



Australian comments on replenishment policy [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Annette Madvig to: gefceo

07/20/2009 04:48 AM

Cc: secretariat, "deborah fulton"

Dear Monique,

Please find attached comments from Australia on issues raised in the documents issued for the recent replenishment meeting. I apologise that we are sending these right at the end of your deadline for receipt of written comments.

Please let me know if you have any concerns.

Best wishes,

Annette.

Annette Madvig
Policy Manager
Policy and Global Environment
AusAID
Tel: +61 2 6206 4831
Fax: + 61 2 6206 4870

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please delete the email and any attachments and notify the sender.

The Commonwealth does not warrant that any attachments are free from viruses or any other defects. You assume all liability for any loss, damage or other consequences which may arise from opening or using the attachments.



Comments Australia to GEF Secretariat on replenishment policy 090720.doc

To: <Gefceo@Thegef.Org>
cc: <Secretariat@Thegef.Org>
"Deborah Fulton" <Deborah.Fulton@Ausaid.Gov.Au>

**Comments from Australia to the GEF Secretariat
on policy for the GEF-5 replenishment
Submitted 20 July 2009 following replenishment discussions 25-26 June 2009**

These comments are provided in addition to the comments made by Australia during the replenishment meeting on 25-26 June.

LDCF/SCCF Programming Strategy

- Australia notes the importance of funding for adaptation. It would be wise to receive guidance from the UNFCCC on an agreed post-2012 climate change framework before changing the funding arrangements for LDCF/SCCF.

GEF-5 Programming

- The GEF should seek to play an appropriate and niche role in the 2010-14 period, ensuring that obligations to Conventions are met and that important environmental outcomes are achieved.
 - The GEF should be properly supported in this period to effectively play its role in climate change action, without structures being established that preempt outcomes in the UNFCCC negotiations on post-2012 framework.
 - Consideration should also be given to discussions on reform of International Environmental Governance and the GEF's likely fit with that reform.
- We encourage the GEF Secretariat to make a stronger, demand-driven case for its replenishment scenarios, both mid-range and high-range, and in its focal area strategies.
 - The alignment of the proposed biodiversity focal area strategy with the UNCBD's four year work program seems a sound way by which to ensure that the GEF focuses on identified needs in a coherent way. Would be interested in how this establishes good practice for programming in other focal areas.
 - The focal area strategies require a better articulation of the GEF's niche role in each area and where difficult decisions about resource prioritisation may need to be made.
 - Note that the Secretariat has included an assumption of \$1 billion for LDCF/SCCF in the proposed total resource envelope for GEF-5 of \$10 billion. Suggest the Secretariat set out what total replenishment it would seek if \$1 billion for LDCF/SCCF wasn't sought as part of the total GEF-5 replenishment.

- We'd seek a better rationale from the Secretariat on the proposed increase in the proportion of GEF resources to climate change vis-à-vis biodiversity, given the GEF's traditional split of one-third of resources to each.
- Australia is interested in some expansion of GEF funding to a wider range of chemicals activities, subject to the total replenishment envelope being sufficient to provide for a larger chemicals window.
- We would be interested in the Secretariat's views on how to manage coordination with the managing bodies associated with multiple chemicals agreements.
- We'd support work on desertification being undertaken in an integrated way, considering forest management, sustainable land management and adaptation to climate change. We support alignment with the ten-year strategy of the UNCCD.
- Interested in there being a stronger, policy-driven debate on how to increase country ownership in the GEF, noting that this would seem a primary goal of the GEF-5 period.
 - Issues to address include strategies such as streamlining the project cycle, the use of resource caps and floors and the use of non-onerous GEF 'business plans', as well as measures requiring more substantial reform, such as direct access.

Institutional, Governance and Policy Reform

- Australia supports consideration of improvements to GEF's governance arrangements and supports the identification of five broad areas of reform.
 - But notes that improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of the GEF's work, such as increased responsiveness to the Conventions, could be carried out without radical institutional reform during GEF-5.
 - Would welcome an elaboration of the GEF Secretariat's role in a scenario in which GEF processes and outcomes were improved rather than under a scenario of major institutional reform.
- Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all GEF partners seems of crucial importance to improving outcomes of the GEF's work and increasing the satisfaction of all partners with the operation of the network.
 - Such clarification could provide a strong basis for more extensive reform in future replenishments.

- Australia is interested in further discussion on broadening the range of implementing partners which can access GEF funds, in so far as such efforts would occur commensurate with the demonstration of appropriate fiduciary standards and accreditation processes.
 - Proposals for access by new multilateral agencies to GEF funds should more clearly explain the rationale and benefits to the GEF.
 - Noting that as agencies are not equally interested in working in all countries, the ‘comparative advantage’ of an implementing agency may be that a country wants to work with that agency and that the agency is willing and able to work with that country.
- Policy on programmatic approaches needs to be considerably strengthened for GEF-5, beyond a consideration of cost management to how to ensure greater programmatic coherence and country ownership in planning, design, implementation and coordination.
 - Such an improvement would help the GEF maintain its role on the cutting edge of development/environment programming, reflecting the growing preference in development programming for programmatic and sector wide approaches over single-project approaches.
 - The proposal to establish a Trust Fund for Programs provided a useful learning process on the strengths and weaknesses of the current implementation of programmatic approaches; lessons should be drawn from that process. We look forward to the forthcoming evaluation of programmatic approaches in GEF-4.