

## Belgium

### Comments on Draft GEF-6 Programming Directions

Belgium would like to thank the GEF secretariat for a very good and comprehensive programming document. In addition to the oral comments made at the Paris meeting, 3-4 April 2013, we would like to provide the following comments, questions and suggestions. They are based on the input received from our national Focal Points to the different conventions and contain, for each Focal Area, a summary of more general issues, followed by specific comments/questions as received from the experts.

#### Biodiversity

The proposed strategy links well with the priorities of the COP and the Aichi targets, but should mention explicitly and give due importance to the NBSAPs. Apart from the fact that NBSAPs are Aichi Target 17, we understand that they should be the basis for all national activities in the realm of biodiversity and, as a consequence, be the reference for approving any GEF activity.

Some specific comments:

- the Biodiversity Strategy is missing in the table of content;
- focusing on generating resources for and by PAs is most interesting (§21-24);
- §26: 10% target PAs: shouldn't that be 17% for terrestrial + 10% for marine & coastal (see Aichi Target 11) ?
- §28: happy to note the focus on MPAs;
- Objective 2: reducing threats: could this include aspects of trade in endangered species e.g. in the context of national capacity building workshops, involving more CITES focal points?
- program 9: the Nagoya Protocol. Does this include guidance from ICNP2 werd ingebouwd?
- program 11: very important.

#### Chemicals

This is the area where many developments at the international level are taking place, developments to which the GEF should respond in the best possible way. In that regard we welcome the listing of all relevant conventions and SAICM in box 1 on pp.112-113, and we believe that it would be useful to be more explicit about them in some places and indicate the possible links with GEF activities.

For instance, when mentioning the integrated approach (p. 111, subpara vi) as an outcome of the UNEP Executive Director's Consultative Process on Financing Option for Chemical and Waste, it would be relevant to describe it more (mainstreaming, industry involvement and dedicated external financing) and cite the UNEP Governing Council's invitation to GEF. When it comes to dedicated external funding the GEF will operate alongside a special programme for institutional strengthening, for which the Terms of Reference will be elaborated later this year.

In the same vein, GEF, which has been designated as the Financial Mechanism of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, will have a specific programme for technical assistance next to it. The detail of this programme will be defined by the first Conference of the Parties in a couple of years. In

October 2013 the Diplomatic Conference will open the Convention for signature and interim arrangements will be agreed.

Also, when referring to the Strategic Approach for the Sound Management of Chemicals (SAICM), it is worth mentioning the Quick Start Programme (QSP) and its associated voluntary fund (QSPF) for initial capacity building.

All the elements above, together with the Conventions mentioned in Box 1, constitute the broader context of chemicals and waste in which the GEF will be active and in which a high degree of coordination will be needed in order to avoid duplication or excessive overlap of activities.

Specific comments:

- p. 112: mercury convention: why is the word “country” in bold? A reference to the Diplomatic Conference is needed because interim financing and possibly priorities for it may be decided;
- p. 115, para 16: what other emerging issues, other than the conventions and SAICM, does this refer to?;
- para 18: building capacity at the national level should be linked to the special programme and QSP;
- para 27 e: besides ratification, implementation could also be added;
- p. 118, fig.1, and para 66: strategic objective 3: program 1: only a regional approach may be too restrictive for dealing with LDCs and SIDS. Can other programmes be added?;
- para 38: what does the joint reporting refer to? Has this been introduced in the different conventions?;
- p. 121, program 2: is this also for mercury (only mentions POPs)?;
- para 51, i: add mercury?;
- para 57: be careful with contaminated sites because very expensive, private sector involvement very important;
- Para 65 zeer voorzichtige formulering om eigenlijk te zeggen dat grote emerging economies (other countries) minder GEF geld nodig hebben dan deze landen (hoop ik toch). Mag van mij zeker sterker geformuleerd worden.

### Climate Change

With regard to the climate change part, the main observation refers to p. 44, para 25, in which reference is made to support for the implementation of the Technology Mechanism of the UNFCCC, including support for TNAs. It was a surprise not to find an explicit reference to the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), especially in light of the COP guidance on 2 occasions (decision 2/CP.17 para. 140 and decision 14/CP.18 para. 13), and GEF’s explicit readiness to support CTCN.