



GEF 6 Programming directions - FR comments  
GLANOIS Frédéric

to:

Rramankutty@thegef.org, wehlers@thegef.org, castrup@worldbank.org  
12/24/2013 09:28 AM

Cc:

POT Cécile, "GIACOMONI Caroline", "DUPORGE Francois Xavier (duporgefx@afd.fr)"  
Hide Details

From: GLANOIS Frédéric <Frederic.GLANOIS@dgtresor.gouv.fr>

To: "Rramankutty@thegef.org" <Rramankutty@thegef.org>, "wehlers@thegef.org" <wehlers@thegef.org>, "castrup@worldbank.org" <castrup@worldbank.org>

Cc: POT Cécile <Cecile.POT@dgtresor.gouv.fr>, "GIACOMONI Caroline" <Caroline.GIACOMONI@dgtresor.gouv.fr>, "DUPORGE Francois Xavier (duporgefx@afd.fr)" <duporgefx@afd.fr>

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

#### 1 Attachment



GEF Programming Directions - FR comments.docx

Dear colleagues,

As promised in the last replenishment meeting, please find attached some written comments on two specific topics of the Programming directions. Additional comments may follow.

Let me also take this opportunity for two kind requests:

- Would it be possible to have the updated STAR Excel file following Paris's decisions and updates – this would be very helpful for the mobilization work we are undertaking now;
- Also in the same objective, any update on the possible amount of "GEF-5 carryovers" expected for this replenishment would be most welcome: to be clear, we suspect (hope?) that the preliminary figure

provided in the "Financial considerations" document circulated for Paris (e.g., 292 MUSD) was cautiously conservative, and that you may have alternative hypothesis available.

Finally, let me say that we look much forward to our future exchanges towards Cancun and beyond. In the meantime, I wish you all the best, to you and your beloved ones, for this end of the year and the year to come.

Kind regards,

Frederic

**Frédéric Glanois**

Head of Official Development Assistance and Multilateral Development Institutions  
Treasury Directorate General  
Ministry of Economy and Finance  
139, rue de Bercy - 75572 Paris Cedex 12  
Tel: (+33) (0) 1 44 87 73 63

**GEF-6 Programming Directions – specific comments by France**

Following the 3<sup>rd</sup> replenishment meeting held in Paris on December 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>, France would like to submit the following comments on two specific items of the Programming Directions.

**1/ On the Integrated Approach “Food security in Sub-Saharan Africa”**

France recognizes the need for an integrated approach on food security in Sub-Saharan Africa, and welcomes this IA, as a program achieving the main purposes of the GEF, in terms of thematic and of geography. Nevertheless, we feel somewhat concerned by the proposed modalities of implementation.

We welcome the consulting process outlined, involving recipient countries, GEF Secretariat and 5 pre-identified agencies, which we will follow closely. We cannot stress enough the crucial importance of a real involvement of the beneficiary countries from the start of the design phase, allowing to take into account their respective particularities.

Food security in Africa cannot, and must not be solved by a high productivity approach, based on a high input - high output model. We would like to ensure that this IA does not aim at replacing staple food crops by commercial ones, and in this context, the fact that “the focus is on fostering sustainability and resilience in production and post-production, and markets for smallholder farmers” should be clarified. To assess the environmental impact of this project, we would like more details, on the way of scaling-up integrated soil fertility management (especially, if this means introducing inorganic fertilisers), on the increased use of diverse crop types/varieties (in particular does it mean hybrid seeds, GMO...)

In line with the position expressed by the African representative, we urge the Secretariat to take into account the ecological and social complexity of African farming systems, emphasizing that we are not in favour of a ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution; noting that this IA concerns 4 vast regions, with different environments and various agricultural models.

Moreover, we would like to express our reservations on the proposed role given to the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). Beyond specific interrogations on the relevance of this specific partner<sup>1</sup>, this Alliance is known to promote models based on hybrid seeds, including GMO, agricultural productivism, and agribusiness, models which we do not see necessarily fit to GEF priorities and the IA’s target, which are mainly smallholder farmers. In short, we do not believe that AGRA’s center role in the proposed IA should be taken as a given at this stage of definition, but rather that the consultation should be open to a wide range of possible partners and that the relevant implementers should be decided at a later stage in full accordance with the objectives of the program and the desire of the future beneficiary countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Which deserves some thorough examination. For instance, according to AGRA’s own website, their activities cover 13 countries and not 17 as mentioned in the GEF document.



## 2/ On the Small Grants Program (SGP)

While we support the overall goal as stated in the document (*"Effectively support the creation of global environmental benefits and the safeguarding of the global environment through community and local solutions that complement and add value to national and global level action"*), we are of the opinion that more emphasis could be put on the capacity building aspects, as we see them as a key factor for environmental sustainability.

Indeed, the purpose of the SGP remains unclear as it could be either 1/ to provide assistance to all CBOs/CSOs project in each SGP countries (without clear phasing out strategies or capacity improvement process with clear steps) or 2/ to create sustainable and long lasting capacities amongst CBOs/CSOs beneficiaries (then with a clear purpose of steps by step improvement and capacity building goal). Of the above two approaches, we would strongly favor the latter and our recommendation is to clarify the role of SGP in terms of capacity building output and methodology to help low capacity organizations to reach a point of sustainable capacities to manage global environment issues. Concretely, we suggest SGP to put in place new challenging outputs such as CBOs/CSOs increased leveraging funding capacity, or capacity to manage larger amounts in order to graduate from SGP and move towards medium size or even full size project management.

In terms of indicators, the expected outputs of the project Frameworks could be revisited and besides the number of projects funded, selected output indicators in terms of biodiversity conservation, climate change attenuation or adaptation, desertification/land degradation reduction, transboundary waters management, POPs reduction may be systematically added. In line with our previous point, concrete indicators of CBOs/CSOs capacities improvements could also be considered.

Finally, we share Germany's doubts on the idea of launching a microlending activity within the SGP and would rather encourage the program to stay focused on the already very challenging existing goals.