

Mexico
Comments regarding document GEF/R.6/07 “Draft GEF-6 Programming Directions”

Overview

The Mexican Government happily receives the document GEF/R.6/07 “*Draft GEF-6 Programming Directions*” and congratulates the Secretariat for its contents and approach. We consider that this document provides an excellent starting point to begin negotiations as it shows the Facility’s institutional evolution in the face of the current global environmental challenges.

The actions that this document presents are consistent with the guidelines that have been adopted in the Conference of the Parties meetings regarding Biological Diversity and Climate Change. Particularly in regards to the Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy, we consider that the broad approach stated in the document recognizes in a clear and comprehensive manner the drivers and consequences of land degradation.

Nonetheless, we also have the following specific comments regarding some of the Focal Area Strategies and objectives:

- **Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy**

General comments:

We agree with focusing GEF resources to attend to the most critical drivers of biodiversity loss (loss of habitat, over exploitation and the invasive alien species) in accordance with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. We recognize that the institutional priorities are represented in the objectives of this focal area's strategy and in the majority of the programs included.

Specific comments:

Page ii: We suggest including in the "Table of Contents" the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy, which is omitted in the document.

Paragraph 15 page 6: Aichi Target 18 has to do with the Traditional Knowledge (TK) and TK associated with genetic resources (which is not considered in the GEF VI priorities), that can be approached jointly with Target 16 referencing the entry of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources. Therefore, we invite the GEF to consider approving projects that link both Targets

Paragraph 45 page 16: In relation to Program 5, we notice that funds will be targeted towards projects that deal with the attention and eradication of invasive alien species in island ecosystems; nonetheless decision XI/5 of COP 11 regarding the financial mechanism, in its paragraph 19 states over invasive alien species:

*19. Requests the Global Environment Facility, in accordance with its mandate, and invites other donors, to provide adequate and timely financial support to developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States among them, as well as countries with economies in transition, **including countries that are centres of origin or diversity of genetic resources;***

Thus, one would acknowledge that even when this issue was a priority in GEF V; there remains a possibility that countries with the characteristics described in the COP11 decision may not be subject to funds and support. Therefore, we would suggest this to be given new consideration.

Paragraph 65, pages 19 and 20: Program 8 is of particular importance to Mexico as a means to meet both national and international commitments such as the Crusade against Hunger, the implementation of Aichi Target 13 and the determination of Centers of Origin and Diversity of Genetic Resources.

Figure 3, page 20: While we acknowledge that the Map (figure 3) is part of the excellent job spearheaded by the FAO; Program 8 should recognize the national efforts made to map and zone areas of Centers of Origin and Diversity of Genetic Resources that rely on specific information

collected in each country. The surface areas of Mexico (in the case of corn, just as one example) are larger than those mapped in the document.

Paragraph 72, page 22: If the information is available, we would suggest mentioning the amount of resources that the GEF has directed towards the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Paragraph 90, page 27. We would suggest clarifying the type of International Financial Institutions that GEF would support.

Climate Change Mitigation Strategy

Specific comments:

Paragraphs 12-25, page 41: On Objective 1 to Promote Innovation and Technology Transfer Program 1: Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of low-carbon technologies and policies

It is important to have a broad definition of the term “demonstration” that goes beyond “showing that innovative technologies – usually developed in industrialized countries-are fully ready to be used”. This broad definition should consider the stages of:

- a) Validation
- b) Monitoring and tracing
- c) Evaluation
- d) Improvement

GEF resources should be available to be used for technology infrastructure, capacity building and human resources. In addition, we recommend clarifying whether larger emitters refer only to individual countries or also to regional and continental projects.

Paragraph 15 d), page 42: We would suggest including a third point aimed at changing the behavior of people through projects in education and dissemination in order to better adapt to new technologies.

Figure 2, Page 42: We recommend including the element of human capital in “Basic R&D”.

International Waters Focal Area Strategy

General Comments:

In Mexico there is a growing interest on international waters, particularly in finding bilateral solutions to prevent, mitigate and resolve potential conflicts in regards to borders, regiments of dominion, use and management as well as conditions for pollution in terms of legal frameworks, institutions, uses and users, and environmental conditions amongst neighboring countries.

Conditions of governance for hidric resources are complex and the conciliation of country point of views is critical for the maintenance of social peace, the development of societies, economies, cultures and environmental conditions. The topics under debate include sovereignty and development in regards to a good which is of a transboundary nature and that requires the development of institutional roles and management instruments to reduce and reverse possible repercussions of an economic, social and environmental nature.

Specific Comments:

Paragraph 57: It would be convenient for the program to go in more depth into this topic. Marine coastal areas provide a variety of fundamental services for the ecological and economic equilibrium that need to be highlighted. In this sense, it would be appropriate to include defined action plans in marine and coastal areas that promote investment, regulate their use, promote its benefits and stop their deterioration. The services in tourism, avoided costs, fisheries and benefits provided by these areas should be valued and included in concrete lines of action.

In addition, meeting Aichi Targets (particularly target 11) requires all the mechanisms available. Achieving in 2020 the conservation of 10% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, requires that governments and societies in general acknowledge the economic value that these areas provide so that efforts may be directed to increase their coverage.

Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy

General comments:

In terms of the Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, we are pleased to see that derived from the results of Rio +20, a greater relevance is given to the topic of land degradation due to the potential positive impact that are implied while addressing this problem in areas such as climate change, biodiversity conservation in forests, food security, poverty reduction and the improvement of life in local populations.

We believe it to be a decision in the right direction that the Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy has adopted a landscape approach understood from an ecosystem point of view so as to maintain and reinforce connectivity, functionality and stability as well as reducing the vulnerability of ecosystems to climate change.

We welcome that inclusion of more specific and precise language in this document which allows us to clearly understand the program's range for this Focal Area; that includes clear linkages to other Focal Areas as is the case of Biodiversity in its Program 8.

The social, environmental and economic benefits that can be reached through the conservation of the earth, water, genetic resources, biodiversity, and ecosystems will allow us to be more resilient to climate change and the natural disasters that may come as a result.

Specific comments:

Paragraph 1: This section does not include a discussion regarding specific market failures such as the role of agricultural subsidies and how they may be efficiently used to avoid land degradation.

Paragraph 4: The only mention, in this section, of protected areas is done in regard to the improved agricultural management of areas adjacent to natural protected areas. However, it fails to analyze the role that natural protected areas can have in the fight against land degradation as well as in satisfying the demand of goods that can be sustainably produced in these areas such as coffee.

Paragraph 9: It would be convenient to include a paragraph that details the importance of natural protected areas to maintain and increase the provision of environmental services to the ecosystem. Furthermore, examples with specific values can be given in regards to the environmental services provided to agriculture, biological processes, land fertility, etc.

Paragraph 11, page 93: We consider it necessary to define the eligibility of a country vis a vis another to benefit under this focal area.

Paragraph 27: We understand that in this occasion, efforts will be directed towards land owners. However, it would be convenient to maintain elements that aid in the elimination of legal barriers and regulations (subsidies, intensive agriculture programs and other perverse incentives) that drive land use change.

Paragraph 29: We suggest the following options that could complement the objectives of this Focal Area:

Objective 1 (LD1):

(a) Agro-ecological Intensification

- Include an approach that deals with the reduction of animal load so as to reduce the pressure on natural resources. This approach should be focused on prairie management and food diversification.
- Include agro biodiversity management.
- Include the efficient use of water as well as rain water collection.

(b) SLM for Climate Smart Agriculture

- Include low energy impact agriculture in regards to the use of water and technified irrigation

Paragraph 32 Objective 2 (LD2)

(a) Landscape Management and Restoration

- Include an approach for migratory agriculture (management of secondary vegetation and grass lands).
- Include and approach of ecosystem fragmentation and practices that increase ecological connectivity.

Specific Proposals:

We believe it to be convenient, that the amount of resources granted to this Focal Area be increased from that assigned in GEF V.

We suggest broadening the incentive instrument developed for torest management in GEF V so as to include activities in land degradation (linkages that deal with two or more focal areas).

We recommend considering within the strategies, objectives and programs, including specific actions for awareness and the dissemination of environmental benefits and sustainable development.

Chemicals Strategy

General comments:

In the case of Mexico, enhancing and increasing the infrastructure available for the management of residuals is a key aspect that will allow us to reach the long term objective of the GEF VI strategy.

Comentarios específicos

Paragraph 9, iv, page 110 and 112: We suggest clarifying if the Mercury Convention has established that GEF would be the only financial mechanism for the Convention.

Page 121, Objective 2: We believe that GEF could support in the development of projects related to Sustainable Production and Consumption, mainly in those that promote the design of products and processes that use and generate a reduced amount of chemical products and residues. The development of better public private alliances can be established with the objective to promote the development of projects that look for the development and adoption of cleaner technologies that consider chemicals from the perspective of their life cycle. It is important to foment innovation and technology transfer from more developed economies to those that need more support in chemical management.

In addition the academic sector plays a key role in the research and development of “green” chemicals, therefore these type of alliances should be promoted.

Sustainable Forest Management Strategy

General comment:

GEF could support efforts to identify and map zones for the promotion and production of rehabilitated lands so as to reduce the pressure on forests and enhance the conservation of high value habitats. These friendly practices can arise from the sustainable management of forests and land.

Specific comments:

Within this section, there is no explicit reference to areas where funds will be targeted. It would also be convenient to mention the types of forests, land tenure regimes, and other eligibility criteria that would provide more certainty in the use of GEF funds under this Focal Area, for example can they be used in naturally protected areas?

An Integrated Approach to the Global Environmental Commons in Support of Sustainable Development

General comments:

Mexico congratulates GEF for linking priorities of the UNCSD in this program so as to make viable the financing of projects at multiple levels (local, regional, global).

Corporate Programs Strategy

Specific comments:

Paragraph 18, 1, page 172: It is important to disseminate the changes agreed in the transition to GEF VI so as to understand the implications that they may have.

Paragraph 34, e, page 177: Small Grants Programme
We recommend complementing this objective with the social development policies of each country.

