

## United Kingdom – Comments on GEF-6 Focal Area Strategies

### Biodiversity

- NPIF text (para 34) should to read:

“Projects funded through the NPIF will support .... three core key elements of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS: PIC, MAT, and Benefit Sharing ~~Providers~~. ~~It would~~ Providers include Parties to the CBD as well as those stakeholders ....”

- On the agriculture it would be useful to mention the Plant Treaty’s Annex 1 <http://www.planttreaty.org/content/crops-and-forages-annex-1>. This includes all the 14 crops highlighted in program 8 para 68 and other important crops and will also highlight the work of the Plant Treaty – which is relevant to in-situ conservation of plant genetic resources
- Query whether programme 4 on Reducing Widespread Poaching of African Elephants and Rhinos and Illegal Trafficking of Elephant Tusks and Rhino Horns is sufficient to meet our commitments on reducing species loss under Target 12 of the Aichi targets? But accept that para 43 of the paper hints at a pilot for wider efforts in future.

### Water

- Query lack of a clear strand on “water efficiency” (technologies but also behaviours and trans boundary policy/decision making.

### Chemicals

- Page 77 (priority areas for funding: DfID asked for more emphasis not only on introducing alternatives to DDT but that approaches are developed to ensure that, for example, resistance to these alternatives through misuse is avoided. Suggest expanding the bullet, as follows:

*“Introduction of alternatives to DDT for vector control **including approaches to improve their safe and rational use for public health**”*

- Page 80 (Outcomes – What are “demonstrated tools”?). Need to avoid development of “tools” which are not used or maintained, as has sometimes been the case. Doubt that using the number of “tools” per se as an indicator without knowing if they are being used, is sensible. Would prefer if the Outcome language could say, “Decision-making tools for prioritisation based on evidence” and the Indicator being a “prioritised list of actions for reducing/eliminating chemicals and wastes”.

## SFM

- Broad support for the aims on deforestation and commodities, and welcome the better fit the World Bank's "landscape" approach, and less emphasis on a sectoral approach to deforestation.
  - But it's less clear how GEF plans to this (page 23 onwards).
  - Actions should be consistent with other similar programmes, not least the actions being taken by the Private Sector including the Consumer Goods Forum.
  - Support the aim should be strengthening the ability of producers to meet the standards of certification schemes such as RSPO and RTRS.
  - What is the GEEF's view on "certification-light" schemes such as the ISPO (Indonesia's own certification scheme); the reference to "one step at a time" (para 3, page 24) would seem to suggest they would be happy with this. This is not a problem provided this approach doesn't undermine more industry-backed schemes such as RSPO.
  - There's a lot about land management and tenure – including zoning and protecting high conservation value areas. But this is a very contentious issue with production/conservation. How does the GEF intend to handle this?
  - Para 5 on page 24 is not clear what is implied by "tool-boxes" and cell phone extension services. This seems to be quite a technical approach, whereas the rest is about capacity building and creating an "enabling" environment including through legality considerations. Risk that this is too wide, too disparate an approach.
- On the annexes: support the aims; important to be consistent with other initiatives which are, increasingly, being developed in this area, especially from the Private Sector; and need to ensure the programme is focused and not too disparate.

## Global fisheries

- No major errors or omissions on the rebuilding global fisheries programme but some more general comments around emphasis and focus of the funding.
- Insufficient focus on two key aspects for fisheries management – science and enforcement capacity. Both are rightly identified in the stated three 'fundamental and interrelated barriers to solving the global fisheries crisis' but much of the focus for the funding appears to be on market and supply chain solutions and economic incentives for fishers. They are both important but without robust scientific advice on fish stocks and the ability to enforce management measures in place the chances of achieving the stated goals are much reduced. There is some mention in here around capacity building, but need to highlight the importance of these elements."