

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

Twelfth Meeting of the Donor Council
World Bank Headquarters, Washington, DC
20 November 2007
9 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Selection of Regional Implementation Teams for Indochina, Polynesia-Micronesia, and the Western Ghats

Recommended Action Items:

The Donor Council is asked to approve the following action items as recommended by the CEPF Working Group:

1. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of BirdLife International as the Regional Implementation Team for the Indochina region of the Indo-Burma Hotspot. The Donor Council is asked to further instruct the Secretariat to finalize the work plan and budget together with BirdLife, with a particular emphasis on developing a strategic approach to address the coverage of the Regional Implementation Team in Thailand and the southern part of China as the proposal focuses on only three of the five countries covered by the ecosystem profile due to the resources available. BirdLife's Indochina regional program with offices in Hanoi, Vietnam, and Phnom Penh, Cambodia would lead the Regional Implementation Team.
2. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of Conservation International as the Regional Implementation Team for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot provided that the organization submits a substantially revised and complete proposal acceptable to the Working Group and Secretariat. This should include a more detailed performance tracker with definitive activities and outcomes as well as a specific output for managing small grants, among other things. Once a revised proposal is accepted, the Secretariat shall work together with Conservation International to finalize the work plan and budget. CI's Pacific Islands Program based in Apia, Samoa would lead the Regional Implementation Team.
3. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE) as the CEPF Regional Implementation Team for the Western Ghats region of the Western Ghats and Sri Lanka Hotspot. The Donor Council is asked to further instruct the Secretariat to finalize the work plan and budget with ATREE, with particular emphasis on reviewing the proposed Steering Committee structure. ATREE, a local organization with four offices and field stations throughout India, would lead the Regional Implementation Team.

Background:

The Regional Implementation Team Terms of Reference and Selection Process approved by the Donor Council in April 2007, as well as the new Strategic Framework and revised Operational Manual include that the Donor Council will approve the selection of each Regional Implementation Team based on a recommendation of the Working Group. The Working Group met on 7 November 2007 to develop these recommendations.

All Working Group members agreed to put forth the recommendations detailed above. The Group agreed that the Secretariat should send these recommendations, along with the attached summary

of the Working Group meeting, to the Donor Council for consideration during its meeting on 20 November 2007. Working Group members also agreed to share any other related information directly with their respective Donor Council representative.

In July 2007, the CEPF Secretariat widely distributed requests for proposals inviting civil society groups to apply to become the Regional Implementation Team in these regions. Each request for proposals included the full text of the Regional Implementation Team Terms of Reference and Selection Process approved by the Donor Council.

As directed by the approved Selection Process, the Secretariat analyzed and ranked the proposals based on the specified criteria for consideration by the Working Group during its meeting. The Working Group reviewed a total of seven proposals as part of its deliberations.

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

Eighteenth Meeting of the CEPF Working Group
World Bank Headquarters, Washington, DC
7 November 2007

Meeting Summary

The Executive Director welcomed the participants, and introduced the new Working Group representatives for Conservation International and the MacArthur Foundation. He provided a brief update, including:

- The annual CEPF audit has just concluded and been reviewed and approved by the Audit Committee of the Conservation International Board. The audit will be distributed shortly.
- The GEF CEO endorsed the \$20 million proposal for additional support to CEPF, following positive GEF Council review of the proposal. The proposal will now be reviewed by the World Bank Board on Dec. 18, 2007, and signed by February 2008.
- A Donor Council meeting is scheduled for Nov. 20, 2007 and will include review of a plan to raise a total of \$150 million for implementation of the Strategic Framework as well as selection of new Regional Implementation Teams based on the Working Group's recommendations.

The Working Group members also provided the following updates:

- The World Bank Working Group member said that President Robert Zoellick has received a written briefing on CEPF and Acting Donor Council Chairperson Kathy Sierra has discussed it with him. He said organizing a meeting between Mr. Zoellick and members of the Donor Council should now be the responsibility of the Secretariat. He said Mr. Zoellick is committed to the CEPF agenda. Task Team Leader Kathy MacKinnon will be preparing a proposal for additional DGF support for CEPF over the next few months.
- The MacArthur Foundation Working Group member said the MacArthur grant agreement for \$12 million in new support for CEPF has been formalized and would be mailed shortly.

Selection of Regional Implementation Teams for Indochina, Polynesia-Micronesia, and the Western Ghats

The Working Group reviewed the applications received from organizations seeking to become the Regional Implementation Team in these new CEPF funding regions as well as the Secretariat's analysis and ranking of those applications. The process was based on the Regional Implementation Team Terms of Reference and Selection Process approved by the Donor Council in April 2007.

In total, 15 organizations expressed interest in becoming a Regional Implementation Team in these regions. Of these, nine organizations subsequently submitted full proposals, including three for Indochina, two for Polynesia-Micronesia, and four for the Western Ghats. One organization—Conservation International—withdrawed its proposal from consideration in Indochina without giving a reason, leaving two proposals for assessment in this region. In Polynesia-Micronesia, one organization proposed working only on a single island where it is based and its proposal was thus not considered further, leaving only one proposal from Conservation International for assessment. As a result, the Working Group reviewed a total of seven proposals as part of its deliberations.

Both BirdLife International and the Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE) scored the highest in the total scores and ranking of applicants for Indochina and the Western Ghats, respectively. BirdLife received 203 and ATREE 200 out of the 230 points possible based on the six scoring categories assessed as described in Attachment 1. Conservation International, the only applicant considered for Polynesia-Micronesia, received 162 points.

The CI Working Group member recused himself from the meeting during discussion of the CI proposal.

Overall, discussion by the Working Group included a number of issues, such as:

- Tension between the full scope of the Terms of Reference and the resources available for the Regional Implementation Teams. Both BirdLife and CI had argued that the allocation of funds was not enough to meet the full scope of responsibilities; BirdLife tailored its proposal to cover only three of the five target countries in Indochina. The general sentiment of the Working Group was not to increase the resources available for the Regional Implementation Teams but rather to explore other options for ensuring effective implementation of the full ecosystem profile for these regions.
- The applicants did not necessarily understand or give enough attention to the grant-making function in their proposals, which would be emphasized as part of finalizing the work plans together with the successful applicants.
- The teams will have significant authority requiring training and supervision by the Secretariat. Each team will be trained in CEPF procedures within 90 days of contracting.

The Working Group members also discussed the low number of applications from both Indochina and Polynesia-Micronesia, which is likely based on two factors: few, if any, other organizations work across such broad areas as defined in the ecosystem profiles for these regions, and several groups would prefer to apply for implementation grants. The Working Group also considered reopening the application process in Polynesia-Micronesia due to the limited choice of applicants as well as the low quality of the single proposal being assessed.

All members agreed that the process undertaken by the Secretariat in requesting and assessing proposals was thorough and helpful in assisting the Working Group in its deliberations.

The Working Group reviewed and discussed the following documents:

- Regional Implementation Team Terms of Reference and Selection Process.
- Request for Proposals for each region issued in July 2007 and widely publicized through the CEPF newsletter, CEPF Web site, and also through direct e-mails to more than 600 stakeholders who participated in the ecosystem profiling process for these regions. No organization was directly invited or solicited to submit a proposal.
- Scoring Process for Assessment of Proposals (Attachment 1). This included scoring for six categories to rank the proposals guided by a series of questions related to the functions and evaluation criteria in the Regional Implementation Terms of Reference and Selection Process.
- Analysis and ranking of proposals for each region based on the Scoring Process as described above and in Attachment 1.

- Proposals and any supporting documents received for each region. Each organization that expressed interest in submitting a proposal was asked to prepare a narrative responding specifically to the section of the Selection Process entitled "Criteria for Evaluating Applications." The organizations also received the application template for completion. The CEPF Secretariat did not have any contact with or provide assistance to individual applicants.

All Working Group members agreed to put forth the following recommendations for review and approval by the CEPF Donor Council:

Recommended Action Items for the CEPF Donor Council:

1. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of BirdLife International as the Regional Implementation Team for the Indochina region of the Indo-Burma Hotspot. The Donor Council is asked to further instruct the Secretariat to finalize the work plan and budget together with BirdLife, with a particular emphasis on developing a strategic approach to address the coverage of the Regional Implementation Team in Thailand and the southern part of China as the proposal focuses on only three of the five countries covered by the ecosystem profile due to the resources available. BirdLife's Indochina regional program with offices in Hanoi, Vietnam, and Phnom Penh, Cambodia would lead the Regional Implementation Team.
2. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of Conservation International as the Regional Implementation Team for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot provided that the organization submits a substantially revised and complete proposal acceptable to the Working Group and Secretariat. This should include a more detailed performance tracker with definitive activities and outcomes as well as a specific output for managing small grants, among other things. Once a revised proposal is accepted, the Secretariat shall work together with Conservation International to finalize the work plan and budget. CI's Pacific Islands Program based in Apia, Samoa would lead the Regional Implementation Team.
3. The Donor Council is asked to **approve** the selection of Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE) as the CEPF Regional Implementation Team for the Western Ghats region of the Western Ghats and Sri Lanka Hotspot. The Donor Council is asked to further instruct the Secretariat to finalize the work plan and budget with ATREE, with particular emphasis on reviewing the proposed Steering Committee structure. ATREE, a local organization with four offices and field stations throughout India, would lead the Regional Implementation Team.

Next Steps Agreed by the Working Group

- The Secretariat will send the summary of this meeting with the Working Group's recommendations for Regional Implementation Team selection to the Donor Council for consideration during its meeting on 20 November 2007. Working Group members will share any other related information directly with their respective Donor Council representative.
- For future Regional Implementation Team Requests for Proposals and assessments, the Secretariat shall advise the Working Group of when Requests for Proposals are issued and include both the total and sub-scores against the assessment categories for each individual application in the documentation prepared for the Working Group.

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

Eighteenth Meeting of the CEPF Working Group
World Bank Headquarters, Washington, DC
7 November 2007
8 a.m.-12 p.m. EST

Agenda

8 a.m.-12 p.m. Developing Recommendations for CEPF Donor Council Selection of CEPF Regional Implementation Teams for Indochina, Polynesia-Micronesia, and the Western Ghats

List of Participants

Working Group Members

L'Agence Française de Développement

Constance Corbier Barthaux, CEPF Task Manager

Conservation International

Frank Hawkins, Vice President, Africa & Madagascar Division

Global Environment Facility

Yoko Watanabe, Program Manager, Biodiversity

Government of Japan

Atsuhiko Yoshinaka and Kenichi Suzuki representing Reiji Kamezawa, Director, Global Biodiversity Strategy Office, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment
Naohisa Konita, Section Chief, Development Policy Division, International Bureau, Ministry of Finance

MacArthur Foundation

Stephen Cornelius, Acting Director, Conservation and Sustainable Development Program Area

World Bank

Warren Evans, Sector Director, Environment

Other Donor Partner Representatives

Claude-Anne Gauthier, Biodiversity Program Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of France

Kathy MacKinnon, Lead Biodiversity Specialist and CEPF Task Team Leader
Toru Kajiwara, Advisor, Office of the Executive Director, Government of Japan

Secretariat

Jorgen Thomsen, Executive Director
Bobbie Jo Kelso, Senior Director for External Affairs
Deborah Spayd, Manager, Grants Management Unit
John Watkin, Grant Director

Attachment 1: Scoring Process for Assessment of Proposals

The analysis process undertaken by the CEPF Secretariat for each application included scoring for the following six categories to rank the proposals:

Rating Categories	Maximum points available
General Overview of the Proposal	45
Proposal Structure and Content	30
Programmatic Capacity/Experience	35
Administrative Capacity/Experience	45
Small Grants Mechanism	20
Budget and Financial Management	55
Total	230

The scoring was guided by a series of questions related to the functions and evaluation criteria in the Regional Implementation Terms of Reference and Selection Process approved by the Donor Council. Each question had a maximum of 5 points available. A team of four Secretariat staff scored each question. The total scores presented in the analysis of proposals for each region are based on the mean of the four individual reviewers' scores.

The following criteria were used for developing scores for the first five rating categories:

Score	Criteria
1	The applicant has limited if any experience related to the question. The proposal makes limited reference to this subject
2	The applicant shows an understanding of the question and addresses this in the proposal
3	The applicant has some experience related to the question and describes how to best deal with the area
4	The applicant has experience related to the question but this is not adequately explained.
5	The applicant has established competence related to question and this is thoroughly explained in the proposal

Category and questions

General overview of the proposal
Is the mission statement for the organization(s) congruent with the objectives and priorities identified for the region in the ecosystem profile?
Does the applicant have relevant experience in the hotspot especially with regard to engaging civil society?
What is your understanding of the integrity of the organization(s)?
Does the proposal demonstrate experience in working with partners (such as NGOs, community organizations, and the private sector) to improve the effectiveness of conservation programs?
Does the proposal address the Strategic Directions and Investment Priorities detailed in the ecosystem profile?
Will this entity build a broad constituency of civil society groups working across institutional and

political boundaries?
Does the proposal detail how the RIT would integrate into the existing regional program of the organizations?
Does the proposal adequately describe how the RIT would carry out the CEPF mission using locally appropriate languages in work with applicants and government officials, and to use English for all evaluations of proposals and reporting on grantee performance?
Is the Proposal complete?

Proposal structure and content
Is the Long-term Goal Statement relevant and achievable?
Are the targeted conservation outcomes realistic and in line with the ecosystem profile?
Is the project purpose/short-term impact appropriate
Are the outputs clearly stated and relevant to the tasks?
Do the activities relate to achieving the respective outputs?
Is the budget requested for the activities appropriate?

Programmatic capacity/experience
Is the mechanism for the request for proposals described adequately?
Is the frequency with which the requests for proposals are suggested appropriate for the region?
Is the LOI review and decision-making process for Letters of Inquiry suitable and just?
Does the RIT have sufficient technical ability to review LOIs and full proposals?
Does the application include a monitoring and evaluation component to create a coherent portfolio of mutually supportive grants?
Does the proposal include and detail site visits?
Does the proposal address how delinquent grantees will be managed?

Administrative capacity/experience
Does the organization demonstrate ability to track, record, and account for funds received and disbursed?
Does the proposal refer to the CEPF Operational Manual?
Does the application include a communications strategy to widely communicate CEPF objectives, opportunities to apply for grants, lessons learned and results?
Does the proposal describe how the organization would request and prepare project documentation for external review for grants of more than \$250,000?
Does the application describe how the applicant will involve the CEPF donor and implementing agency representatives, government officials, and other sectors within the hotspot in implementation?
Does the application describe the segregation of duties? (Financial controls, avoiding conflict of interest, etc.).
Does the proposal include an organizational chart?
Does the proposal address measures to overcome logistical problems that could prevent the RIT from performing its role? (Power, Internet connectivity etc?)
Does the proposal detail how the RIT would maintain effective coordination with the CEPF Secretariat on all aspects of implementation?

Small grants program
Does the organization detail how it would establish and manage a small grants program?
Does the organization have appropriate legal capacity to award small grants?
Does the application describe how the applicant would assist smaller NGOs and CBOs in applying

to CEPF for funds?
Are there additional administration costs for managing the small grants program?

For the sixth rating category—budget and financial management—the following criteria were used for developing scores:

Score	Criteria
1	Limited description of the administrative and financial management capacity of the organization. Does not describe how these apply to the small grants program
2	Brief description of the capacity of the organization to satisfy the financial and administration needs of being the RIT
3	Assumes that the reviewers are familiar with their financial procedures and administrative capacity
4	Good description of the systems and controls required in the administration and financial reporting required
5	Fully details the range of financial controls and accounting procedures that would be used to manage funds. Details the needs of managing the small grants program

Category and questions

Budget and financial management
Is the budget below the stated limit?
Is there a matching component in the budget?
Regular reconciliations of money received and disbursed, in comparison with bank statements.
Internal controls and objective criteria that guide the review of payment requests and other invoices
Does the proposal describe how the RIT will undertake systematic record keeping?
Are there built-in fraud and embezzlement safeguards?
Is the proportion of the budget allocated to salaries appropriate?
Is the proportion of the budget allocated to travel appropriate?
Is the proportion of the budget allocated to furniture and equipment appropriate?
Is the proportion of the budget allocated to miscellaneous appropriate? (less than 10%)
Is the indirect cost 13% or less?