

## GEF Council/Replenishment Meeting

### GEF Replenishment

We recognize that support to projects on POP's and – to a lesser extent because support is limited to Economies in Transition – ozone depleting substances, have a special status for GEF, since the GEF is financial mechanism for the Stockholm convention and the Montreal Protocol.

However, Denmark finds that the global environmental problems, and associated health problems, pertaining to chemicals, increasingly call for a broader approach in GEF. This is underlined by the development in chemicals production and use towards developing countries. It is also underlined by the development in international environmental governance in later years, including the adoption of SAICM, the decision on cooperation and coordination under the Stockholm, Rotterdam, and Basel Conventions – both inviting the GEF to contribute to their implementation. Furthermore, 9 new chemicals have been decided for listing under the Stockholm Convention. UNEP GC also recently decided to start negotiations on a convention on mercury. Finally, there are also a number of emerging issues of concern, for example related to endocrine disrupting chemicals, including in international waters.

We are therefore in favour of a chemicals area as such merging and develop the POPs and ODS window, which is able to support developing countries in the best way possible in achieving sustained sound chemicals management. Is it necessary to focus on general foundational capacities as well as capacities in specific areas and multiple areas where there are synergies in approaches.

Synergies can often also be found in relation to other environmental problems, including by the other focal areas covered by GEF, which also calls for a cross-cutting approach.

We welcome the draft focal area strategy on chemicals, and the proposal to consider chemicals activities in a more systematic and comprehensive manner. We support the proposal to integrate elements related to mercury, for the facilitation of the adoption of an effective convention. We furthermore note that the strategy – which is also mentioned in the draft - will need to be updated in light of recent developments, especially in relation to decisions, including guidance, from the 4<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention. We welcome the “Linkages with other focal areas” section (in doc GEF/5/Inf 3), but would like to see it further operationalized.

We find that more operative focus in the focal area strategy should be on:

- Integrating sound chemicals management into development/sustainability strategies, including the coherent implementation of the three chemicals conventions and SAICM. This also has the potential of raising additional donor funding in accordance with the Paris Declaration.

- More focus on integrating issues of relevance to general chemicals management and exploiting synergies in the implementation of chemicals conventions. Several elements in the adopted recommendations on cooperation and coordination between the Stockholm, Basel and Rotterdam Convention as well as in SAICM could be useful to include.
- Chemicals aspects of GEF projects in other focal areas/coordination of focal area projects should be strengthened/prioritized even further, and should have funding allocated.
- In relation to objective 2, on managing the use of chemicals, we find that the production element should also be included, in order to take into account the fact, that an increasing share of chemicals are produced in developing countries. The headline for objective 2 should be "*Manage the protection and use of chemicals in an environmental sound manner*"

Finally, we welcome and support GEF cooperation with other international fora on projects. This includes projects relating to the Arctic region, where there are also substantial challenges in relation to hazardous chemicals and wastes of such.

Regarding the proposed funding: We are glad to see the proposal of a substantial increase in the proposed funding for the chemicals area including the implementation of the Stockholm Convention in light of the recent development under the convention with the listing of 9 more chemicals and the adoption of regional centres. We believe that projects of a general chemicals management issues, including foundational capacities, are very important to obtain sound chemicals management. Also, we find it important to allocate funds to cross cutting projects between the GEF focal areas, such as projects under chemicals and IW.

Also, we have a few detailed questions addressed to the TAG groups:

Doc GEF/R.5/Inf "Chemicals Draft Strategy for GEF-5:

- para 19 in it is stated: "*those SAICM concrete measures that have most obvious regional/global aspects*" – does this refer to the priorities identified within SAICM global plan of action or "concrete measures" defined elsewhere?
- para 26 refer to other PTS of priority concern such as mercury in articles and lead in paint. This is stated within objective 1 which deals with controlled chemicals. Denmark does believe it is very important and welcomes the inclusion within the chemicals area but since these substance are not yet controlled globally it might not be the right placing of this para
- para 30 identifies other areas of chemicals management that GEF could address if further resources are available. Denmark sees this as the reference to SAICM and wonders where the identified areas come from? SAICM identifies a list of globally prioritized actions and activities which we find should be referred
- para 45 on linkages with "IW". Denmark supports the linkages between the different focal areas and suggests a direct link to a cooperative portfolio along the same lines as in the IW strategy. We have at this point difficulties to see the direct link to IW within the 4 objectives. This should be specified directly in the objectives like specified under objective 5 under IW. Likewise, there's a reference to "the Global Plan of Action" – which plan does this refer to?