

LAC recipient countries

- 1) **Strategic and Programming Documents:** we suggest the Secretariat to make more concise, simplified and focused documents, and to prioritize areas where countries have legal obligations or clear commitments. In the development of specific projects the principles of country ownership and demand driven are the ones that have to prevail.
- 2) **The vision of the new Replenishment:** we share the CEO's vision of the urgency for action and for improvement. We also recognize the crucial role of the GEF in this historical moment. In this context, we request that more funds be provided during the replenishment. This will facilitate the innovations that the GEF is known for and it is required to impact the environment of the Planet. This is also necessary to assist the countries to meet their commitments and legal obligations. We are happy to be represented at the replenishment process since we have been requesting for more transparency about the new allocation process for the replenishments. The countries should be included in the decisions of the GEF along with the Agencies and the Donors.
- 3) **GEF 6 Replenishment** should build on the success of the STAR and should not regress to the pre RAF phase. The GEF has had more impact in the last two cycles than any other cycle.

We are especially conscious of the current economic turn down but we believe that this is the time to invest into the environment in a sustainable way. The GEF can be a vehicle to transform economies and get the world economy growing again. The STAR has been especially important for LAC countries and we would like GEF 6 to build and scale up on this success.

- 4) **A 2020 strategy:** we welcome the parallel vision exercise of the CEO to promote a reflection for a midterm vision. The identification of the most important challenges has to be in line with the Global Environmental Goals already identified by Governments in the context of the COP's decisions and in fundamental documents like the ones of "Rio plus 20".
- 5) **Direct Access:** direct access by developing countries should be prioritized. The experience of direct access to the Adaptation Fund as well as the GCF has to be taken into consideration.
- 6) **The signature Projects:** in general we could support the new thinking in relation to signature project providing they are aligned with convention guidance and do not compromise the allocation for LAC countries, especially for those with small allocations, and LDCs and SIDS' s.

We can support this innovative idea if it comes with the necessary mobilization of additional resources provided by the promoters. We think that the current examples of "signature projects" could be initially acceptable but we also notice

the absence of an adequate reference to “chemicals and waste management”, specific projects in countries where agriculture and cattle are central in their economies, and others that are very much in line with the drivers of environmental degradation noted by the GEF Secretariat in its presentation.

- 7) **Co-financing:** there is uncertainty about the level of co-financing require per project and across periods of the GEF. Countries are requesting clarification on this issue. We are requesting a review of the co-financing for projects and in fact we believed that co-financing should be waived for very vulnerable countries, especially SIDS and LDCs. This is particularly the case for the Climate Change focal area.
- 8) **Resources and flexibility:** due to their vulnerability and absolute need for impact, as well as their importance in global biodiversity, natural resources in general and food production and their notable contribution to the global environment a minimum allocation in Countries of the LAC region should be US10 Million. This amount should be fully flexibility for usage across the conventions.
- 9) **SIDS and LDCs:** we consider that the documents presented for the GEF 6th cycle replenishment do not explicitly consider SIDS's and LDCs issues; therefore we request that a section on LDCs and SIDS be included within the revised document to be considered at the September replenishment meeting. As expressed in point 8 supra a minimum allocation of 10 US million should be allocated for SIDS and LDCs as well as countries with current small allocations. (see the detailed contribution of the Caribbean Constituency on this issue and several others).
- 10) **Country Support Program:** the CSP should be continued and enhanced. It needs to be strengthened and designed to provide real support to the OFP to carry out their functions. This should be redesigned with the input of the countries and the amount significantly increased. Access to this very small fund should be designed to be easier.

In this case, we underline the value that the ECWs have had for the constituencies of the LAC region, at the constituencies meetings, the NDI, with the support and presence of the GEF Secretariat that helped to understand better the GEF system. This led the countries to participate more actively in the system and make more effective the “country ownership” that we all support taking in mind that it would be much harder to achieve it without this corporate program executed by the Secretariat. The new way of doing business that is being proposed for GEF6 needs to be understood and internalized by developing countries. For this to happen, we all have to understand and buy in to the new ideas. The best way to achieve this is to continue to communicate effectively through the proposed strategy.

- 11) **Cross cutting capacity development:** it is still necessary to strengthen national systems in developing countries. The new way of doing business in the GEF must spill over into countries so that they also approach the issues of the

environment not as a separate silo but as an integrated part of their economic development. For this, they need to develop the capacities of their staff so that they realize the importance of working internally in a coordinated manner, breaking down the silos that separate them and work across different ministries on issues and topics of importance.

12) **Implementing agencies:** the region feels that the Implementing Agencies had improved significantly in the services provided to the countries. Many countries however still experience challenges to work with Implementing Agencies. And these challenges can determine if a country can use its allocation or not. This replenishment has to take into consideration that agencies have to continue to improve their commitment and efficiency as implementing agencies of the GEF that serve developing countries. They have to contribute in a more active role and show commitment and creativity while supporting countries. A business as usual approach for them is not acceptable, in a moment when donors and recipients have to make extra efforts and be more creative than ever.

13) **SGP:** we also support the continued evolution of the Small Grants Programme to a more integrated approach with broadened partnerships. We think that a higher core allocation to the SGP is needed in GEF6, especially to support activities in the fields of chemicals and waste, and in particular for the actions on the Minamata Convention on Mercury where they can play an important role reaching communities, developing projects on ASGM or with the health sector, etc.

It is crucial to highlight the importance of small-scale work with civil society. Although the scale appears to have less impact, the fact of awareness in society at all levels contributes to a change the way of doing things nationally. Moreover, the proposed new strategy fits more closely linking the SGP activity with the largest ones.

14) **New and additional funds for chemicals and wastes:** the countries of the LAC region are of the view that the current GEF funding for Chemicals and Waste is insufficient to meet the 2020 goal of a sound management of chemicals and hazardous wastes reaffirmed in Rio plus 20. We also recognize, however, that more and more countries are in favor of increasing the support for this very important emerging area, not only in the four legally binding instruments but also to implement the SAICM approach. This new and additional funding for the implementation of the four existing Conventions (Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam and Minamata) should be clearly identified to be over and above from the funds of the other Conventions. The new Minamata Convention represents new and additional legal obligations to LAC countries and that is the reason why we would like to see an adequate support for its initial activities to promote its entry into force as soon as possible. The same situation is clearly noticed for the inclusion of new POPs in the context of the Stockholm Convention. UNEP's agreed decisions suggest that support should be also given to activities of the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions. Following the COP's decisions the network of Stockholm and Basel Regional Centers has to be considered as the preferable way for an efficient regional delivery in the area of chemicals and waste.

- 15) The discussion of **middle income countries** is inconsistent with the mandate and intent of the Conventions and the GEF that services them. **Eligibility of countries** is an issue that is addressed within and at the level of the Convention. The replenishment process should not address this issue and or take unilateral decisions on this matter. Decisions on this regards that could affect the allocation of LAC recipient countries could compromise the implementation of legal obligations in their countries and for that reason is consider to be out of place. This “category of countries” is not mentioned in any Convention text, and it was not even suggested in the context of the Minamata Convention on Mercury negotiated this year and that is going to be open for signature in October 2013.
- 16) The Role of the GEF within the **Climate Architecture** is not a question that should distract the replenishment process. The GEF is the only fund that should be used for the Conventions unless otherwise stated by the Conventions. This is the mandate of the GEF. The Adaptation Fund and the GCF are all complimentary and their roles should be decided by the COP and not by the GEF or its processes. The Donors needs to meet their commitments to Climate Change convention and scale up the funding for this within the GEF, the AF and the GCF. The Funds currently provided to the GEF is small compared to the billions per year that the donors have indicated that they do provide via other channels. Based on these figures provided by donors, there are lots more funds that can be provide via the GEF that the ones that are currently being provided. This question of the new climate change architecture is not for the GEF to be responded, but to the Convention to discuss and come to an agreement.
- 17) **International Waters:** The GEF has played an important role in the LAC recipient region in projects related to bi-national and regional agreements related to waters. We support the concept of basin and we encourage more activities in international waters where there is a clear request from the countries. We understand that with regard to groundwater resources, all related actions must conform to the stipulations of the relevant regional conventions. The strategy has also to take into consideration the integrated mangrove ecosystem management, taking into account climate variability and climate change.
- 18) **Land Degradation:** It is important to maintain the Land Degradation financing window, with a view to ensuring that the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification targets its programs toward the Latin American continent, especially in the areas of “desertification and drought.” In keeping with the primary objective of the GEF—obtaining global benefits—areas that have not yet been prioritized should be strengthened, such as the aforementioned drought.
- 19) **Biodiversity:** is a key area for LAC countries. The protection of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and sustainable use of biodiversity is a very important point.

Biodiversity in each territory is a result of several factors such as latitude and altitude, the macro climate, soil factors as well as the water system. In this line,

countries have the objective of the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components.

The GEF's biodiversity strategy must take into account the importance of addressing the various realities of all Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and not only focus on the most megadiverse.

In this sense, it is understood that the temperate ecosystems such as grasslands and their associated ecosystem are no adequately assessed in the distributions of the GEF funds from the biodiversity window. The UICN in its last Congress in South Korea sent a clear message to Ministers of the countries addressing the importance of grasslands and its protection. Moreover, it is understood that there is a need to support the protection of coastal marine ecosystems and those associated.

MORE DETAILED CONTRIBUTIONS

FROM THE LAC RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

ARGENTINA

NON OFFICIAL TRANSLATION (SEE ORIGINAL VERSION IN SPANISH)

COMMENTS ON THE “Draft GEF-6 PROGRAMMING DIRECTIONS” DOCUMENT

The Argentine Government wishes to make the following observations on this document, which is a first attempt at defining the overall programming for the next GEF cycle, 2014-2018:

BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA

We have no objections to the proposal of new approaches and objectives.

Throughout the entire chapter, reference is made to the “production landscape.” In this regard, and bearing in mind that the focus of this terminology should be internationally agreed on, it must be pointed out that this term has not been accepted and must be used carefully, so that its use is not linked to agriculture, as this could imply the “multifunctionality of agriculture.”

In paragraph 10 (page 5), mention is made of “the societal failure to adequately capture the economic value of biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides (...).” Reference is made to the concept of “societal failure” with regard to the economic value of biodiversity, whose scope is not clear. The failure is also reiterated in paragraph 13, in calculating the economic value of all the ecosystems and biodiversity. We think it would be better not to speak about “failure” but rather to find positive terminology to describe a situation.

In paragraph 33 (page 12), it is stated that the GEF will promote positive incentives such as “biodiversity-friendly certification standards” for sustainable agriculture, forestry, and fisheries production, to help ensure that production is certified and in accordance with the standards that allow for entry into any market. In this regard, Argentina would like to state that the incorporation of these standards must not entail non-tariff barriers to trade.

In paragraph 93, mention is made of the promotion of “Better Management Practices (BMPs)” in relation to land use. We recommend caution in its usage, as the regulation of land use and land ownership is a sovereign right of States.

In paragraph 69.c (page 21), as well as in others, mention is made of the promotion of fiscal and market incentives to promote biological diversity on farms across the production landscape. The foregoing notwithstanding, with regard to the scope of this concept, we suggest that special attention be paid to the promotion of agriculture-related incentives, which could lead to the sanctioned establishment of related subsidies.

In paragraph 82 (page 25), reference is made to innovative financial mechanisms that should be promoted, such as “habitat banking” and “tradable development rights and quotas.” We are not clear on the scope of these terms. In this regard, it must be pointed out that the financial mechanisms are additional, optional, and voluntary tools for the CBD financial mechanism, and they cannot replace it.

Program 11 (paragraphs 83-89) of the strategy refers to taking deforestation out of the supply chain for global commodities of beef, soy, oil palm, pulp, and paper, to secure global biodiversity benefits. We suggest that this description be rewritten, avoiding generalizations, especially with regard to the production of biofuels and soy for feeding livestock. In this regard, it must be borne in mind that not all production activities in the world have the same context and differ in terms of greenhouse gas emissions.

CLIMATE CHANGE FOCAL AREA

The objectives will be geared toward climate change mitigation. Specifically, they will seek to support developing countries and economies-in-transition through innovation and technology transfer.

In keeping with the statements in the above paragraph, the DA has noted that the subject of “adaptation” was not included in the climate change objectives stipulated for the new GEF operation. In this regard, we have a concern about the imbalance between adaptation and mitigation, especially bearing in mind that both are related, and, furthermore, that adaptation to the effects of climate change is an important fundamental aspect for the agriculture sector because of the need to contribute to food security in a context of growing demand for food. We therefore feel that it is very relevant to incorporate the theme of adaptation to climate change into the GEF-6 programming directions.

The GEF must bear in mind the States Parties' guidelines with regard to supporting the Poznan Strategy and strengthening its implementation in long-term programs, including financial projections and private sector support.

Program 2 of Objective 2 on mitigation (page 51) makes reference to the term "Climate smart agriculture." This is a term promoted by the FAO Secretariat, which has not taken into account the relevant discussions in order to reach a consensus on an internationally acceptable definition. We therefore suggest that it be deleted, as it is not an acceptable term. In its stead, we would suggest a term like "good practices."

We note that there is an attempt in the new GEF strategy to include some issues that have still not been resolved in the primary climate change forum, namely the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), for example, the agriculture:forest ratio.

In general, with regard to monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV), we note that in the negotiations underway regarding REDD+ in the UNFCCC, there are countries that advocate for strong commitments although there is still no clear financing strategy from developed countries. This should guide the commitments regarding verification. In light of the lack of an agreement in the plenary at the close of the SBSTA in Doha | (December 2012), it was decided that discussion of the topic would continue -at the 38th session of the SBSTA next June.

Based on the type of work that our country is doing with regard to biomass-derived energy, and cognizant that the use of this type of energy helps to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, this GEF strategy must include a paragraph that refers to this topic, bearing in mind that it contributes to energy efficiency, increases the proportion of renewable energy, and uses cleaner technologies, as these are important elements for sustainable development, and for addressing climate change.

In fact, Argentina is implementing a Project called "PROBIOMASA," which seeks to increase the production of biomass-derived energy at the local, provincial, and national levels to ensure the society will have a growing supply of clean, reliable, and competitive renewable energy, while opening up new opportunities for the development of the agricultural, forest, and agroindustrial sector of the country. The project will facilitate the mitigation of the emission of approximately 9,500,000 metric tons per year of CO₂ eq. Furthermore, we expect that there will be job creation, mitigation of local and regional environmental impacts, and contribution to energy security, among other sustainable development benefits. Biomass Promotion Project: <http://energia3.mecon.gov.ar/contenidos/verpageina.php?idpageina=3682>

INTERNATIONAL WATERS FOCAL AREA

The text refers to "water systems," terminology that has not been adopted by our country, as its definition assumes a water system that covers agriculture, energy, industry, and domestic use, for surface water and groundwater, as well as waters not used for consumption but for shipping. In this regard, our country has traditionally opted for the basin concept.

We understand that with regard to groundwater resources, all related actions must conform to the stipulations of the relevant regional conventions. In the case of South America, we must bear in mind the Guarani Aquifer Agreement, signed by Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Brazil.

We are also of the view that there is no need to include the topic of “oceans” since it is very specifically regulated by its own conventions, to which not all States are party.

Likewise, it is not appropriate to include the concept of “transboundary waters,” which also have their own regulatory framework and we must specifically point out that for our country, it is inappropriate to speak about issues of “security” in water-related matters.

LAND DEGRADATION FOCAL AREA

It is important to maintain the Land Degradation financing window, with a view to ensuring that the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification targets its programs toward the Latin American continent, especially in the areas of “desertification and drought.” In keeping with the primary objective of the GEF—obtaining global benefits—areas that have not yet been prioritized should be strengthened, such as the aforementioned drought.

In addition, we must point out that sustainable land management should not only have objectives related to production systems maintenance, as suggested in the document, but it should also be geared toward maintaining dryland ecosystems in general.

In particular, the GEF should take the necessary steps to facilitate and expedite the processes for the application of available resources, in order to make better use of them.

The GEF Secretariat should be called upon to give notice, in a more efficient and expeditious manner, of the available resources for enabling activities. This would make the application processes more flexible and allow countries to obtain these resources.

SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT FOCAL AREA

In the document, many references are made to “landscape approach” as an internationally accepted term. It must be borne in mind that this term has not been accepted and must be used carefully, so that its use is not linked to agriculture, as this could imply the “multifunctionality of agriculture.”

We would suggest that references to the “landscape approach” be replaced with the promotion of an integrated, intersectoral, and interinstitutional approach to sustainable forest management. It is important to bear in mind that at the Rio+20 conference, it was acknowledged that there are different approaches, visions, models, and tools for achieving sustainable development, for which reason SFM must not be linked exclusively to the landscape approach.

In paragraph 27, a recommendation is made to promote “enabling conditions for integrated national and landscape level planning....” In this regard, we suggested that

this phrase be replaced with “enabling environment (as is mentioned in the non-binding instrument on all types of forests) for sustainable forest management at the national level.”

In paragraph 28 (page 142), mention is also made of “effective land use.” In this regard, we do not know the criteria to be used to measure the effectiveness of land use, as this is the purview of the Governments and they are the ones who determine their own corresponding national indicators and criteria. It must be pointed out that at the last Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests, many delegations, including Argentina, opposed the inclusion of this term.

In several passages of the document, reference is made to land use, as well as competition between land use systems and, in particular, on page 135, in the last line of paragraph 9, reference is made to the indirect causes of land degradation. Since the scope of these indirect causes is not known, we suggest that these references be deleted or clarified.

In many passages, reference is also made to land use planning. We must point out that this is a very sensitive issue that forms part of the sovereign rights of each country, depending on their priorities and national development plans. We therefore recommend caution in its use.

Agriculture is mentioned as the main cause of deforestation and loss of forest mass. It must be borne in mind that is not always the case, so a balance should be sought between agricultural development and the loss of forest resources.

In paragraph 24 (page 141), reference is made to additional pressures on forest resources caused by biofuel production techniques. In this regard, it is important to bear in mind that the circumstances and contexts of biofuel production differ in each country. No generalizations should therefore be made about these concepts, bearing in mind the efforts being made by each country individually to develop second generation biofuel technologies.

Another instance is found in paragraph 30.i where reference is made to the change in land use as a result of agriculture and bioenergy production. In this regard, it is pointed out that the change in land use in relation to biofuel production is another way of mentioning the “indirect change in land use,” which is a concept that the European Union promotes unilaterally for the trade in biofuels and which has little or no scientific basis. We would therefore recommend that it be deleted.

In paragraph 30.Ii reference is made to the implementation of “zero-deforestation commodity supply chains.” In this regard, we suggest that it be borne in mind that this concept could have negative consequences for Argentine agricultural production.

The document makes many references to “valuing natural capital” as a way of recognizing the value of multiple goods and services that forests can provide. In this regard, it must be pointed out that natural capital is a concept that is not internationally accepted, and at the last Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests it was rejected by many delegations, such as Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. In this regard, we must highlight that not all countries regard natural resources as “capital” that can be

incorporated into national accounts, while other countries do not have sufficient capacities for it. In addition, this vision emphasizes monetary compensation from forests, while there are other values of the forests that are very difficult or even impossible to quantify in monetary terms, such as the spiritual value of a forest for indigenous and local communities. In light of the foregoing, we suggest that special attention be paid to the use of these concepts.

On many occasions, reference is made to “sustainable financial mechanisms.” We need some clarification about this term since we do not understand its scope and it does not appear to be internationally accepted.

In paragraph 31 (page 144), reference is made to the need to implement SFM based on sustainable practices, with a footnote indicating that “SFM is identified in line with the International Tropical Timber Organization’s assessments,” and that the requirements include having been independently certified or being in the process of getting certified. We must indicate that the independent certifiers are voluntary and therefore national standards need to be established, to prevent independent certification from becoming a hidden restriction to international trade.

The document highlights Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES). In this regard, it must be borne in mind that all payments for ecosystems should be consistent with the relevant international regulations, especially those of the WTO, such as the Agriculture Agreement, in which there is a series of requirements to prevent these PES from becoming agricultural subsidies.

In paragraph 41 (page. 148), reference is made to “green growth.” This term was not adopted at Río+20; hence we suggest that it be replaced with “inclusive economic growth,” as appears in the document “The Future We Want.”

In paragraph 43 (page 149) regarding the objective of increasing regional and global cooperation, reference is made to the relevance and importance of South-South cooperation. The DA highlights the importance of cooperation in all its forms. We therefore suggest incorporating North-South cooperation and the triangle, to complement South-South cooperation.

In paragraph 45 (page 149), mention is made of the “responsible use... of forests.” As this is not a term that was adopted at Rio+20, we suggest that it be replaced with “sustainable use... of forests.”

Paragraph 47.I (page 150) of the document, for example, indicates the importance of the private sector to forest financing and the SFM. In this regard, we must point out that in Argentina, the Government, through instruments such as the Law on Minimum Budgets for the Protection of Native Forests, has helped to develop the institutional and financial apparatus for SFM.

In paragraph 48 (page 150), mention is made of “genetic fingerprinting” as a way to combat the illegal traffic in timber, and it was also noted that this technology is being verified and tested by the GEF in a number of countries. We need more clarification on the topic and would like to highlight that this technology is not accessible to all countries. Technology transfer to developing countries must therefore be improved.

NICARAGUA

2013

GOVERNMENT OF RECONCILIATION AND NATIONAL UNITY

NON OFFICIAL TRANSLATION (SEE ORIGINAL VERSION IN SPANISH)

THE MINISTER'S OFFICE

Managua, April 30, 2013

Ref.: DM-JAS/0448.04.13

Mr. Fernando Lugris
Representative for Latin America
GEF-6 Replenishment Process

Dear Mr. Lugris:

This correspondence serves to inform you that you have Nicaragua's support for the review and definition process for the GEF-6 resource replenishment and that we will await the reviews and analyses of the documents that the GEF Secretariat will present at the meetings.

Nicaragua believes that the next meetings, which will be held in September and November 2013, should examine the following issues:

1. Fairness and imbalance in the application of the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) implemented during GEF-5, with special focus on a review of the indexes that determine the allocation of resources.
2. Prioritization in the allocation of STAR-5 resources toward mitigation and less for adaptation, where there was an allocation of US\$850 million for mitigation.
3. Complete evaluation of the amount of funds needed for the application of the Convention on Biological Diversity for the sixth replenishment of resources of the Trust Fund of the Global Environment Facility.
4. Complete evaluation of the amount of funds needed for the application of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification for the sixth replenishment of resources from the Trust Fund of the Global Environment Facility.
5. In the area of Chemical Management, prioritize the gradual elimination of persistent organic pollutants.
6. In the area of International Waters, prioritize integrated mangrove ecosystem management, taking into account climate variability and climate change.

Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Km. 12 ½ Carretera Norte, Frente a Corporación de Zonas Francas/
Telephone: 22331112-22631994-2331916/www.marena.gob.ni/

NICARAGUA
GOVERNMENT OF RECONCILIATION AND NATIONAL UNITY

Very truly yours,
/s/
Juana Argeñal Sandoval
Minister
GEF Political Focal Point

Cc: Roberto Araquistain – Vice Minister, GEF Operational Focal Point
Ana Marcía Zeledón – Secretary General
Luis Fiallos – Advisor MARENA (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources)
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Km. 12 ½ Carretera Norte, Frente a Corporación de Zonas Francas/
Telephones: 22331112-22631994-22331916/www.marena.gob.ni/

**Caribbean Constituency
Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic
Back to back meeting, July 1st**

We the countries, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Dominica, Cuba, Grenada, Guyana, St. Kits and Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, members of the Caribbean Circumscription for the Global Environmental Fund (GEF), have discussed and agreed on the following as the main concerns that our countries share as part of this important organization and we request that this issues must be taken into account during the new process of replenishment of the GEF:

- 1) Co-financing: there is uncertainty about the level of cofinancing require per project and across periods of the GEF. Countries are requesting clarification on this issue. We are requesting a review of the cofinancing for projects and in fact we believed that due to our vulnerability, cofinancing should be waived for SIDS and LDCs. This is particularly the case for the Climate Change focal area.
- 2) Resources and flexibility: due to their vulnerability and absolute need for impact a minimum allocation to SID and LDCs should be US10 Million. This amount should be fully flexibility for usage across the conventions. This will reflect the multifocal and cross cutting nature of SIDS and LDCs.
- 3) Country Support Program: the CSP should be continued. It needs to be strengthened and designed to provide real support to the OFP to carry out their functions. This should be redesigned with the input of the countries and the amount significantly increased. Access to this very small fund should be designed to be easier.
- 4) Implementing agencies: it was felt that the Implementing Agencies had improved significantly in the services provided to the Countries. Many countries, however, still experience challenges to work with Implement Agencies. And these challenges can determine if a country can use its allocation or not.

5) Strategic and Programming Documents: we consider that the documents presented for the GEF 6th cycle replenishment do not explicitly consider SIDS's and LDCs issues; therefore we request that a section on LDCs and SIDS be included within the revised document to be considered at the September replenishment meeting.

6) The vision of the new Replenishment: we request that more funds be provided during the replenishment. This will facilitate the innovations that the GEF is known for and it is required to impact the environment of the Planet. This is also necessary too assist the Country's to meet their commitments. We are requesting more transparency about the new allocation process for the next replenishment. The Countries should be included in the decisions of the GEF along with the Agencies and the Donors.

7) GEF 6 Replenishment should build on the success of the STAR and should not regress to the pre RAF phase. The GEF has had more impact in the last two cycles than any other cycle. We appreciate the economic turn down but we believe that this is the time to invest into the environment in an sustainable way. The GEF can be a vehicle to transform economies and get the world economy growing again. The STAR has been especially important for SIDS and LDCs and we would like GEF 6 to build and scale up on this success.

8) About Funding for the treatment of hazardous chemicals and wastes: the countries of this constituency is not in support of the GEF funding the Chemicals, we recognize however that this is the decision and we will support the GEF's efforts to implement this approach. We would like however to advise that the GEF window for chemicals should be new and addition funds over the GEF 5 replenishment and should not take away resources from the existing conventions. This new and additional funding for the implementation of the four Conventions (Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam, Minamata) should be clearly identified to be over and above for the other conventions.

In addition, the GEF should allow to the countries to make national projects for POPs. The countries prefer national projects since these have greater impact on the Environment as well as country ownership.

9) The accreditation of new agencies should not happen in GEF 6. Direct access by Countries should be prioritized and may even be a requirement from each of the countries. These countries will have to develop direct access to the Adaptation Fund as well as the GCF. To this end the countries should be given an increase in the GEF country program to support this exercise.

10) The Signature Projects: We support the new thinking in relation to signature project providing they are aligned with convention guidance and do not compromise the allocation for our countries specially LDCs and SIDS' s.

11) The discussion of middle income countries is inconsistent with the mandate and intent of the Convention and the GEF that services them. Eligibility of countries is an issue that is addressed within and at the level of the Convention. The replenishment process should not address this issue and or take unilateral decisions on this matter.

12) The Role of the GEF within the Climate Architecture is not a question that should distract the replenishment process. The GEF is the only fund that should be used

for the Conventions unless otherwise stated by the Conventions. This is the mandate of the GEF. The Adaptation fund and the GCF are all complimentary and their roles should be decided by the COP not the GEF or its processes. The Donors need to meet their commitments to Climate change convention and scale up the funding for this within the GEF, the AF and the GCF. The Funds provided to the GEF is small compared to the Billions per year the donors have indicated that they do provide via other channels. Based on these figures provided by donors, there are lots more funds that can be provided via the GEF that is currently being provided. This question is not for the GEF to respond to it is for the Convention to discuss and come to an agreement.

ECUADOR

NON OFFICIAL TRANSLATION (SEE ORIGINAL VERSION IN SPANISH)

SIXTH REPLENISHMENT PROCESS OF THE GEF

In the 44th GEF Council, held in Washington, DC - USA, between the 18th and 20th of June 2013, the Circumscription of: Ecuador, Brazil and Colombia expressed its concerns regarding paragraph 11 of document GEF/C.44/Inf.03 "**Update on GEF-6 Replenishment**", in particular with regard to the proposed increase in the minimum contribution to the budget of the GEF, as well as the discussion of the distinction of the different categories of developing countries as of "middle-income countries".

The Circumscription understands that the treatment of this subject would be an intensive discouragement to developing countries to commit with the Fund either in the role of donors or in the role of users of the resources.

Moreover, we are concerned about the possibility of a reduction in the resources allocated to our countries. The progress of countries in their development should not be an obstacle to the access to financing for sustainable development. The countries making progress towards its development also have initiatives that are important and have impact on the fund's activities.

This is an opportunity for all countries to build an inclusive mechanism, fair and equitable, to grant new and additional resources, prioritizing the results and the impact of the projects in the countries and in world.

ABOUT THE ITEM: RELATIONS WITH THE OTHER CONVENTIONS AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Based on the decisions XI/4, XI/5 adopted at COP11 of the CBD regarding the Guidance to the Financial Mechanism (GEF) our Constituency considered important to study the possibility of creating a "window" for the Nagoya Protocol.

In this regard the decision XI/5 in points 4 and 5 calls to avoid additional and lengthy processes for the allocation of available resources and calls on the GEF NBSAPs to use

resources as the basis for the definition of needs and priorities in the GEF6. It also calls the Fund to clarify the concept and the implementation and co-financing of biodiversity projects in the future and invites the GEF to apply co-financing arrangements in ways that do not create unnecessary barriers and costs for recipient countries to access GEF funds.

We invite the Parties to give priority to national plans and projects of biosafety under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) to ensure the support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

With regard to the decision 11/COP10 decision of the Convention to Combat Desertification on collaboration with the GEF, we are aware that the GEF and UNCCD would have completed the Memorandum of Understanding between the two Secretariats. In this sense, we would like to have further information on the current state of the process.

Quito, Ecuador
July 19th, 2013