

TELEFAX

Sender:

Frank Fass-Metz
GEF Council Member
Head of Environment Division
BMZ (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
Adenauerallee 139-141
53113 Bonn, Germany

Telefax No.: +49-228-535 3980
Email: Frank.Fass-Metz@bmz.bund.de
Desk officer: Vera Rosendahl
Email: Vera.Rosendahl@bmz.bund.de

Ref.No.: 312-K8185-40/94

Date: July 10th, 2009

No. of pages incl. this page: 4

To: Monique Barbut
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson
Global Environment Facility
Fax: 001 – 202 – 522-3240
(advanced copy also sent by Email to: gcoordination@thegef.org)

Subject: Comments by Germany SCCF Work Program of June 2009

Dear Ms. Barbut,

Please find below Germany's comments on the SCCF Work Program.

Best regards

Vera Rosendahl
on behalf of
Frank Fass-Metz

1. **Piloting Climate Change Adaptation to Protect Human Health**

Agency: UNDP

SCCF Project Grant: \$ 4.50 million

Country: Global (Barbados, Bhutan, China, Fiji, Jordan, Kenya, Uzbekistan)

Germany agrees to the project proposal. Changes and requests for clarification outlined below should be made prior to project implementation.

- Project, baseline and adaptation activities are well described.
- The health sector will increasingly be impacted by climate change, and there is limited experience in adaptation so far. It therefore seems reasonable to address this topic in a global project allowing for lesson learning and sharing of experiences. However, it should be further elaborated how the comparative advantage of a global project will be realized as this project is dealing with very different climate related health risks (heat stress, vector borne diseases, water stress, flooding) in very diverse countries.
- It is appreciated that the project is conducted in cooperation with WHO. In order to ease follow-up and incorporate expertise optimally, WHO should have a strong role in component four on best practice generation, dissemination and regional coordination.
- In the individual countries, the following needs to be considered:
 - In Fiji, coordination with a SPC-German regional project on adaptation to climate change in the South Pacific is encouraged.
 - In Jordan, close coordination with the Jordan-German bilateral Management of Water Resources Programme working on sustainable sanitation and treated wastewater use needs to be ensured.
 - Project interventions in Uzbekistan need to be further specified.

2. **Integrating Climate Change into the Management of Priority Health Risks**

Agency: UNDP

SCCF Project Grant: \$ 1.72 million

Country: Ghana

As already stated in the LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting this PIF lacks a clear description of how the overall objective is to be achieved. **Germany has therefore asked for re-submission of the PIF to the Council. Up to now we have not received a revised PIF neither from UNDP nor from the GEF Secretariat. We can only approve this project, once we have received a revision of the PIF that addresses our concerns:**

- The proposed interventions are mostly generic and not sufficiently elaborated. They are not specific to the health sector nor to the specific programmes Ghana is undertaking to fight e.g. Malaria. There is a reference to “upscaling” the Roll Back Malaria Programme, however no details are provided with regard to how the project activities may be linked to upscaling efforts. The integration of project activities with the activities under the Roll Back Malaria Programme appears to be a good approach, but expected outcomes need to be outlined.
- The linkage between this project and the proposed global project on Piloting Climate Change Adaptation to Protect Human Health is not clear. Coordination amongst projects and use of economies of scale should be ensured.

3. Integrating Climate Change in Development Planning and Disaster Prevention to Increase Resilience of Agricultural and Water Sectors

Agency: Worldbank
SCCF Project Grant: \$ 4.35 million
Country: Morocco

Germany agrees to the project proposal. Changes and requests for clarification outlined below should be made prior to project implementation.

- Captures well priorities in Morocco and fits into the reform and policy strategies of the country.
- The relation of the baseline investments (the co-financing) and the adaptation project should be elaborated. The co-financing focuses mostly on irrigated agriculture (US\$ 70 mio out of a total of US\$ 80 mio co-financing), while the described adaptation interventions are much broader in its scope. This project approach seems to be sound, but it should be clarified whether all investments listed should be considered as co-financing.

4. Integrating Rural Livelihoods Climate Change Adaptation Support Programme

Agency: IFAD
SCCF Project Grant: \$ 2.63 million
Country: Pakistan

Germany agrees to the project proposal. Changes and requests for clarification outlined below should be made prior to project implementation.

- The focus on water resources and rainfed agricultural land seems to fit very well into country priorities as well as IFAD's comparative advantage in Pakistan.
- The proposal stresses an "investment-oriented approach" (p. 5) and an emphasis on technological solutions. Preparing for upscaling and deployment of such technologies needs to be addressed.
- The project has remarkably low government co-financing (US\$ 150,000 out of 13.3 mio of total co-financing). It should be clearly shown that there is sufficient ownership in the country to enable upscaling and deployment of the technologies as well as mainstreaming, which are key pillars of the proposed project.

5. Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildfire Hazards Associated with Climate Change

Agency: UNDP
SCCF Project Grant: \$ 3.54 million
Country: South Africa

We agree to this proposal without a need for further comments.

6. **Climate-resilient Infrastructure Planning and Coastal Zone Development**

Agency: ADB/UNDP

SCCF Project Grant: \$ 3.40 million

Country: Vietnam

Germany agrees to the project proposal. Changes and requests for clarification outlined below should be made prior to project implementation.

- The value added of the UNDP contribution is questionable and needs to be clearly outlined or reconsidered:
 - The PIF describes several ADB baseline projects, for which additional costs of taking into consideration climate change are clearly evident. Yet, the two UNDP projects both already address climate change and should by their very design adequately address impacts of climate change.
 - Another role of the project is outlined as helping form a coherent program on climate change building on the package of investments by the two agencies. While an integrated and coordinated approach is encouraged, this should rather go through national coordination in Vietnam, e.g. the NTP. Coordination between the ADB and UNDP projects should be part of good practice in donor coordination and alignment, for which SCCF funding does not seem appropriate.
 - Close coordination with the Vietnamese-German and other bilateral projects on coastal zone management should be ensured.