

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Donor Council
Brussels, Belgium
27 January 2015
10 a.m. – 5 p.m. CET**

Approved Minutes

Special Session: Phase III Communications Strategy Workshop (Doc. CEPF/DC26/7)

Donor Council members participating in Brussels took part in a workshop designed by Earth Council Alliance to determine donor needs and preferences in regard to communication, and to use donor expertise to guide development of the Phase III communications strategy, which will move forward in February.

The Earth Council Alliance team will integrate the Donor Council input into a final recap document to be reviewed by CEPF and the Donor Council.

The Secretariat will distribute the Communications Workshop recap document on 23 February 2015.

1. Welcome to regular meeting and introductions (Doc. CEPF/DC26/1)

Donor Council Chairperson Jean-Michel Severino welcomed Donor Council members and representatives participating in the meeting and thanked the European Commission for hosting. He also welcomed Olivier Langrand to his first Donor Council meeting as the Executive Director of CEPF and officially recognized Patricia Zurita's leadership over the previous five years. The Chairperson also apologized for the remote connectivity issues that prevented some representatives from the World Bank, the Government of Japan, the MacArthur Foundation and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) from participating.

2. Adoption of agenda (Doc. CEPF/DC26/2)

The Donor Council approved the agenda.

3. Adoption of Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Donor Council (Doc. CEPF/DC26/3)

The Donor Council adopted the minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Donor Council, which took place on 24 June 2014, with any suggested changes to be sent via email by 17 February 2015.

4. Report from the Executive Director* (Doc. CEPF/DC26/4)

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

The Executive Director reviewed highlights from his written report on activities since the Twenty-Fifth Meeting of the Donor Council on 24 June 2014, including:

- *Long-term Vision*: The scope of work for the long-term strategic vision has been revised to reflect the Donor Council and Working Group comments. The resulting scope was used to contract a consultant to develop the vision for the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains within the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot.

- *AFD Evaluation*: The Secretariat received the executive summary (in French and English) and full report (in French) after the Donor Council documents were sent out. The summary is included in the hard copy of the Donor Council documents for those in Brussels, and is posted with the documents online.
- *Wallacea Profile Technical Summary*: The Secretariat distributed the Wallacea profile technical summary to the Donor Council in July 2014.
- *Conservation International (CI) Cash Investment*: The Secretariat received World Bank approval to implement CI's investment policy and after a competitive process, UBS was appointed as the investment advisor for a portion of CEPF's surplus funds to enhance the investment return.

The partnership highlights included:

- *CEPF participation at international meetings*: The Secretariat participated in both the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) World Parks Congress in Australia and the U.N Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP) 12 in Korea.

At the World Parks Congress, CEPF, in partnership with l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD), hosted a reception celebrating the opening of the "35 Wonders of the World" exhibit on display at the Royal Botanic Garden Sydney. This event was a great success, with approximately 180 guests, including French dignitaries, in attendance. CEPF also led the "Small Grants Mechanism" Day, held at the Conservation Finance Pavilion on 15 November 2014.

During the CBD COP 12, the Secretariat demonstrated the role that CEPF plays in supporting civil society to assist governments to achieve the Aichi biodiversity targets. The Secretariat is continuing to build a relationship with the CBD to showcase the work of CEPF grantees and make it relevant to governments. This will include measuring CEPF's impact on achieving the Aichi biodiversity targets.

- *Photo exhibit*: The "35 Wonders of the World" exhibit has now been displayed in 21 countries and territories. The successful showing of this impressive exhibit will continue in 2015, with the Secretariat and partners working to display it in additional countries, including in Cyprus for Biodiversity Day in May and in Brussels for Green Week in June.
- *Profiling updates*: The Tropical Andes Ecosystem Profile is undergoing final edits. The Secretariat will distribute this to the Donor Council on 02 February 2015.

Remote consultations are ongoing for the Guinean Forests of West Africa ecosystem profile, which has suffered a delay due to the Ebola outbreak.

The Cerrado ecosystem profiling team has determined that all of the stakeholder workshops will take place in Brasilia because of its central location. The first workshop is scheduled for February, with subsequent workshops to take place in March.

A representative of CI asked what the Secretariat does to ensure a consistent quality for the ecosystem profiles and emphasized the importance of these for developing a strategy for each hotspot. The Secretariat noted that CEPF staff works with the profiling team to gather the data and develop a work plan for the CEPF investment. The draft ecosystem profile also goes to the Working Group for input.

The GEF emphasized the need for CEPF to continue strengthening development of the ecosystem profiles, particularly the strategy development and CEPF niche for investment.

The Secretariat noted that in an effort to ensure consistency and high quality of ecosystem profiles, it has instituted a new step in the profiling process, which is to bring the ecosystem profiling teams to the CEPF Secretariat at the start of profiling so the Secretariat can provide further guidance and clarity on expectations. This will not only help ensure that the profiles are data rich, but also that the analysis and strategy development meets CEPF's requirements. The Cerrado Hotspot ecosystem profiling team was the first to benefit from this new process; the team spent several days with the Secretariat in early December at the CEPF office.

CI also noted the importance of selecting the best group to serve as the ecosystem profiling team. The European Union (EU) noted that the Secretariat and Donor Council spent a lot of time deciding which team to choose for the ecosystem profiling and that CEPF now has a wealth of institutional knowledge on development of the ecosystem profiles.

- *New investments update:* The Donor Council recently approved the Malagasy organization Foundation Tany Meva to be the Regional Implementation Team (RIT) for the Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands Hotspot. The first call for proposals for the hotspot closed just a few days ago, and 60 proposals were received.

The Donor Council also recently approved Burung Indonesia to be the RIT for the Wallacea Hotspot. The first call for proposals for the hotspot was issued mid-January.

The Secretariat noted that both of these new investments have a regional organization serving as the RIT, showcasing how CEPF empowers local entities.

The financial overview highlights included:

- *Financial summary:* As of 30 September 2014, the CEPF balance is at \$45.6 million, with 80 percent of CEPF expenses going to grants, five percent going to profiling and 14 percent covering Secretariat costs. This demonstrates the low-cost functionality of CEPF, with the majority of funding going to field conservation.

The FY15 burn rate for profiling is high, at 135 percent, due to the additional costs of the Guinean Forests of West Africa profiling, as the methodology had to be revised and adapted in order to take into account the constraints imposed by the Ebola outbreak in the region.

The special projects expenses include CEPF's participation in the CBD COP 12 and World Parks Congress.

- *Local versus international:* The local versus international percentages of funding for Phase II to date show that 55 percent of all grantees are local NGOs, while 45 percent are international.
- *Investment of funds:* Following the decision at the last Donor Council meeting, UBS was appointed as the investment advisor for CEPF's surplus funds, and \$30 million was transferred to UBS in December 2014. The expectation is that on an annual basis, these funds will generate income of about \$400,000. This compares to annual interest income of \$130,000 when the funds were invested in the money market.
- *Grant management system:* To date, \$385,000 has been spent from interest earnings to design a customized grant management system for CEPF. This tool will also collect additional monitoring data for CEPF, allowing the fund to demonstrate its impact on poverty reduction, climate change, and more. The costs for development of this system are higher than expected, and the system is taking longer than planned to build, with more than 50 percent of the project remaining. The Secretariat is currently evaluating alternative solutions, such as off-the-shelf software like Salesforce, and hopes to have a fully operational system before the next Donor Council meeting.

The Donor Council members discussed the financial overview summary, noting that the information presented dated back to the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year, at the end of September. The Secretariat will engage CI to determine if the financial overview information presented can be more up to date, closer to the date of the meeting. If not, the Secretariat will engage the Donor Council to determine if the meeting schedule should be revised.

The GEF welcomed Olivier Langrand as the new Executive Director and officially recognized Patricia Zurita's leadership as the previous Executive Director. The GEF participated in the CEPF events at the World Parks Congress and the CBD COP 12, and suggested that the Secretariat work more closely with the Donor Council to make CEPF more visible at international meetings.

The EU would also welcome the Secretariat and RITs involving its delegations in the regions where the fund is active, to inform them of activities and encourage communications to raise awareness about CEPF's investments. This is particularly important now that the EU is scaling up its investment in biodiversity and expanding its work in the field.

5. **Update on Phase III Business Plan (Doc. CEPF/DC26/5)**

The Donor Council was asked to review the executive summary of the analysis conducted for CEPF's Business Plan for Phase III, especially the "Points for Consideration."

Following the Twenty-Fourth Meeting of the Donor Council, at which the Donor Council approved the strategic framework for Phase III of CEPF, the Secretariat contracted PADMA Consulting to conduct an analysis of the state of biodiversity funding and develop a new business plan, which will guide CEPF implementation over the next five years and will allow CEPF to scale up to a level that allows it to truly meet the challenge of the biodiversity crisis.

The draft business plan analysis executive summary was presented, with discussion including:

- *Objectives:* PADMA Consulting noted that the draft summary identifies an approach for CEPF to meet its fundraising target based on official development assistance (ODA) figures, which track biodiversity funding more widely than most organizations, and private sector funding information.

The draft summary also reviews CEPF's current governance and best practices. The draft summary is not a comprehensive study of all resources, and does not include information from private foundations.

- *Fundraising:* PADMA Consulting reviewed the fundraising analysis, noting that ODA allocations show that international aid is still the most significant source of funding for biodiversity, but that biodiversity aid is still much lower than other sectors such as water and health. Only a small fraction, less than 1 percent, of aid goes to biodiversity, with no overall increase as of 2011.

The bulk of biodiversity funding (80 percent) has been from multilaterals, which bundle biodiversity with other development goals. But the decline in multilateral allocation, especially from the GEF, post 2011 is significant. Bilateral aid is a growing priority, with a tendency to be more stable and consistent.

Germany is the top bilateral donor, but the Netherlands and Norway give more in relation to gross domestic product (GDP). None of the countries making the largest contributions to biodiversity are current CEPF donors.

Moving forward with CEPF Phase III, it will be essential to determine how to make biodiversity relevant to other development themes in order to increase resource allocation. Another important comparison to consider is climate funding, which ODA tracks as well.

PADMA Consulting recognizes the importance of incorporating private foundations into the fundraising findings since they are prospective donors for CEPF. This information will be included in the full report.

The EU noted that it was not included in the list of top bilateral donors, but EU funding for biodiversity has increased; the GEF also noted that their funding for biodiversity has been steadily increasing, not decreasing as the summary suggests. The EU and the GEF requested that the data used in the analysis presented by the consultant be updated with the most recent information.

The Donor Council members suggested that PADMA Consulting incorporate biodiversity funding data available from the U.N. CBD website, which is more recent than the ODA allocations. This would show a solid increase in biodiversity funding since the CBD COP 10 in Nagoya in 2010.

CI also suggested including data on biodiversity funding from Brazil and China. PADMA Consulting noted that they looked at these figures, but that most of their allocations are national, not ODA.

The Secretariat will follow up with Daniela Lerda of PADMA Consulting to ensure that the CEPF Phase III Business Plan Executive Summary includes the latest biodiversity funding data from U.S.

private foundations and multilaterals, specifically from the GEF and the EU, as well as biodiversity funding data from the U.N. CBD, available on the CBD website.

- *Private sector trends:* PADMA Consulting noted that little information is available on private sector support for biodiversity, and they pulled data from a group of 40 companies that are publicly recognized for biodiversity support. Of these, 19 do not mention biodiversity at all; when mentioned, it is incorporated into broader development themes such as community and economic development.

The median giving appears to be \$18.3 million in 2013, with environmental issues receiving the least contributions, at only approximately 3 percent of total corporate giving in 2013. Investments are short-term and limited, with unrestricted support uncommon. Based on their analysis, PADMA Consulting did not believe that individual companies, sustainability councils, industry associations or NGO partnerships would work as a donor for CEPF.

The EU suggested that CEPF engage the private sector through sustainable supply chains, which are impacting agriculture in developing countries. This is an example of how private companies can do something positive for biodiversity instead of providing direct funding, which is difficult to obtain.

PADMA Consulting suggested that the Donor Council more fully consider how CEPF should engage the private sector, whether as a potential donor or to influence their business practices via supply chains, risk management and/or mitigation issues. The EU noted that another example of partnership could be through palm oil; and CI noted that private companies might work as a regional donor to CEPF.

CI also noted that the CEPF brand is not particularly well known. If the CEPF brand were elevated, private companies might be more attracted to becoming a donor for the fund. PADMA Consulting noted that health, education and community economic development are the top three areas of investment for private companies. Connecting biodiversity conservation to development needs might also help strengthen the CEPF brand, which they feel is already at a disadvantage due to its long and confusing name.

PADMA Consulting also reached out to gain regional perspectives on private sector engagement from the RITs, who feel that agriculture, oil and gas, mining and tourism offer the greatest prospects. National Development Banks (NDBs) are also important regional players that can facilitate access to private sector companies, but the RITs still lack the skill and abilities needed to engage NDBs. Also, the RITs have a potential conflict of interest in leading fundraising initiatives for CEPF, as they are often local NGOs who have their own fundraising needs. It will be important for CEPF to further consider how RITs will be engaged in fundraising in Phase III and whether the Secretariat needs to add staff with expertise in establishing corporate partnerships.

- *Governance best practices:* PADMA Consulting consistently received positive feedback from the Working Group members – they spoke with all members except the MacArthur Foundation and the GEF – about CEPF’s operations, which are thought to be transparent, accountable and pioneering. This results in resistance to changing the current model and structure of CEPF governance.

PADMA Consulting reviewed CEPF’s Operations Manual and found the Donor Council and Working Group members to have overlapping responsibilities for approving priority areas and investment strategies. CEPF also has operational and technical issues, lacking clear procedures for nominating and terminating members, with no limits to term, diversity and representation.

PADMA Consulting also found that the participation of nontraditional government donors and private sector companies is perceived as risky by CEPF’s current donors. PADMA Consulting noted that these risks can be mitigated by having clear rules for selecting, maintaining and excluding CEPF donor members.

CI asked what PADMA Consulting meant when stating that CEPF lacks diversity. PADMA Consulting clarified that most organizations addressing social and environmental issues include indigenous representatives, local and private sector perspectives on their boards. CEPF’s board on the other hand tends to be comprised of like-minded organizations. This does not necessarily have to be associated with decision-making, but rather could be in the form of an advisory council.

Another emerging issue that PADMA Consulting recommended to be clarified is Donor Council membership and when a donor member term expires. The CEPF Donor Council currently consists of founding members and new members, and not all of the donors currently provide funding for the global program.

CI also noted that CEPF needs to consider how regional donors will have a voice and contribute to the Donor Council at a regional level.

- *Points for consideration:* PADMA Consulting outlined the points for consideration, including how to maintain CEPF’s current set of donors and how to target top bilateral donors. Additional points for consideration include identifying private foundation prospects and the best approach for engaging the private sector.

CI noted that the most important point for consideration is how to maintain the current membership of donors and ensure renewal commitments from AFD, the GEF and the MacArthur Foundation. The Donor Council should have a conversation about CEPF best practices and Donor Council alignment.

The EU also noted the importance of defining Donor Council term duration, and what potential new donors to approach without changing the fundamental mission of CEPF. When determining how to engage the private sector, it will be important to consider whether we want to work with them to change their practices or just have them financially support CEPF as part of the Donor

Council. It is good for CEPF to upscale, but it should be done in a way that maintains the way we currently operate.

PADMA Consulting noted that the risk of engaging the private sector can be mitigated if you have clear rules on the selection of donor members.

The Government of Japan also noted that clear governance rules and procedures about member selection and terms of service are important, but that there also needs to be clear rules for each type of stakeholder, especially if we bring in indigenous people and various advisors. CI agreed and noted that transparency will be necessary.

The Government of Japan also noted that they are supportive of having additional donors, including the private sector, support CEPF, since it is unclear whether some of the current donors can renew, including the Government of Japan. This makes them concerned that the financial target for CEPF is unrealistic.

The GEF agreed and questioned how CEPF plans to reach the \$750 million by 2020 target. First, CEPF should determine how much it is likely to get from the current donors in the next five years. Then the business plan can project how to fulfill the target. This should involve engaging the Donor Council to determine who should be approached to become a donor to CEPF, especially in regard to private companies. It will be important to prioritize the sectors to mitigate risk.

The GEF also noted that Save Our Species (SOS) has a tiered governance structure, with three different levels of participation based on funding contributions. The GEF would be happy to further discuss how to restructure CEPF's governance, but also noted that if the donors are happy, it might not be necessary to make any changes. The GEF also believes that an advisory group might work well for CEPF.

PADMA Consulting emphasized that this is not the CEPF Phase III Business Plan, rather it is an analysis of potential fundraising prospects for CEPF and a review of current governance and best practices. In order for CEPF to move forward with its Phase III fundraising goals, the fund will need to acquire new skills and the capacity needed at the Secretariat level to engage in fundraising with the private sector. There are also potential fundraising roles that the RITs and donors could fulfill, as well as the option of obtaining external support.

CI noted the importance of determining member selection and governance terms of service, including regional representation. These are reoccurring issues for the fund and should be resolved. In terms of engaging the private sector, CEPF should not redesign itself, but instead engage private companies that do not pose an operational risk. The EU agreed that the CEPF governance processes and membership need clarification, but noted that the private sector does have a higher reputational risk.

The Chairperson noted that the governance processes can be adjusted to clarify roles for various levels of donors. The governance rules and procedures should also address whether CEPF brings independent members on board the Donor Council, or creates an advisory group. These procedures will need to have a clear set of expectations for all members and include rules for

managing conflicts of interest. This does not apply to just the private sector, but all potential CEPF donors – for instance, the World Bank supports development that impacts the environment.

The Chairperson also noted that the governance rules should clarify the mechanism for project funding, differentiating between local funders and how CEPF funds each project. The Donor Council members agreed that the Secretariat should draft governance rules and procedures, but that these should be conservative in order to maintain CEPF's current mission.

The Secretariat will draft language for the CEPF Phase III Business Plan that outlines Donor Council membership and governance processes, including term duration, as well as rules for managing conflicts of interest and a governance mechanism for project funding. The draft will be presented to the Working Group in April and the Donor Council in June.

6. Update on Phase III Long-Term Strategic Vision for Graduating Civil Society from CEPF Support in the Albertine Rift and the Eastern Arc Mountains (Doc. CEPF/DC26/6)

The Donor Council was asked to review the approach for building the long-term vision for the Eastern Afromontane as the first example of its kind as part of implementing the CEPF Phase III Strategy.

Considering time constraints, CEPF Managing Director Nina Marshall presented a shortened version of the update on the long-term strategic vision, noting:

- *Objective:* The objective of the long-term strategic vision is to ensure a transformational impact in the hotspots, by supporting civil society to have the capacity and credibility to reverse long-term biodiversity loss in the hotspots. To achieve graduation – an endpoint where civil society “graduates” from CEPF support with sufficient capacity, access to resources and credibility to respond to future conservation challenges – will likely take more than five years.

The long-term visions will cover the entire hotspot, where practical, setting locally relevant graduation targets and identifying actions necessary to directly or indirectly effect the required changes. The long-term visions will also set financial targets for each action and develop a financial plan for the long-term vision.

- *GEF Project Identification Form (PIF):* In 2014, the GEF approved the CEPF PIF for the project “Effectively mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into government policy and private sector practice: Piloting sustainability models to take the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to scale.” Development of long-term visions for the Eastern Afromontane and Indo-Burma hotspots will inform the design of this project.
- *Eastern Afromontane Overview:* The Eastern Afromontane Hotspot has 15 countries, each with a different state of economic and social reality, making it difficult to apply the concept of graduation across the entire hotspot. CEPF decided to start by focusing only on the Albertine Rift and Eastern Arc Mountains, consisting of the Nile Basin/Albertine Rift lakes (Kivu, Edward, Albert), Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria. This includes seven countries, parts of South Sudan, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya and Tanzania. “Completing” the long-term vision exercise for the hotspot will require further thought as to how

to address the other three sub-regions of the hotspot, which are the montane “islands” to the south, the Ethiopian Highlands, and Yemen/Eritrea in the north.

In September 2014, CEPF opened a competitive procurement process, and in November, awarded a contract that runs through April 2015 to Future Dialogues International (FDI) of Kampala, Uganda. FDI will work with the logistical support of the Eastern Afromontane RIT, BirdLife International and IUCN, based in Nairobi, Kenya.

FDI has established a Planning and Advisory Group (PAG) consisting of representatives from biodiversity conservation NGOs, partners offering institutional support for civil society organizations, private sector, rural development, and regional development and cooperation. The first meeting of the PAG took place on 19 December 2014 and a larger workshop will take place in Nairobi on 20 February 2015, with the final draft long-term vision expected to be ready on 28 March 2015. FDI has also coordinated five individual consultation meetings, each of which had approximately 40 participants.

The Secretariat will present the final draft long-term vision for graduating civil society from CEPF support in the Albertine Rift and the Eastern Arc Mountains within the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot to the Working Group in April and the Donor Council in June.

- *Indo-Burma Overview*: The information on development of the long-term vision for the Indo-Burma Hotspot was not presented due to lack of time.
- *Mediterranean Basin Overview*: The Mediterranean Basin is an example of a hotspot where CEPF is not investing in all of the countries. Developing the long-term vision for the hotspot will require a strategic approach, choosing a sub-region or region such as the Balkans that can feasibly achieve policy alignment and reach graduation.
- *Funds Reallocation*: The Secretariat will work with the Donor Council to determine if the funds remaining from the CEPF investment in the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot (\$171,424) can be reallocated to fund development of the long-term visions.

7. Other business

The Executive Director thanked the Donor Council members and representatives for their participation, and noted that the next Donor Council meeting is set to take place in Washington, D.C., in June 2015. The Secretariat will follow up with the Donor Council members to finalize a date.

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-Sixth Meeting of the Donor Council was approved.
- The minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Donor Council Meeting were adopted, with suggested changes to be sent via email by 17 February 2015.
- The Secretariat will draft language for the CEPF Phase III Business Plan that outlines Donor Council membership and governance processes, including term duration, as well as rules for managing conflicts of interest and a governance mechanism for project funding. The draft will be presented to the Working Group in April and the Donor Council in June.

2. Follow-up actions

The Secretariat will:

- Distribute the Communications Workshop recap document on 23 February 2015.
- Distribute the Tropical Andes Ecosystem Profile on 02 February 2015.
- Engage Conservation International to determine if the Financial Overview information presented can be more up-to-date, closer to the date of the meeting. If not, engage the Donor Council to determine if the meeting schedule should be revised.
- Follow up with Daniela Lerda of PADMA Consulting to ensure that the CEPF Phase III Business Plan Executive Summary includes the latest biodiversity funding data from foundations and multi-laterals, specifically from the Global Environment Facility and the European Union, as well as biodiversity funding data from the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) available on the CBD website.
- Present the final draft long-term vision for graduating civil society from CEPF support in the Albertine Rift and the Eastern Arc Mountains within the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot to the Working Group in April and the Donor Council in June.
- Work with the Donor Council to determine if funds remaining from the CEPF investment in the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot (\$171,424) can be reallocated to fund development of the long-term visions.
- Set the date for the next Donor Council meeting, which is scheduled to take place in Washington, DC, in June 2015.

List of Attendees

Donor Council Members

Jean-Michel Severino	CEPF Donor Council Chairperson
Laurence Breton-Moyet, Director Sustainability	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
Karl Falkenberg, Director-General Environment, Directorate General for Environment	
* Gustavo Fonseca, Head of Natural Resources, on behalf of Naoko Ishii, CEO and Chairperson	Global Environment Facility
* Shuichi Hosoda, Director of Development Issues International Bureau, Ministry of Finance	Government of Japan
* Chris Holtz, Asia Program Officer, on behalf of the President	MacArthur Foundation
* Valerie Hickey, Team Task Leader, on behalf of Paula Caballero, Senior Director, Environment and Natural Resources Global Practices	World Bank

Guests

Raymond Chavez, Senior Vice President, Communications
and Program Development, Earth Council Alliance
Elisabeth Guilbaud-Cox, Consultant
Douglass Humphreys, Earth Council Alliance
Daniela Lerda, Director, PADMA Consulting

Staff

CEPF

Olivier Langrand, Executive Director
Nina Marshall, Managing Director
Jack Tordoff, Grant Director
Pierre Carret, Grant Director
Julie Shaw, Communications Director
Mandy DeVine, Communications Manager
Maren Hozempa, Web Manager

Conservation International

Jennifer Morris, Chief Operating Officer

European Commission

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

Philippe Mayaux, Head of Sector, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, DG ICD

Arnold Jacques de Dixmude, Directorate General for Development and Cooperation-EuropeAid (DEVCO)

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

* Tomonori Nakamura, Deputy Director of Development Issues, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance

* Kazutoshi Numamoto, Section Chief of Development Issues, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance

**Note: Due to technical difficulties, some representatives listed here, marked with an asterisk, were largely or entirely unable to participate remotely in the meeting despite their best efforts. The Secretariat greatly appreciates their efforts, and apologizes for the inconvenience.*