level of expectation/objective.

The Chairperson thanked AFD for presenting the evaluation findings and recommendations, noting his concern that CEPF is doing great work but the return on investment for France in terms of visibility of the French contribution has been limited. This could become a problem for political support for CEPF in the future.

The Donor Council discussed the AFD evaluation, noting:

- *Visibility:* The European Commission noted that the low local visibility of AFD's investment in CEPF is a communications and branding issue. This should be discussed in the communications

strategy for CEPF's Phase III, in order to ensure that the donors receive credit for their role in the partnership.

The Chairperson noted that the donors also have a responsibility for communicating about CEPF.

- *Low level of return:* The main reason for this is that French NGOs focus more on development than biodiversity. When you look into projects funded by AFD, of 150 projects developed in the past few years, only six focused on biodiversity.

The GEF noted that the human well-being element is not being incorporated into development work, and for CEPF's Phase III strategy it will be important to decide if this is a byproduct or a key objective.

CI suggested that the Donor Council think about how the Secretariat and RITs can engage French companies and NGOs and how the donors can engage organizations back home in CEPF's Phase III strategy.

- *Efficiency:* The World Bank noted that the Donor Council should discuss the role of CI and efficiency, and CEPF should elevate this and use it as a pitch to get other donors.
- *Impact:* CI highlighted the potential challenges in monitoring and evaluation, specifically related to livelihoods. During the next Donor Council meeting, the members should discuss what can be done related to the indicators and whether this should be a central part of CEPF's Phase III strategy.

The World Bank suggested that the next Donor Council meeting be extended so that there is more time to delve into discussion about the agenda topics.

The Secretariat will distribute the final AFD Evaluation once available.

6. Presentation on the Wallacea Ecosystem Profile* (Doc. CEPF/DC25/7)

Burung Indonesia, which led the ecosystem profiling process in conjunction with BirdLife International, Bogor Agricultural University Coastal and Marine Centre, the Samdhana Institute and the Wildlife Conservation Society, presented the ecosystem profile for the Wallacea biodiversity hotspot.

The draft profile was presented to the Working Group on 14 May 2014. The revised draft responds to all major concerns raised at that time, including a restatement of the niche (Chapter 11) and revisions to the investment priorities (Chapter 12).

The Donor Council discussed the Wallacea ecosystem profile, noting:

- *National NGOs:* The World Bank noted that local NGOs in the hotspot are quite weak and that building capacity and networking will be critical. The GEF reiterated the point, noting that the profile has a clear focus on working with local communities and indigenous people.

The European Commission also noted that involving local NGOs is important, with coordination on the ground. The European Commission has delegates in Indonesia who were involved in the stakeholder process and are currently reviewing the profile.

The Executive Director noted that the Secretariat would be happy to set up a conference call with the European Commission's delegates. If they have additional comments, the Secretariat could incorporate these into the final ecosystem profile.

- *Private sector:* The GEF noted the importance of focusing on private sector engagement. The GEF has multiple grants in the region working with the private sector, and these could be coordinated and complement CEPF's investment.

CI noted that the private sector is the biggest threat in the region and is concerned about addressing the drivers, such as oil palm. It is critical to address sustainable production issues, not just corporate social responsibility, and work with the government to make sure policy reflects the need for sustainable production.

Burung Indonesia thanked the Donor Council for their comments, noting that the private sector is going to be a dominant actor and it will be necessary to engage them to improve conservation efforts.

The Executive Director reminded the Donor Council that the electronic no-objection approval period for the profile ends 24 July 2014. The Secretariat will distribute the 30-page Wallacea summary via email.

7. Approval of change in investment fund management (Doc. CEPF/DC25/8)

The Donor Council was asked to approve the recommendation of the Secretariat to invest a portion of CEPF's funds in a broader pool of high-quality, low-risk, interest-bearing instruments consistent with CI's Board-approved operating cash investment policy.

The Executive Director provided the Donor Council with an overview of the Secretariat's funds, which are in their own account separate from CI and currently invested in a money market account, maintaining the most conservative approach for investment to minimize risk. This account produces about 0.3 percent interest, which is used by CEPF to pay for the annual audit, fundraising initiatives and events, and special expenses and investments (such as the upgrading of the grant management system or the design of the Phase III strategy). The interest earned over the life of CEPF through March 2014 is \$2.5 million.

Per CI's investment policy, the Secretariat proposed to broaden CEPF's investment options to include A1/P1 rated instruments, specifically U.S. Government Treasury notes, insured certificates of deposit, and highly rated corporate and U.S. municipal bonds with terms ranging from six months to a maximum of three years. This is still a highly conservative approach, but is expected to achieve improved returns with minimal risk, based on preliminary discussions the Secretariat and CI's Finance team had with several banks.

The Donor Council discussed the recommendation for a change in investment fund management, noting:

- *Cost:* The World Bank asked how much hiring an investment strategy advisor would cost and noted that they would have to think about procurement. The Executive Director noted that there would be a fee on the management, but the Secretariat would look for a competitive rate. CI noted that the management fee is determined by a sliding scale based on the portfolio, and should not be high since it is not a complicated investment.
- *World Bank Policy:* The GEF noted that the investment of a portion of CEPF's funds in a broader pool of high-quality, low-risk interest bearing instruments would have to fit within the World Bank's policy for investing cash from its grants.

The European Commission suggested looking into an eco-fund, and the World Bank also suggested investing in green funds.

The Secretariat will distribute the full CI cash investment policy. The World Bank will then send confirmation on procurement requirements for appointing an investment advisor and on whether the CI investment policy aligns with their policy for investing cash from its grants.

The investment of a portion of CEPF's funds in a broader pool of high-quality, low-risk interest bearing instruments was approved provided CI's investment policy aligns with the World Bank's policy for investing cash from its grants.

8. Other business

The Chairperson noted that the next Donor Council meeting will be hosted by the European Commission, and is tentatively scheduled to take place the week of 27 January 2015 in Brussels. The European Commission is looking into coordinating an outreach event and combining this with a display of the World Wonders exhibit. The Secretariat was asked to set the date for this Donor Council meeting and to extend the length of the meeting.

The World Bank noted that Paula Caballero, the Senior Director of Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice, will be taking Rachel Kyte's seat on the Donor Council starting 1 July 2014.

The Executive Director thanked the Donor Council members and representatives.

The Chairperson adjourned the meeting.

*For information only

Summary of decisions and follow-up actions

1. Decisions Reached

The Donor Council reached the following decisions:

- The agenda of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Donor Council was approved.
- The minutes of the Twenty-Fourth Donor Council Meeting were adopted, with corrections to the list of attendees from the Global Environment Facility and the Government of Japan.
- The framework and draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions for graduating civil society from CEPF support were approved for a pilot in three hotspots (Eastern Afromontane/Great Lakes, Mediterranean Basin and Tropical Andes), with comments from the Donor Council and Working Group to be incorporated.
- The updated Terms of Reference for the Regional Implementation Teams were approved.
- The investment of a portion of CEPF's funds in a broader pool of high-quality, low-risk interest bearing instruments was approved provided Conservation International's investment policy aligns with the World Bank's policy for investing cash from its grants.

2. Follow-up actions

The Secretariat was asked to:

- Revise the draft scope of work for the long-term strategic visions to incorporate the Donor Council and Working Group comments, which are due to the Secretariat by 11 July 2014.
- Engage the Working Group in the development of the long-term visions for the pilot hotspots.
- Present the long-term vision for the pilot hotspots during the next Donor Council meeting.
- Distribute the final AFD Evaluation once available.
- Distribute the 30-page Wallacea summary.
- Distribute the Conservation International cash investment policy. The World Bank will then send confirmation on procurement requirements for appointing an investment advisor and on whether the CI investment policy aligns with their policy for investing cash from its grants.
- Set the date for the next Donor Council meeting, which is tentatively slated for the week of 27 January 2015. The Secretariat will extend the length of the meeting, which will be hosted by the European Commission in Brussels, Belgium.

List of Attendees

Donor Council Members

Jean-Michel Severino	CEPF Donor Council Chairperson
Jean-Yves Grosclaude, Executive Director of Strategy	l'Agence Française de Développement
Peter Seligmann, CEO and Chairman	Conservation International
Klaus Rudischhauser, Deputy Director-General, Policy and Thematic Coordination (Dire A, B & C), Directorate General for Development and Cooperation - EuropeAid	European Commission
Naoko Ishii, CEO and Chairperson	Global Environment Facility

Guests

Agus Budi Utomo, Executive Director, Burung Indonesia
April Bucksbaum, Vice President, Baum Foundation Board of Directors
Constance Corbier Barthaux, Agroeconomist, l'Agence Française de Développement

Staff

l'Agence Française de Développement

Guillaume Chiron, Chef de projet Biodiversite, Agriculture, Développement Rural, Biodiversité (ARB),
Département Développement Durable (DDD)

CEPF

Patricia Zurita, Executive Director
John De Wet, Vice President, Finance and Operations
Deborah Rainey, Senior Director, Grant Management Unit
Jack Tordoff, Grant Director
Dan Rothberg, Grant Director
Julie Shaw, Communications Director
Mandy DeVine, Communications Coordinator

Conservation International

Jennifer Morris, Executive Vice President, Ecosystem Finance and Markets
Niels Crone, Chief Operating Officer

European Commission

Thierry Dudermeil, Head of Sector – Climate Change, Environment, Natural Resources, Water,
Directorate-General for Development and Cooperation
Anne-Theo Seinen, Policy Officer, Directorate-General for the Environment

Global Environment Facility

Yoko Watanabe, Senior Biodiversity Specialist

Government of Japan

Rikiya Konishi, Assistant Director, Global Biodiversity Strategy Office, Nature Conservation Bureau,
Ministry of the Environment

MacArthur Foundation

Christopher Holtz, Asia Program Officer

World Bank

Valerie Hickey, Team Task Leader