

## **GEF 6 Work Program – Comments by The Netherlands, 27 September 2013**

### **General comments**

The Netherlands appreciates the new focus on drivers of environmental degradation.

A general concern we have is the lack of attention to gender equality and the role of women in the GEF-6 programming. We support Sweden's proposal to have an action plan on gender equality for GEF-6.

In a similar vein, the private sector strategy could be more evident throughout the work program. We are happy that, at the replenishment meeting in September, the GEF CEO promised to develop an action plan on private sector engagement.

In the case of a status quo scenario in financing, the Netherlands would advocate against reallocating substantial funding from the focal areas to signature programs. As discussed and decided in Delhi, the signature programs should rather be a pilot, to be financed according to opportunities given the level of funding for GEF-6. In case only a few of the signature programs will be carried out, we have a slight preference for i) Taking Deforestation out of the Commodities Supply Chain; iii) Sustainable Cities – Harnessing Local Action for Global Commons; and (iv) Fostering Sustainability and Resilience of Food Production Systems in Africa.

### ***Climate Change***

In case of a status quo scenario, the Netherlands would be opposed against a reduction of funding or the percentage of funding allocated for the climate change focal area. The Netherlands attaches great importance to climate change and would like GEF to remain a major channel for climate change financing, at least as long as the GCF is not fully operational.

Within the climate change area we recognize that adaptation, before and after 2020, will be one of the main topics for developing countries. The Netherlands attaches great importance to a robust future adaptation policy, hopefully within a legally binding framework. The Netherlands would encourage a shift in favour of a bigger adaptation focus: from limiting vulnerability on the short term towards strengthening climate resilience in the longer term. The focus on resilience is of major importance economically, for infrastructure, ecosystems and society. The Netherlands would like to receive some clarification on GEF's position towards the Adaptation Fund. Will GEF's adaptation work mainly consist of cross sectoral work in multi focal area programmes?

In addition and as a side note, with a view to our climate change financing commitments and reporting to UNFCCC, we would like GEF to calculate what percentage of its programs are relevant for climate change mitigation and adaptation. We discussed with the GEF Secretariat that it would be correct and desirable to include other focal areas than climate change mitigation; for instance REDD+ and many other programs from other focal areas are highly climate relevant.

### ***Biodiversity focal area***

The Netherlands generally agrees to the priorities and programs selected in this focal area strategy.

However, the Netherlands is wondering to what extent under this focal area there should be explicit focus on illegal trafficking of rhino and elephant products as outlined in Program 4: Reducing Widespread Poaching of African Elephants and Rhinos and Illegal Trafficking of Elephant Tusks and Rhino Horns para 36-43. As stated in para 8, the GEF-6 strategy should not address all direct or indirect drivers of biodiversity loss. The programs in this GEF-6 strategy should target the three principal direct drivers. Linking Program 4 to sustainable forest management, ecosystem management, resource efficiency and SCP, it would better contribute to the broader objectives of

this focal area strategy, as reflected in para 12. International trade in specimens of wild animals and plants are covered by CITES, which has its own instruments and a financial mechanism.

#### ***Chemicals and waste focal area strategy***

The Netherlands considers paragraph 28 as essential: “(...) the strategy seeks to create a fully integrated focal area for chemicals and waste (...)”.

Furthermore, the Netherlands supports GEF’s focus on POPs and mercury, where GEF is the financial mechanism (for the Stockholm Convention) and an important financial mechanism (for the Minamata Convention).

The Netherlands also strongly supports paragraph 38 - and Annex 1 on page 93, with regard to innovative programming options as well as the activities under Private Sector Partnerships. We welcome in particular the partnerships with a focus on (d) Green development – industries and cities and (g) Life cycle and green chemistry investments, since these two areas seem most promising when it comes to cross-sectoral work in multi-focal area programmes.

#### ***International Waters***

With regard to sustainable water management, ‘targeted research en portfolio learning’ could figure more clearly in the strategy.

In Program 3 (page 113), we would like to stress that Regional Fish Management Organisations (RFMOs) should cooperate with Regional Sea programs. This is a pre-condition for making fishing practices more sustainable and setting up ecosystem based fishery management.

#### ***Land degradation***

More emphasis could be given to the topic of ecosystem restoration, including its importance as a business case for the private sector.

#### ***Sustainable forest management strategy***

More attention could be given to investments in forest governance and forest law enforcement. GEF could play a useful part in creating an enabling environment for the private sector.