

GEF-6 Programming Directions

- Comments Sweden –

General remarks

- Sweden welcomes the high level of ambition in the proposed focal area strategies and signature programs but wants to underline that a final decision on the proposed programming directions needs to be based on the final results from the OPS-5, the final replenishment level, as well as the additional analytical documents on the added value of the proposed strategies and signature programs presented by the GEF-secretariat prior to the next replenishment meeting.
- Sweden generally supports the proposed **signature programs** as they are explicitly designed to address key drivers of environmental degradation, are in line with the evolving post-2015 development agenda and seek to improve synergies across GEF's programming areas. As is stated in the GEF 2020 paper, GEF-interventions targeted on drivers are much more likely to be scalable, thus increasing the impact of GEF resources. An integrated program approach is also better suited to address the interlinkages between various focal areas. To achieve their full potential, Sweden wants to underline the need for these programs to be developed further based on broad and transparent partnerships.
- Sweden's previously expressed view remains that proposed strategies and signature programs ought to a higher extent reflect a strong **focus on LDCs** without compromising expected environmental benefits.
- Sweden is extremely concerned about the almost total absence of a **gender** perspective in both the focal area strategies and the signature programs – both in terms of vision, problem statement and proposed indicators. The fact that gender is not mentioned even once within the focal area strategies and only three times in the signature programs appears to be in contradiction to the GEF Secretariats own stated ambitions to strengthen gender aspects within the operations of the GEF.
- For the GEF to make impact at scale **private sector engagement** is critical. Sweden therefore welcomes that private sector involvement is stated as a key objective in the proposed strategies and programs. However further clarification is needed in regards to concrete action and steps forward. Sweden thus welcomes the decision at the previous replenishment meeting to develop a work plan on private sector engagement to be presented at the next replenishment meeting in December.
- Sweden welcomes the improvements that have been made in the draft **results frameworks**, both in terms of stating goals and objectives as development results to

be achieved at the end of the strategy period rather than an activity, as well as in regards to output and outcome targets. However Sweden wants to reiterate that proposed results frameworks must include objectives and indicators that are addressing development and gender equality. It is not enough, as is the case in several focal area strategies, to only focus on the achievement of environmental outcomes.

Climate strategy

- Sweden particularly welcomes the proposal to support the introduction of performance-based funding mechanisms and policies in recipient countries and the use of performance-based funding for individual GEF projects.

Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy

- Sweden would like to thank the GEF-secretariat for the revised Strategy which is taking steps in the right direction, and welcomes the integrated focal area. However Sweden would still like to see additional strengthening of the wording related to the role of private sector which shall not be limited to partnerships only, as is the case now, but also allow for e.g. the creation of frameworks for cost recovery systems.
- Sweden would like to ask the secretariat why, in the chapter on chemicals and waste, there is no paragraph on guidance from the COP as is the case in the other strategies?
- Sweden would like the GEF strategy to emphasize the importance of benefits of action for countries (health and environment) and also for the private sector in the field of chemical and waste, as exemplified in Global Chemicals Outlook and UNEP LIRA guidance.

On the Montreal protocol:

- Sweden wants to stress the importance to maximize climate as well as **environmental** benefits when phasing out HCFC.
- Sweden also believes that management of equipment containing ODS at end of life (waste), which is not funded by the Multilateral fund under the Montreal protocol, is an important and urgent task that should be addressed by the GEF strategy. When addressing this issue, synergies with other conventions should be taken into account, for instance the Stockholm Convention.

In § 42

Add "in article 5 countries" in the end of the last bullet point and add a new bullet point about waste and synergies:

- Management of equipment containing ODS at end of life (waste), which is not funded by the Multilateral Fund under the Montreal Protocol, should be addressed. When addressing this issue synergies with other conventions should be taken into account, for instance the Stockholm Convention.

In §60

“The funding will ~~only~~ be to maximise climate and environmental benefits and only when these elements are clearly not eligible for funding under the MLF, and would introduce those elements that would maximise climate, ozone and other environmental benefits.

In § 59

Add “In case of the MLF funding, due to compliance related investments, synergies with the GEF should be encouraged in a timely manner”.