



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

COMPILATION OF COMMENTS
SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS
ON THE
JUNE 2013 WORK PROGRAM

NOTE: This document is a compilation of comments submitted to the Secretariat by Council members concerning the project proposals presented in the June 2013 Work Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL COMMENTS.....	1
BIODIVERSITY	1
1. Argentina: Mainstreaming Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Production Practices of Small Producers to Protect the Biodiversity of High Value Conservation Forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco – UNDP - GEF ID = 5338.....	1
2. Colombia: Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia - FAO - GEF ID = 5288	2
3. Guinea-Bissau: Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau - UNDP - GEF ID = 5368.....	3
4. India: Integrated Management of Wetland Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Water and Food Security – UNEP - GEF ID = 5132.....	4
5. Indonesia: CTI: Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program- Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III) - ADB - GEF ID = 5171	5
6. Sri Lanka: Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustenance of Ecosystem Services in Environmentally Sensitive Areas - UNDP - GEF ID = 5337	6
CLIMATE CHANGE.....	7
7. Regional (Caribbean and Latin American Islands): PPP-IDB Sustainable Caribbean Basin Private Equity Fund (PROGRAM) – IADB - GEF ID = 5388.....	7
8. Regional (Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines): Sustainable Energy for the Eastern Caribbean (SEEC) Program – IADB - GEF ID = 5312.....	8
9. Azerbaijan: Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for Low-carbon End-use Sectors in Azerbaijan - UNDP - GEF ID = 5291	9
10. Belarus: Belarus Green Cities: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium Sized Cities in Belarus - UNDP - GEF ID = 5372	10
11. Brazil: Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5378.....	11
12. Equatorial Guinea: Sustainable Energy for All: Promoting Small Scale Hydropower in Bioko and Other Clean Energy Solutions for Remote Islands - UNDP – GEF ID = 5286	11
13. Guinea: Developing a Market for Biogas Resource Development and Utilization in Guinea - UNDP - GEF ID = 5289	12
14. India: Improving Rural Energy Access in Deficit States - World Bank - GEF ID = 5364.....	14
15. Indonesia: Promoting Energy Efficiency for Non-HCFC Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (PENHRA)(RESUBMISSION) - UNDP - GEF ID	

= 4899.....	15
16. Kazakhstan: Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions for Low-carbon Urban Development - UNDP - GEF ID = 5059.....	17
17. Malaysia: Green Technology Application for the Development of Low Carbon Cities (GTALCC) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5329	18
18. Mexico: Mexico Sustainable Energy Technology Development – World Bank - GEF ID = 5387	19
19. Myanmar: Improvement of Industrial Energy Efficiency - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5321	19
20. Nigeria: Scaling up Small Hydro Power (SHP) in Nigeria - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5375.....	19
21. Russian Federation: National Urban Transport Improvement Project – World Bank - GEF ID = 5396.....	20
22. South Africa: South Africa Wind Energy Project (SAWEP) Phase II - UNDP - GEF ID = 5341.....	21
23. Tunisia: NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan - UNDP - GEF ID = 5340.....	21
INTERNATIONAL WATERS.....	22
24. Regional (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina): Adriatic Sea Environmental Pollution Control Project (I) – World Bank - GEF ID = 5269.....	22
25. Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago): Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC) - FAO - GEF ID = 5304.....	23
26. Regional (Central African Republic, Chad, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria): Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP - UNDP - GEF ID = 4748	23
27. Regional (Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam): Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand - UNEP - GEF ID = 5401	24
28. Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan): Enabling Country of the Transboundary Syr Darya Basin to Make Sustainable Use of their Ground Water Potential and Subsurface Space with Consideration to Climate Variability and Change - UNDP - GEF ID = 5301	24
LAND DEGRADATION.....	26
29. South Africa: Securing Multiple Ecosystems Benefit Through SLM in the Productive But Degraded Landscapes of South Africa - UNDP - GEF ID = 5327	26
MULTI FOCAL AREA.....	27
30. Global (Madagascar, Georgia1): Global Forest Watch 2.0 FW 2.0 - UNEP – GEF ID = 5356	27
31. Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru): Adaptation to the Impact of Climate Change in Water Resources for the Andean Region – World Bank - GEF ID = 5384	27

32. Regional (Cook Islands, FS Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) : R2R- Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities “Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods - UNDP - GEF ID = 5395	29
33. Antigua and Barbuda: Pine Islands - Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy - UNEP - GEF ID = 5390	31
34. Chile: Delivering the Transition to Energy Efficient Lighting - UNEP – GEF ID = 5135	32
35. China: Sustainable Forest Management to Enhance the Resilience of Forests to Climate Change - FAO - GEF ID = 5139	33
36. Haiti: Increasing Resilience of Ecosystems and Vulnerable Communities to CC and Anthropogenic Threats through a Ridge to Reef Approach to BD Conservation and Watershed Management - UNDP - GEF ID = 5380	34
37. Indonesia: Strengthening Forest and Ecosystem Connectivity in RIMBA Landscape of Central Sumatra through Investing in Natural Capital, Biodiversity Conservation, and Land-based Emission Reductions (RIMBA) - UNEP - GEF ID = 5285	34
38. Kenya: Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Agrobiodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya - UNEP - GEF ID = 5272	35
39. Mozambique: Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project - World Bank - GEF ID = 5225	36
40. Russian Federation: Save the Source: Catalyzing Market Transformation of Breweries from a Major Natural Resource Consuming Industry to a Pro-active Steward for Resource Efficient Cleaner Production (RESUBMISSION) - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5293	37
41. Russian Federation: Sustainable Land Management and Ecosystem-based Climate Change Mitigation in the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion (RESUBMISSION) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5104	38
42. Sao Tome and Principe: Promotion of Environmentally Sustainable and Climate-Resilient Grid-based Hydroelectric Electricity through an Integrated Approach in Sao Tome and Principe - UNDP - GEF ID = 5334	38
43. Thailand: Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Peat-swamp Ecosystems - UNDP - GEF ID = 5330	39
44. Yemen: Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago - UNEP - GEF ID = 5347	39

POPs **40**

45. Global: Global Project on the Updating of National Implementation Plans for POPs - UNEP - GEF ID = 5307	40
46. Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines and Vietnam): Demonstration of BAT and BEP in Open Burning Activities in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5082	40
47. Cote d'Ivoire: POPs Pesticides Management Project - World Bank - GEF	

ID = 5362	41
48. Macedonia: Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS - UNIDO - GEF ID = 4385	41
49. Mexico: Sound Management of POPs Containing Waste - UNDP - GEF ID = 5179	42
50. Sri Lanka: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs Wastes and PCB Contaminated Equipment in Sri Lanka - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5314	42

PROJECTS SUBMITTED UNDER PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES.....42

51. Regional (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam): EAS: Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia - UNDP - GEF ID = 5405	42
52. Regional (Cook Islands, FS Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu): R2R: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries - UNDP - GEF ID = 5404	43
53. Regional (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam): EAS: Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas - UNDP - GEF ID = 5393	43
54. Cook Islands: R2R: Conserving Biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Functions through a Ridge to Reef Approach - UNDP - GEF ID = 5348	44
55. Fiji: R2R: Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods - UNDP - GEF ID = 5398	45
56. Nauru: R2R: Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions in Nauru (R2R Nauru) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5381	46

JUNE 2013 GEF WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS (REFERENCE: GEF/C.44/06)

GENERAL COMMENTS

✓ *Canada's Comments*

Canada thanks the GEF Secretariat, the STAP, the Implementing Agencies and recipient countries for putting together a good work program. In the context of limited uncommitted GEF-5 resources, we would appreciate an explanation of how the GEF Secretariat has applied the criteria agreed upon at the 43rd GEF Council meeting to prioritize the remaining GEF-5 programming, including by prioritizing LDCs and SIDS. We encourage the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to work together to ensure that GEF-5 resources are fully programmed in the GEF-5 period, with a focus on projects that clearly relate to recipient countries' obligations and commitments under the MEAs for which the GEF is the financial mechanism. We note that there are four projects that provide Climate Change Mitigation resources to countries that are Annex 1 countries under the UNFCCC. According to paragraph 9 of the GEF Instrument, and as paraphrased on the GEF's website, countries are eligible for GEF funding in a focal area if: (1) they meet eligibility criteria established by the relevant COP of that convention; (2) they are members of the conventions and are countries eligible to borrow from the World Bank (IBRD and/or IDA); and, (3) they are eligible recipients of UNDP technical assistance through country programming. We would appreciate the GEF Secretariat reconfirming by focal area the full list of countries that continue to be eligible, based on the criteria set out in the GEF Instrument.

BIODIVERSITY

1. Argentina: Mainstreaming Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Production Practices of Small Producers to Protect the Biodiversity of High Value Conservation Forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco – UNDP - GEF ID = 5338

✓ *France's Comments*

- The Project will intervene in the Provinces of Misiones, Salta and Jujuy (Yungas) and Salta (Chaco).
- The project aims i) to promote the development and implementation of non-timber forest product (NTFP) production models with small producers as a viable option for incomes and to reduce threats to biodiversity ii) to strengthen the policy and regulatory frameworks to provide safeguards for ecological sustainability of production iii) to promote market initiatives that seek the development of value chains and preferential markets for sustainably harvested products.
- We support the initiative and the project objective, but it seems that the coordination with on-going projects in the area could be improved.
- Especially, the program for the conservation and sustainable management of Gran Chaco Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia co-funded by FFEM may be considered. This project aims to reduce deforestation and degradation of vegetation by suggesting viable alternatives to local populations to generate revenue. In order to do this, the project proposes to create a

regional area of sustainable development and conservation to integrate the preservation of biodiversity in public land use policies. At the same time, carrying out and supporting pilot local economic development programs that will allow identification of activities that improve the quality of life for populations while conserving natural resources. This project is complementary to the regional project sustainable forest management in the transboundary ecosystem of the Chaco.

Opinion: favourable provided that the above recommendations are addressed during project development.

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- We add for consideration that the actually involved stakeholders and institutions, especially the *Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development*, do not have the necessary capacities as well as the required connections to small producers. For this reason we call for the involvement of further institutions and important stakeholders related to the target group (like *Foro Nacional de Agricultura, Institutos de Investigación de la Pequeña Agricultura Familiar, Coordinación de Transferencia y Extensión* and *Subsecretaria de Agricultura Familiar*).
- Furthermore a participative approach is necessary in order to achieve that the peasantry rethink their existing land-use practices. This is only possible by including other important stakeholders.

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, opposes this project and therefore does not join a Council decision that would support this project.

2. Colombia: Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia - FAO - GEF ID = 5288

✓ **Canada's Comments**

- In general, project proposals in the biodiversity focal area should clearly describe how they specifically relate to relevant CBD Aichi Targets. The table on pages 20-22 of the proposal is therefore helpful in tracking the relation between the project and Colombia's efforts in meeting the 2020 Aichi Targets. This could be enhanced by relating the project to Colombia's domestic 2020 Aichi Targets, and by adding more targets/goals associated with the "SMART" indicators.
- We agree with the STAP's call for consistency in project terminology, and highlight that terms such as "socio-ecosystem connectivity" and "mosaics" in between protected areas are not necessarily universal, nor have they been discussed and elaborated within the context of the CBD. Given the use of such terminology, Colombia and FAO should

endeavor to share their ideas, experiences and results with these approaches with the broader biodiversity community in the future.

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The proposal as such is well-articulated and reasonable. In line with the Aichi target thinking of trans-sectorial approaches and landscape-level resource management, it promotes the very innovative concept of socio-ecosystem connectivity (as compared to “classical” biodiversity corridors, based solely on biophysical criteria, and sectorial approaches). In times of climate change and globalization impacts, this kind of project and its aspired impacts (less vulnerability, more resilience) are much sought after by political leaders and in integrated territorial planning strategies. However, Germany requests the following requirements be taken into account:

- **Planning:** Due to the pilot character of the initiative, the planning should allow for thorough analysis of lessons learnt, and discussions / communication / transfer on a regional scale.
- **Financial flows & administration:** with regard to implementation, the planning seems very ambitious for a 4-year time frame.
- **Integration of plans & coherence:** We ask to look in more depth into how integration of the project into national / regional development plans is possible.
- **Social integration:** By definition, the concept of “socio-ecosystem connectivity” includes human interventions in the landscape. Please line out more comprehensively the participation of civil society and indigenous communities on the ground.
- **Sustainability & replication:** Please clarify the project's sustainability strategy and the role of the Regional Corporations in facilitating scaling up results of the project.

3. Guinea-Bissau: Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau - UNDP - GEF ID = 5368

✓ **France's Comments**

- The project will try to try enhance the financial sustainability of Guinea Bissau's protected area system, and will also try to reduce pressure from extraction companies on the Catanhez National Park.
- We support the initiative and particularly the project objective and rationale.
- The cofinancing from the FFEM was discussed with UNDP and both French Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Ecology. There was an agreement to look positively at this project and present this request to the FFEM committee. Confirmation of FFEM cofinancing to this project is thus conditioned to the decision process and further due diligences by the FFEM once the project appraisal document will be prepared.

- The final position of FFEM will also depend from diplomatic opinion on the opportunity of this intervention, knowing France isn't recognizing the current administration of the state which took over from the previous elected government by a military coup.
- To facilitate the project review at FFEM, we strongly recommend to the UNDP staff to invite the FFEM secretariat to participate in the project preparation and at the appraisal mission once it is ready in order to prepare the project in a coordinated manner.

Opinion: Favourable

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States recognizes and appreciates the importance of having a well-funded and collaborative protected areas system to preserve the valuable biodiversity that exists in Guinea-Bissau, and the role this system plays in increasing both local and environmental benefits.
- We suggest the project proposal detail how donor concerns regarding the governance and operational capacity of the FBG (BioGuinea Foundation) have been addressed. For example, will the GEF project monies be used to develop procedures to verify and formalize auditing and reporting protocols?
- Table A.3 on Risk Management notes that "even if minor disruptions [in the political situation occur after 2013 elections] may occur and cannot be prevented, IBAP has effectively operated under similar conditions in the past wherefore the risk appears manageable." How were risks of disruption managed in the past and how is that experience relevant to future impacts on the FBG and Guinea-Bissau's conservation efforts from political instability?
- However, the United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, abstains from participating in the decision.

4. India: Integrated Management of Wetland Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services for Water and Food Security – UNEP - GEF ID = 5132

✓ **Canada's Comments**

- Given that the wetlands have continued to degrade over the years in India, despite substantial investments in conservation, please elaborate on what are the drivers of this degradation and how will this project be different from the other investments in this area.
- We agree with STAP that prior to CEO endorsement, the project should establish more of a link between wetland managers and influencing broader economic development actors and forces. For example, component 2 focuses on training wetlands managers, but does not attempt to link this training to broader influence over local and state planning processes.
- We also agree with the STAP that the project proposal should:
 - (i) provide clear rationale for selecting the three pilot watersheds for the project; and,
 - (ii) clearly outline results indicators and targets, so that the achievement of global environmental benefits can be properly measured.

✓ *USA's Comments*

- The United States appreciates that the proposed project includes investment in science-based assessments, communication, public engagement, conflict management, in order to showcase water and wetlands as crucial to economic development. However, we would like to see the proposal address how the project will build a solid platform for continued, longer term engagement on water and wet land resources after the project is over. For example, will the project partners also try to address land and resource tenure issues, so as to begin resolving these types of conflicts and impediments? Will there be efforts to secure additional funding or resources to capitalize on the GEF project to keep stakeholder groups active and to support changing institutional attitudes about the economic value of wetlands?
- Given the focus on achieving gender equity within the written description of the proposed project, we suggest that it might be preferable to more prominently list that as a goal in the Project Framework table under "II. Building capacity on mainstreaming integrated wetland management at state-level". We understand that the management planning processes would serve to empower the role of women within wetlands or river basin / landscapes through information sharing, education and training, technology transfers, organizational development, financial assistance and policy development. However, we would appreciate more detail on how the project intends to create gender specific programming for all these activities. For example, will there be separate consultation processes for women, led by women? Will communication strategies be different? How will financial assistance be tailored to women?

5. Indonesia: CTI: Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program-Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III) - ADB - GEF ID = 5171

✓ *Canada's Comments*

- We welcome the inclusion of lending instruments in the project, and request an explanation of how the re-flows will be managed and whether they will be channeled back into MPA work.
- We also welcome the inclusion of work on MPA valuation and possible Payment for Ecosystem Services schemes in the proposal. We look forward to seeing the outcomes of this important work, particularly within the context of marine ecosystems.
- We would appreciate an elaboration of: (i) how the project relates conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity with increased local incomes; (ii) how the Government of Indonesia is going to provide the identified co-financing; and, (iii) how the project's outcomes relate to the CBD's 2020 Aichi Targets as well as to Indonesia's national efforts to contribute towards these targets.
- The STAP makes numerous important observations on how the project could better build upon existing projects and initiatives, including Phase II of this same programme. We fully support the STAP's call to further improve the project and request that STAP's recommendations be fully taken on board.

✓ *USA's Comments*

- The United States sees this project as a valuable opportunity to promote the sustainable management of marine biodiversity in Indonesia. We believe the project will advance and

support significant existing efforts by Indonesia, USAID, NOAA, NGOs and others in the region. We encourage the project to closely coordinate and tap into these existing efforts, to maximize effectiveness of investments and avoid duplication of efforts.

- We also recommend that the metrics proposed for the project be further refined. Currently the numbers emphasize management actions (such as formation of MPAs, for instance, or drafting of management plans), but do not provide biological measurable targets.
- We also encourage the project to carefully consider ways in which the risks that alternative income programs might fail to meet community livelihood needs could be mitigated.

6. Sri Lanka: Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustenance of Ecosystem Services in Environmentally Sensitive Areas - UNDP - GEF ID = 5337

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The proposal as such is sound, but very ambitious.

- While all the activities are sound, the question is, whether they can be achieved in and be aggregated to one project taking into account the suggested funding and time frame.
- In relation to the constraints to managing sites designated as ESAs – (lack of) incentives for landholders come out as near the top of the list. These aren't given enough emphasis in the project design, but without them, it's difficult to see how all the other mechanisms (planning, institutional, management, financing, etc.) are going to work. In order to address the very profitable but unsustainable land use practices that are going on in the ESAs, opportunity cost must be analyzed and incentives for different land use need to be created. Furthermore, these measures need high level support and high level policies – e.g. fiscal measures, participation of Ministry of Finance, etc. in order to be successful.
- Furthermore, the proposal does not mention the challenges with regard to the institutional capacity of the Ministry of Environment, and especially the Biodiversity Secretariat, and to a lesser extent the Forest Department, Department of Wildlife/ National Parks, Coast Conservation Department, etc. (in staffing and institutional terms, influence on the ground).
- During further project development the full project scope, existing experiences from The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) shall be taken thoroughly into account. This could also involve existing approaches such as GIZ's methodology for the Integration of Ecosystem Services into Development Planning (which helps to better analyze ecosystem services risks and opportunities and related trade-offs. This is particularly relevant when it comes to designing policy instruments that aim to integrate ecosystem service value.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, opposes this project and therefore does not join a Council decision that would support this project.

CLIMATE CHANGE

7. Regional (Caribbean and Latin American Islands): PPP-IDB Sustainable Caribbean Basin Private Equity Fund (PROGRAM) – IADB - GEF ID = 5388

✓ Canada's Comments

- Canada supports this project and welcomes its objective of catalyzing private sector investments in alternative energies to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- To strengthen the proposal, we request the following information, which should also be reflected in the final project proposal:
 - clear targets should be included in the results framework; minimum quantitative targets should be included so that the GEF can properly assess the efficiency of the proposed use of donor funds
 - elaborate on how this project will build on GEF project 840 (Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Program). Please include a discussion of the challenges encountered in project 840, its lessons learned and how the lessons learned are addressed in the current project proposal. In particular, how will this project address the difficulties project 840 encountered related to using loans and guarantees for renewable energy.

✓ Japan's Comments

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000

Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States supports this project's goal of increasing sustainable energy development in the Caribbean.
- The project would benefit by explaining a framework for what constitutes successful deployment of this fund.
- We would also like to underline that we understand the Secretariat will resubmit this proposal if additional resources are identified for it prior to CEO endorsement, and that the fund will not invest in Cuba

8. Regional (Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines): Sustainable Energy for the Eastern Caribbean (SEEC) Program – IADB - GEF ID = 5312

✓ **Canada's Comments**

- As with project 5388, Canada requests an explanation of how the current project builds on the lessons learned from GEF project 840 (Caribbean Renewable Energy Development Program), and ask that this information be included in the final project proposal.

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000

Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States is supportive of this project's focus on both energy efficiency and renewable energy, and its potential for scaling up in the future especially given the Caribbean islands' high reliance on imported fossil fuel energy.

9. Azerbaijan: Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for Low-carbon End-use Sectors in Azerbaijan - UNDP - GEF ID = 5291

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Component 3 defines as one expected output among other things at least one NAMA utilizing carbon market mechanisms. This output is dependent on UNFCCC negotiations, a fact that should be reflected in the risk assessment and monitoring. Further clarification is required in how far credits sold via the carbon market require GEF funding in terms of incremental reasoning.

- Component 2 includes a prioritization of NAMAs. It is not clear if the single prioritization criterion is abatement cost and if the indicated co-finance will depend on the selected NAMA. In this context, the proposal talks about the critical role of SOCAR's full engagement in terms of monetizing the domestic to international oil and gas price difference into an additional financing source. The conditionality of this commitment to requesting GEF funding is not clear and should be defined. This is also reflected in the Risk assessment for the category "domestic energy markets". The willingness of the government to reduce fossil fuel subsidies and monetize the lower subsidy levels into renewable energy investment should be clarified.
- It is not fully clear if SOCAR is a private or a public (state-owned) company (section C, for example, defines SOCAR contribution as private sector contribution while in other

parts SOCAR is referred to as national company).

- Component 1 and component 2 are about the establishment of GHG BAU reference baselines, emission reduction targets, and MACs. It is not clear if this represents a duplication of the activities executed under the “ADB Economics of Climate Change in Central and West Asia”-program.
- Clarification is sought in how far independent (non statal companies) power producers are permitted in Azerbaijan and in how far opposition between SOCAR and these IPP is avoided in the project design.
- Component 3 talks about a contribution of 15 mln US\$ for the implementation of the climate strategy. Clarification is sought whether the implementation of the strategy is excluded from the indicated co-financing as it constitutes a baseline investment.
- In the description of component 3, the proposal says that GEF resources will be used for incremental investment in relation 1:23. However under item 5 “global environmental benefits” it says that 1.3 mln US\$ from GEF mobilizes 15.0 mln US\$.

✓ **USA’s Comments**

- The United States supports this project’s goals to gather baseline data in the oil and gas end-use sectors.
- We are concerned that implementation of NAMAs will be difficult given the strong orientation of the economy toward oil and gas. The final project documentation should consider as well the presence of any energy subsidies and potential impact on the project’s likelihood of success.

10. Belarus: Belarus Green Cities: Supporting Green Urban Development in Small and Medium Sized Cities in Belarus - UNDP - GEF ID = 5372

✓ **Canada’s Comments**

- Canada requests justification for providing CCM support to an Annex 1 country under the UNFCCC.
- We also request clarification of the project’s expected outputs, to ensure that they are directly related to CCM-2 and CCM-4 GEF-5 objectives, and requests that this information also be included in the final project proposal.
 - For example, in the current project proposal, the project includes “1.1 Green urban development Plan for Belarus” and “4.6 Funding of Green Cities Association”. The final proposal should clarify how these project elements directly generate global environmental benefits consistent with GEF-5 objectives.
- While Canada is supportive of taking a cross-cutting, multi-focal area approach to GEF programming when feasible, we want to ensure that GEF resources are only used to fund the portion of projects that generate global environmental benefits. Please confirm that this is indeed the case in this project.

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

The concept is overall feasible and addresses relevant problems of urban transportation in Belarus. Co-financing from the national level is adequate, especially given the possibly limited funds of project partners. Germany supports the STAP comments on public transport improvements– beyond tram improvements (which may take some time), bus lanes and BRT (light).

- We strongly recommend cooperation with the projects and initiatives supported by the German Ministry for Economic Development on climate-friendly mobility in the Ukraine, as they have developed into a role model and knowledge hub on sustainable urban transport for the Russian-speaking audience, especially concerning cycling (see <http://www.mobilnlist.org.ua/home/> and <http://velotransport.info/>)
- Component 4: Although the initiative is welcomed, funding beyond the GEF project duration will become a major challenge. Possible benefits for the cities need to be better outlined.

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States believes this project could be very beneficial, and could also be a model for other eastern European cities.
- We are encouraged that the project mentions discussions with local officials to determine what types of sustainable transport are desirable in each city. However, the project would benefit from including input from local civil society organizations, and perhaps planning to partner with them during the implementation phase of the project.
- However, the United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, abstains from participating in the decision.

11. Brazil: Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5378

- *No comments were received for this project.*

12. Equatorial Guinea: Sustainable Energy for All: Promoting Small Scale Hydropower in Bioko and Other Clean Energy Solutions for Remote Islands - UNDP – GEF ID = 5286

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- The project framework defines an output “reduction of insurer premiums/ contingencies”.

- It is not defined how this output shall be achieved and it should be clarified if direct support to insurers is excluded. Further, the indicated total cost of component 2 seems rather high.
- The proposal mentions a barrier of limited hydropower expertise at MMIE and MFE which seems strange in view of the country relying to one third on hydropower. In view of the significant hydropower share refurbishment/ repowering could be taken into the list of measures to enhance electricity production.
- Paragraph 11 describes that the Chinese SynoHydro Corporation might invest in hydropower activities together with government's oil and gas revenues. Clarification is sought about how oil and gas revenues are assigned either to the SynoHydro Corporation or to the GEF funded activities, respectively in how far replication can be achieved.

✓ USA's Comments

- We are concerned that the mitigation measures for the risks mentioned are not strong enough. The lack of policy and regulatory structure for small scale renewable energy coupled with the high risk of conflict among various government institutions is worrying.
- The project could benefit from an explanation of the relative costs and benefits of small scale hydropower compared to other renewable energy options, especially given the possibility of climate change affecting rainfall patterns and river flow (reduced rainfall/river flow will have a proportionally larger effect on small hydropower projects as compared to large hydropower projects).
- The project would also be strengthened by including public participation, especially participation by any local civil society organizations that could provide input or help to implement these projects.
- The project mentions fuel subsidies and a plan to phase them out, but it is not clearly explained how this would happen.
- The United States believes the goal of sustainable energy development is beneficial in Equatorial Guinea. However, the United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, abstains from participating in the decision.

13. Guinea: Developing a Market for Biogas Resource Development and Utilization in Guinea - UNDP - GEF ID = 5289

✓ Frances's Comments

- The project aims to establish a functioning and effective market for the widespread use and commercialization of biogas technologies in Guinea.
- The barriers to be addressed are well analysed and the components to be put in place well described.
- The project should rely on local and international NGOs who have experience in biogas. We suggest to set up competitive process with call for proposals to select projects for the realization of the pilot units and select the best organizations able to implement these units in the Guinean context.

Opinion: Favourable

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The proposal remains somewhat unclear about the collaboration and complementarity to existing biogas activities in Guinea.

- Page 5 says that the baseline for component 3 is the PRONIASE program. It is not clear why the baseline is not represented by the existing EU programme (National program for domestic biogas in Guinea). This is crucial in terms of defining the incremental investments. The incremental nature of the GEF funding is also unclear with view to component 1 on the creation of an enabling policy.
- Component 2.2 is about developing an operational micro-finance mechanism. However, the proposal does not describe whether finance represents the largest and singular barrier. If finance is not the major barrier a shift towards training and construction training could be worthwhile. It is unclear whether manufacturers of biogas installations or buyers/operators shall be the beneficiaries.
- In terms of component 3.2 the use of biogas instead of traditional fuels shall be promoted. Thereby it should be taken into account that biogas accrues on a permanent basis while consumption is temporary. Further, it should be taken into account that manure might not be available throughout the entire year (e.g. summer when livestock is kept extensively).
- The benefit of component 3.6 (“completed value chain for biogas use”) needs further explanation especially for the small-scale biogas applications. In general further clarification on the benefit of promoting the use of biogas and the technology to promote its use is sought.
- The need for the modification or development of adequate policies on biogas use is not clear.
- The assumed lifetime of 20-years is very long and aspiration of such high quality technology might not be appropriate. In this context exchange with SNV biogas programme should be sought (e.g. SNV supported Vietnamese household-level biogas construction and servicing programmes).
- The GHG mitigation potential as mentioned under component 1 for the 10 large-scale biogas plants (around 56,000 tCO₂e/year) seems overestimated especially in view of typically high project emissions of biogas plants.
- The necessity to support large-scale biogas installations should be reassessed both in terms of incremental cost reasoning and in complementarity to existing activities.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States believes this project is promising given that there are already biogas initiatives underway in the country.
- The proposal does not clearly explain who would own, operate, and maintain the 2,000 digesters – whether the electricity and heat produced will be used by families or sold to commercial enterprises. We recommend a more comprehensive explanation of the ownership and management plans for this project.

14. India: Improving Rural Energy Access in Deficit States - World Bank - GEF ID = 5364

✓ Canada's Comments

- We note that the project's objective appears to be increasing access to energy in rural areas in India. This is an important goal, and one could warrant GEF support if it has clear global environmental benefits, such as reduced GHG emissions as a result of the adoption of renewable energy technologies. This justification is not clear from the project document. We request this project be re-drafted before final approval, to explicitly justify GEF funding.
- In addition the final project proposal should be improved by:
 - clarifying the use of non-grant instruments, along with how resource reflows will be managed; and,
 - highlighting how this project relates to and improves upon several previous clean / renewable energy projects already implemented in India: GEF projects 4900, 10, and 76.

✓ Japan's Comments

- We welcome this project proposal expecting equity participation as co-finance from private project developers. However, while the average co-finance ratio of GEF5 climate change projects is 1:11, this project's co-finance ratio is 1:2. We would like to know the reason behind this and also like to hear if the World Bank could design this project to attract more co-finance.

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany supports the numerous and significant guidance given by the STAP and the GEF Technical Comments. Additionally, we have the following comments:

- It is not clear how the activity contributes to the objectives of the GEF in the focal area "climate change" (the proposal does not indicate the relevant GEF objective, successful outcomes and outcome indicators). Promotion of rural access to electricity is not an objective of the GEF.

- The private developer will be responsible for project implementation and for choosing the technology. Germany agrees with the STAP that it is not clear whether the private developer will also be responsible for the operation of installed systems or whether there are sufficient existing rural grids under development where power suppliers are meant to get access and to feeding electricity.
- Germany requests to provide more detailed information on the Project Components. It is not fully clear in this context what the baseline scenario is and what the associated baseline projects are.
- Component 2 (page 9) states that the PIUs (Project Implementing Units) would be staffed with professional staff. Would this staff include local professionals or trained people from local villages?

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. The United States believes that the goal of this project is beneficial and that renewable energy could play a significant role in achieving this goal. We are requesting to see this project again because the project lacks discussion of global environmental benefits and is focused on local development goals rather than global environmental improvement. We ask that the project documentation include environmental indicators and an explanation of how the GEF grant will be used to cover the incremental funding gap to provide global environmental benefits.
- The project documentation should also include an update on whether or not India has agreed to reduce the challenges to implementation of this project through assistance with policy barriers and transaction costs.
- Finally, we recommend inclusion of public participation to help gauge how well these renewable energy projects will be received by their target audience.

15. Indonesia: Promoting Energy Efficiency for Non-HCFC Refrigeration and Air Conditioning (PENHRA)(RESUBMISSION) - UNDP - GEF ID = 4899

✓ Canada's Comments

- We welcome this project and note that it will be an interesting example of GEF-MLF collaboration to achieve dual environmental benefits.
- We support this project and note its approach is fully consistent with the co-financing ideas we have supported under the Montreal Protocol. In the approach, the Multilateral Fund (MLF) provides incremental funding to assist a country in transitioning from HCFCs to low-GWP alternatives in a given sector, while another source of funding provides assistance in the same sector to ensure that this transition is carried out in a manner that maximizes the benefits to the climate.
- As noted in the proposal, when manufacturers convert their processes to manufacture non-HCFC based equipment, this provides an opportunity to address process modifications to optimize the energy efficiency of the equipment.

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- Germany strongly asks for consideration of its comments made on March 28, June 7 and 12.
- The project proposal at it is today, can be regarded as technology neutral. It lacks ambition regarding energy efficiency (standards) and does not promote the application and distribution of climate friendly, natural refrigerants. Germany expects a reconceptualization of the project and its components, so that the project clearly and measurably delivers climate benefits. Apart from existing efforts in the framework of the HPMP the Indonesian government shall be supported in developing and applying high energy efficiency standards for appliances in the cooling and AC sector.

Support mechanisms shall clearly focus on the production and the application of highly efficient and climate-friendly refrigeration/cooling technology. Market development of climate-friendly refrigeration and AC-technology shall thus be the core of the project.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States is encouraged by the high cost benefit ratio of this project in terms of finances as well as global environmental benefits.
- The project could benefit from including a framework for what would constitute a successful project outcome, especially in terms of increased consumer awareness of energy efficient air conditioners and consequent behavioral change.

16. Kazakhstan: Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions for Low-carbon Urban Development - UNDP - GEF ID = 5059

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany has some major comments:

- Component 2: The urban sector is identified as one of seven priority areas for economic growth and GHG mitigation. In this context, further clarification on whether the relation of public commitment for NAMA development in this sector and expected private sector engagement are sufficient to achieve the assumed NAMA targets.
- The main barrier for the currently low private sector engagement in Municipal Management Companies is assumed to be a financial barrier. An assessment whether providing finance through revolving funds and EADB is sufficient to overcome barriers to the extent assumed and to the extent reflected in the size of the revolving fund is lacking. Such an assessment is crucial if the funds shall be fully absorbed by the private sector.
- Component 5: It is not clear whether the total targeted emission reduction potential of around 7 MtCO₂e corresponds to the direct mitigation potential of the two GEF supported NAMAs (one credited and one out of 15 urban NAMAs) or to those expected to be implemented under the revolving fund and credited NAMAs. This has a significant impact on the assessment of the cost effectiveness of the GEF funding.

Further, Germany has some minor comments that should also be taken into account when developing the project:

- Component 4: It is not clear how the measures “greening of public areas” and “extend the technological innovation in the city’s water pumping system” contribute to climate change mitigation.
- Germany welcomes the proposed MRV approach of building upon the ETS MRV system to ensure consistency across sectors and to avoid duplicating efforts. The objective to potentially include the urban sector in the ETS should be evaluated on the basis of a cost-benefit-analysis.

- The proposal mentions that there is any global experience with NAMA implementation. However, there are many ongoing studies and programmes on climate resilient cities and on climate change mitigation in the urban sectors. It is recommended establishing contact to these activities.

17. Malaysia: Green Technology Application for the Development of Low Carbon Cities (GTALCC) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5329

✓ Japan's Comments

- The Japanese government will start a feasibility study for large-scale formation of greenhouse gas emission reduction projects in Iskandar, Malaysia shortly and will start an investment project next year. This project is to support realize a low carbon society blue print, developed jointly by Japan and Malaysia, by utilizing Japanese environmental technology and products applicable to smart cities. We request close cooperation by the GEF agency and its executing partners with the Ministry of the Environment of Japan to complement each other's activities and maximize synergy effects.

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany supports the conclusions by the STAP. The development of an extensive BRT network to foster public transportation is welcomed. However:

- The concept has some shortcomings especially with regard to the envisaged multi-sectorial and holistic approach for urban development planning, as most activities are limited to the transport sector and have a narrow, technology-oriented focus.
- From a transport perspective, there is a shortage of information on how large the mitigation potential of the EVs will be. Although electric mobility can play role in future sustainable urban mobility concepts, there should be more information on its expected climate benefits.
- There seems to be a weak embedment of the 2 isolated measures EV and BRT into an overarching concept for sustainable (urban) mobility. We recommend a thorough review of the proposal a) to fulfill the requirements of a multi-sectorial approach and b) avoid the current technology-focused approach based on only two technologies (EVs and BRT).
- There is potential for cooperation with projects of the bilateral German development cooperation: i.a. TRANSfer (www.transferproject.org) (energy efficiency NAMAs) and mitigation in the Land Transport Sector in the ASEAN Region (<http://www.citiesforcleanair.org/EEandCCM.html>) with regard to climate-friendly transport in general.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States is supportive of this project and believes that low carbon urban development is an important means to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.
- We suggest that the proposal include a clearer explanation of the types of EVs that are planned for use (plug in hybrids or battery electric vehicles), as well as examination of the challenges that EV adoption faces, especially in terms of consumers' willingness to pay higher prices.
- The project could also be strengthened by including evidence that BRT and EVs are types of low carbon transport that would be welcomed and adopted by the people in these cities.
- Lastly, a more comprehensive results framework would be helpful in defining what constitutes success in the various components of this project

18. Mexico: Mexico Sustainable Energy Technology Development – World Bank - GEF ID = 5387

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- Germany agrees that strengthening the current status of the Sustainable Energy Fund is necessary as well as improving the current process through a better presentation of the project. Besides the technologies that are mature, we consider it necessary to also pay attention to those technologies that are in the phase of development, and still need support in market introduction.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States believes that this project is valuable to improving the quality of clean energy technology initiatives already underway, and is supportive of efforts to better coordinate activities of the relevant stakeholders.

19. Myanmar: Improvement of Industrial Energy Efficiency - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5321

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States is supportive of efforts to increase energy efficiency, and believes that examination of current energy subsidies and encouragement of their removal is particularly important.

20. Nigeria: Scaling up Small Hydro Power (SHP) in Nigeria - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5375

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States is supportive of this project's goal of expanding electricity access through expanded use of a non-fossil fuel source. We welcome the inclusion of the

private sector in the project development and encourage that co-financing from private sector entities should be sought and incorporated in the final project proposal.

- The project would be strengthened by an explanation of where the power generated from these small hydropower projects will go (are there power purchase agreements in place), who will pay for transmission connections, and what proportion of power is expected to be kept locally vs. exported for sale.

21. Russian Federation: National Urban Transport Improvement Project – World Bank - GEF ID = 5396

✓ *Japan's Comments*

- Japan acknowledges the importance of these projects and would like to have detailed information on them, including the area in which they will be implemented. We sincerely request the Secretariat to provide us the final project documents for these two projects to be reviewed by the Council prior to CEO endorsement.

✓ *Germany's Comments*

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The concept is overall feasible and addresses relevant problems of urban transportation in Russia. Additionally we recommend the following:

- It should be checked whether there is any duplication of work with the current process of establishing a sustainable transport strategy for Russian cities hosting the FIFA Worldcup 2018. Results of the strategy may be highly relevant especially for cities such as Saint Petersburg and could also guide investments of the GEF project.
- Subcomponent 2.1.: The GEF funding focuses on investments into ITS systems/equipment. There is no mentioning of the investment being embedded in an overall strategy of the city to improve the sustainability of its transport system (other than some marginal improvements to the tram system). Without such a strategy, ITS will possibly not help much– it is neither sufficient to improve the gridlock situation nor to mitigate GHG emissions. Benefits for pedestrians or cyclists are also not clearly laid down– how would they use ITS services and how would that mitigate congestion problems? ITS for public transport is a good choice, but standing alone it will not improve the reliability of the public transport system. The scope of activities in St. Petersburg should thus be reevaluated.
- Component 2: Incremental activities mention TDM including parking. This is very welcome, but should be included in the three activity descriptions of the pilot cities.
- Component 3: It is not clear whether “various baseline studies” are already ongoing or only planned.
- It seems that the effects of the national policy to be established on GHG emissions are not yet taken into account.

22. South Africa: South Africa Wind Energy Project (SAWEP) Phase II - UNDP - GEF ID = 5341

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

The proposal is well structured and clearly defines the planned intervention and complementarity to other activities. There are, however, some minor comments:

- Under component 1 the establishment of a platform between SAREC and the government as a section of the IPP unit might be appropriate while a needs analysis, as proposed, has already been done and duplication should be avoided.
- GIZ has just contracted a study on the development of grid connection standards (i.e., grid codes) and guidelines under their South African energy programme targeting grid and system integration. For the avoidance of duplication an exchange should be sought.
- Concerning component 3, exchange to the “Green Skills Programme” should be sought. Therein, a curriculum for wind service technicians has been developed by SAGEN and the Green Skills Programme and is currently in the process of being approved by SAQA/DHET.

✓ **USA's Comments**

- With regards to the South Africa Wind Energy Project, the United States is concerned about this project as we believe that local content requirements for renewable energy potentially deter investors and raise the cost of renewable technology. LCRs in developing countries hinder development and distort trade by providing more favorable treatment for domestic over imported goods, frequently in violation of trade and investment commitments.
- We therefore request that Component 1 of this project be revised to focus on an evaluation of the barriers imposed by increasing local content requirements and not on their "optimization and improvement." GEF resources should not be helping investors utilize local content requirements.
- We therefore request the opportunity to review the project documentation again prior to CEO endorsement to ensure these changes have been made.

23. Tunisia: NAMA Support for the Tunisian Solar Plan - UNDP - GEF ID = 5340

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany has three major concerns which shall be taken into account during the design of the final project proposal regarding: 1) Verification of the incremental reasoning, 2) Better coordination with existing and planned activities in Tunisia, and 3) Clarification of the institutional framework. In detail:

- Tunisia is already working on defining a feed-in tariff (FiT) for renewable energies. There will be a supporting mechanism for renewable energy technologies which would *de facto* render the performance-based emission reduction payment system as proposed by the implementing agency obsolete. This aspect is very critical and requires new evaluation of the incremental cost reasoning.
- The coordination with related climate- and energy activities in Tunisia is not sufficient. There are manifold ongoing and planned activities in the Tunisian energy sector. Among them, are the planned activities by the German Climate and Technology Initiative (DKTI) and an ongoing activity by the German International Climate Initiative (ICI) on Measurement, Reporting, and Verification. DKTI envisages supporting the Tunisian Plan Solaire starting from 2014.
- Germany observes duplication of envisaged activities and expected results under Component 1.3 (scenario studies). This also applies to experiences for operation of solar PV plants in desert areas where, for example, plants in the USA already have been accumulating experiences for several decades.
- The proposed system boundaries of the NAMA, in particular the reasons for designating pilot measures pertaining to three technologies (wind, PV and CSP), instead of designating the Tunisian Solar Plan as one NAMA are unclear. For all technologies it is necessary to determine the incremental cost reasoning (the technologies are already profitable or will become profitable with the planned Feed-in Tariff and the necessity for installing the technologies as described under Output 3.1 for grid stabilization is not clear).

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States is supportive of this project and its goal of emissions reductions through wider deployment of sustainable power generation.
- The project mentions the existence of fossil fuel subsidies as a barrier to successful implementation of this project and discusses the difficulty in achieving their removal. Final project documentation should include a more thorough discussion of the impact of these barriers to the project's sustainability and ability for replication and upscaling.

INTERNATIONAL WATERS

24. Regional (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina): Adriatic Sea Environmental Pollution Control Project (I) – World Bank - GEF ID = 5269

✓ Japan's Comments

- Please utilize the lessons learnt by the following project of UN Trust Fund for Human Security in order to maximize synergy effect. UNDP and UNESCO have worked on capacity building for community based waste processing since 2007 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Bosnia and Herzegovina	Community Reconciliation through Poverty Reduction	2,349,579.83
------------------------	--	--------------

25. Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago): Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC) - FAO - GEF ID = 5304

✓ **USA's Comments**

- United States believes that this project represents a valuable effort to manage bycatch in Latin American and Caribbean Trawl fisheries. We would encourage, however, this project to consider ways in which additional countries could be involved.

26. Regional (Central African Republic, Chad, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria): Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP - UNDP - GEF ID = 4748

✓ **France's Comments**

- The project will try to achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods.
- Specifically the project will address the following issues:
 - Weak regional and national governance and cooperation frameworks for ecosystem-based management ;
 - Absence of sustainable financing mechanisms to support SAP implementation ;
 - Unsustainable practices for the sustainable use of riparian and lacustrine zones ;
 - Weak governance of groundwater and low incorporation of groundwater and climatic variability and change into the SAP.
- The project is well designed and documented, but, as there are many projects and programs with similar issues concerning Lake Chad sustainable development, the project should request some stronger analysis on existing data and initiatives.
- In particular, the Lake Chad preservation project cofinanced by the FFEM is a continuation of the ongoing Lake Chad Sustainable Development Program (PRODEBALT) in connection with the forward programs of FEM and the African Development Bank. It is intended to be a tool to assist with decision-making for defining a sustainable development policy for Lake Chad and integrates all of the existing data produced in connection with previous research and study programs as well as:
 - The planning model for water management in the Lake Chad Basin as a tool for managing water resources throughout the Basin ; This component is essential for taking into consideration all the compartments (Lake and aquifer, rivers, wetlands) and flows (precipitation, run-off, infiltration, evaporation) of the explanatory water

cycle of the Lake's water balance. The Water Charter as a framework component for management of the Basin, for which the formulation of technical schedules leads to supplementary investigations.

Opinion: favourable, with the above clarification on coordination between projects

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

27. Regional (Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam): Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand - UNEP - GEF ID = 5401

- *No comments were received for this project.*

28. Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan): Enabling Country of the Transboundary Syr Darya Basin to Make Sustainable Use of their Ground Water Potential and Subsurface Space with Consideration to Climate Variability and Change - UNDP - GEF ID = 5301

✓ **Germany's Comment**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- The proposal contains a review of associated projects in the region and in related countries, focusing mainly on UN activities. We propose to also consider the following projects:
 - IWRM related European projects, such as GIZ Transboundary Water Management in Central Asia Project (TWMCA) and the EU Water Governance Project (2009-2010); and
 - Previous groundwater related activities.
- The proposal specifies the Ministers (Chairmen) of Nature respectively Environmental Protection as focal points for endorsement. The Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources as well as technical partner such as the Geological Institutes might be others.
- The question how to improve the awareness for groundwater subjects in the national daily water resources works is not addressed in the proposal. Despite the legal situation in the countries' Water Codes, groundwater subjects are generally not part of the water resources management. The reasons for this situation are various, but are mainly seen in the administrative division. We seek clarification on how the project will deal with this challenge.
- A very relevant country of the Syrdarya basin, Uzbekistan, is not included in the project activities. Uzbekistan is the only country that has two large groundwater areas upstream and downstream to Tajikistan (Fergana Valley upstream and Dostyk, the Arnasai depression, the alluvial plain of Syrdarya downstream). Kyrgyzstan does not have large groundwater reserves in the Syrdarya, Tajikistan has only groundwater aquifers isolated in smaller pre-mountain basins around the Fergana Valley, and Kazakhstan has some aquifers however at the Syrdarya, but those are very saline. For this reason, the possibility of the Uzbek participation in the project shall be reconsidered.
- The main instrument is the TDA, which is a method to rapidly assess the main root causes and impacts for a region in a transboundary context. We are of the opinion that the TDA analysis does not allow going into detail for such a large region (even excluding large territories). However, the results of the TDA may deliver some starting points for further assessment. We seek clarification on whether such deeper analysis is planned.

LAND DEGRADATION

29. South Africa: Securing Multiple Ecosystems Benefit Through SLM in the Productive But Degraded Landscapes of South Africa - UNDP - GEF ID = 5327

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The proposed project objective is very relevant and addresses important challenges in the rural areas of South Africa. It follows a comprehensive approach to develop and mainstream SLM under changing climatic conditions. At this stage, the proposed scope seems however fairly ambitious, as already pointed out by the STAP.

- The current proposal emphasizes very much technical aspects and solutions, such as tools, methods, data and information management. In order to increase the sustainability of the project, the further project development should take community involvement more into consideration and support active participation of all stakeholders. This also includes exploring innovative policy instruments for the local governance of natural resources, such as e.g. Biocultural Community Protocols (BCPs);
- The presented concept of a green economy should be explained more clearly. It should also refer and build on existing agreements and reference initiatives, such as the South African Green Economy Accord. With regard to the creation of alternative livelihoods and “green jobs”, potential alternative sources of income should be specified in more detail as options to reduce pressure on natural resources;
- During the elaboration of the full project scope, existing experiences from the Economics of Land Degradation (ELD) Initiative and The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) should be taken thoroughly into account. This could also involve existing approaches such as GIZ's methodology for the Integration of Ecosystem Services into Development Planning (which helps to better analyse underlying causes of land and water degradation and who depends on ecosystem services, and who impacts on them). This is particularly relevant when it comes to analyzing potential trade-offs between different development activities such as mining, fracking, agriculture and other economic activities;
- The involvement of the private sector could be explored further, and as far as possible go beyond the proposed aspects of corporate social responsibility. This could, for example, include exploring business schemes for the sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity, payments for ecosystem services, eco- and farm-tourism, or partnerships for the fair and equitable use of genetic resources (Access & Benefit Sharing);
- For the development of the full size project, existing projects / programmes and experiences should be taken into account, such as the NEPAD/African Union Support to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), and the SADC/ BMU (German Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety)-project development of integrated MRV systems for REDD+ in the SADC region.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States notes that the list of stakeholders is quite broad, and it seems reasonable to believe that consultation will be effective. We suggest that the project proposal detail how consultations will proceed with local communities and community institutions—do the partners listed (e.g., Land Care Program, Working for Water Program) have well-functioning stakeholder engagement efforts and extension networks that can be used to disseminate information and secure buy in from farmers and households? Given the ambitious goals for the number of farmers and households adopting improved watershed management, conservation agriculture and planting of thousands of trees, we recommend more detail on how community engagement will be used to achieve these outcomes.
- We believe that the proposal is somewhat vague with regard to what is meant by conservation agriculture. We suggest that the proposal provide a definition and explain what activities by farmers could be counted. We note that the criteria by which South Africa will evaluate the uptake of conservation agriculture could be useful for other countries, regions, or stakeholder groups.

MULTI FOCAL AREA

30. Global (Madagascar, Georgia1): Global Forest Watch 2.0 FW 2.0 - UNEP – GEF ID = 5356

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. While we support the project's intentions to build an open access platform for promoting sustainable forest management, prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed. In particular, we would like to see greater evidence that the technology will work within the project's time frame. We would also like a clearer explanation of the rationale for the choice of pilot countries.

31. Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru): Adaptation to the Impact of Climate Change in Water Resources for the Andean Region – World Bank - GEF ID = 5384

✓ Japan's Comments

- Please closely coordinate with the project of UNTFHS in Bolivia. WFP, FAO and UNICEF have been strengthening the Human Security of rural communities which are vulnerable to climate change since the end of 2011.

Bolivia	Strengthening of Human Security of Rural Communities through integral support to their resilience, response capacity and food security situation	\$ 2,041,177
---------	--	--------------

- Also, in Peru, please utilize the lessons learnt by the project implemented by UNDP, FAO, WFP, UNICEF, PAHO and WHO through UNTFHS in 2006 in order to maximize synergy effect.

Peru	Natural Disasters in Peru: from Damage Limitation to Risk Management and Prevention	1,576,484.62
------	---	--------------

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- Germany appreciates the attempt of addressing the resilience of vulnerable ecosystems in the Andean region across national borders which is an important yet challenging appointment. However, for successful implementation of the proposed activities, Germany recommends explaining how they build on national policies and plans, other projects and interventions and findings from the National Communications (baseline scenario). Germany further recommends elaborating on what kind of activities are already covered by those national plans and where additional activities start that are delivered by the GEF project (additional cost reasoning).
- Regarding the proposed activities, Germany recommends refining the activities and describing precisely how the activity is linked to the expected output and where exactly they will have an impact in the rather large area covered by the project. Calculating the amount of the fund per year and country, the project should focus on few watersheds. We would appreciate more information on which vulnerability assessment the selection of watersheds is based on, the target areas in each country including a description of the socio-economic characteristics of the communities in the target areas, the climate change impacts in the target region as well as an indication how each component will contribute to reducing the vulnerability of the communities to the expected climate impacts. In addition, Germany, recommends better explaining how the special component for Ecuador fits into the project as also suggested in the STAP review.
- Germany appreciates that the SGCAN makes use of its expertise, core competency, its role and mandate given by the four countries in bringing the countries together and facilitating exchange as proposed in component 1. However, the allocation of funds seems disproportionate and might be reconsidered.
- Since the project endeavors to mainstream climate change into national policies and plans, Germany recommends identifying and advancing the cooperation with national counterpart institutions. These counterparts should include several relevant line ministries and meteorological institutes. The latter once are also currently strengthened by the recently started project PRESDDES, financed by the Finish Government, which can be a benefit for the proposed GEF project.
- As stated already in the comments from the GEF Secretariat, Germany would like to ask that the GEF fee policy is followed (point 11), that the links between the proposed project activities and objective of the SCCF-B are outlined (point 2) and that it should be outlined how gender dimensions are considered in the project (point 6).
- In addition, Germany shares the concerns of the STAP and recommends integrating the

requests from the STAP review in the final project document. This applies particularly to a clearer outline of the projects activities, their outcomes and the SCCF strategy (point 3), and providing a context-appropriate and user-friendly solution for measuring key results (point 6).

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. We recognize the potential value of this project in addressing the impacts on water resources from climate change in the Andes Region. However, prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed. In particular, we would appreciate more detail regarding the expected implications of climate change and glacial retreat in the Andes and the specific adaptation mechanisms envisioned in the project. We would also like to see indicators to estimate and monitor expected biodiversity and adaptation benefits associated with the project.

32. Regional (Cook Islands, FS Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) : R2R-Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities "Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods - UNDP - GEF ID = 5395

✓ France's Comments

- The project will contribute to maintain and enhance Pacific Island countries' ecosystem goods and services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural) through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience.
- We globally support this proposal but we would like to underline two concerns:
 - One specific issue on "monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management": In the program framework document, it seems that this component will be implemented through platforms and "appropriate media". We suggest developing exchanges of experiences, and to build on the best practices, transfer practitioners on sites with similar problems and facilitate peer exchanges or twinning. It may be interesting to articulate the proposed GEF project with an existing project « Restoration of ecosystem services against climate change unfavorable effects – Resccue » (SPC - AFD - FFEM). Indeed, this project seeks to find long-term economic and financial solutions to ensure that ecosystem services are maintained in the Pacific islands, which climate change and societal changes are tending to put into danger. The overall objective of this regional project thus focuses on improving and sustainably funding integrated management of Pacific island coastal zones, where most Pacific islanders live and where climate change has many negative effects. The added value of Resccue is that it proposes setting up economic and funding instruments (including payments for ecosystem services) at six pilot sites in the Pacific, so as to provide for the sustainable funding of activities after project completion.

Opinion: favourable, with the above recommendations

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

- In Vanuatu, please closely coordinate with UNICEF, UNHABITAT and UNFPA which have been implemented the project below since 2011.

Vanuatu	Community resilience and coping with climate-change and natural disasters in Vanuatu	3,003,022.66
---------	--	--------------

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany welcomes the regional multi-focal area approach employed by the project but requests that the final project proposal clearly reflects the STAP recommendations. This includes in particular enhanced coordination and long-term sustainability through inter alia institutional internalization both at national and regional levels. Furthermore, Germany adds the following comments:

- Since the proposed project is parenting fourteen Pacific Island Countries (PIC), the consideration of a comprehensive marine and coastal spatial planning approach is requested at a regional scale and at on-the-ground intervention levels in order to balance environmental and socio-economic considerations, fostering a more integrated approach that can help to resolve conflicting natural resource uses and enhance ecosystem connectivity.
- In relation to the (ecosystem-based) adaptation activities planned, it is requested that creating synergies between sub-national and national adaptation plans will be addressed. This could include consideration of measures to quantify and integrate ecosystem services when assessing and valuing EBA options.
- During the formulation of the project proposal, the implementing agencies and the executing partners should actively seek contact with on-going projects funded by the German Government in order to ensure synergies and complementarities and avoid duplication of efforts, as well as consult with concerned national and local authorities for improved coordination and cooperation.

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. Prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed, particularly with regard to adding value to the program beyond its role as an enabling and coordination mechanism.

33. Antigua and Barbuda: Pine Islands - Sustainable Pathways - Protected Areas and Renewable Energy - UNEP - GEF ID = 5390

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

While the baseline of the project appears to be clear and the assumptions sound, some doubts in the project design remain, mainly with regards to its financial sustainability and inclusion into national funding schemes, but also with regards to potential impacts of project on biodiversity. Recommendations:

- In accordance with WB project, assure that Environment Fund receives profits from the renewable energy instillation and directs them towards protected area management (in compliance with the requirements for NPTAFs under the GEF-funded, World Bank-implemented "Sustainable Financing & Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine

Ecosystem Project").

- Replication schemes should be included in the project proposal in order to assure sustainability and transference of know-how generated, that allow for benefit generation in other regions of Antigua & Barbuda (include replication in the operation mode of UNEP proposal).
- With respect to biodiversity conservation, serious efforts to identify those locations for wind-generation infrastructure should be made, that least affect resident and migrating birds and their routes (avoid or minimize bird strikes, provide for environmental management plan).

34. Chile: Protecting Biodiversity and Multiple Ecosystem Services in Biological Mountain Corridors in Chile's Mediterranean Ecosystem - UNEP – GEF ID = 5135

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States suggests that the project carefully consider how best to mitigate the human resources and institutional capacity risks associated with this project. We note that of the 30 municipalities included in the Project area, 10 of them have not assigned any staff exclusively to environmental protection of their territories through local environmental management, and those who have been assigned are not always adequately trained or exclusively dedicated to these tasks.
- The PIF states that the project seeks to *Carrying out a pilot project to enhance personnel capacities in the environmental departments of 30 municipalities (Outcome 3.1)*, but it is unclear exactly how this outcome is going to address the fact that there do not seem to be enough people to actually staff the positions needed to implement previous GEF project outcomes or those that may come from the current proposal. We suggest providing more detail on how the project will help identify personnel gaps, recruit staff to appropriate departments and retain them after they have been trained.
- With regard to private sector involvement in the development of an environmental compliance label, we suggest that the project seek to ensure that: a) many companies will adopt the measures needed and undertake a certification process and b) that consumers will be educated on what such a label means and seek out those products. We are concerned that the economic incentives might not be in place that could compel industry to undertake a certification process, and that enough companies are on board with the concept to have a noticeable impact on environmental degradation. There is only one private company listed as a co-financer (Gasco) and Gasco and "Owners of Nature Sanctuaries in the Metropolitan Region" are the only private sector entities listed as potential private sector stakeholders in Table B.5.
- We have concerns about how the results of this proposed project will be successfully adopted, given that the results of previous GEF projects are languishing due to lack of resources. This concern ties back to our comment about addressing human resource and institutional capacity risks. We suggest providing more detail on how this project will cope with or address the risk of insufficient resources to implement its outcomes. Are there other funding streams that will continue after the project is finished, that are focused on implementation or scaling up of results? Will this project's outcomes build upon or facilitate the implementation of the outcomes from the previous GEF projects that seem to have languished?

35. **China: Sustainable Forest Management to Enhance the Resilience of Forests to Climate Change - FAO - GEF ID = 5139**

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The project uses improved SFM / innovative FM and a few other such terms interchangeably. In the absence of clear definitions (see also above mentioned UNEP review), it remains guesswork which specific elements the SFM-package of this project is supposed to contain.

- The project is to be implemented in three provinces, ranging from the tropics (Hainan Province) and subtropics (Guangxi) to warm-temperate zones (Henan). We recommend evaluating the benefits of a differentiated approach in terms of carbon modelling reflecting local growth/site conditions.
- To ensure credibility for forest carbon offsets it is recommended including robust figures obtained through (i) repetitive inventories conducted on a certain (ii) number of statistically derived (iii) permanent sample plots and of a (iv) predefined shape.
- It is recommended to further specify the type of incentives and define benchmarks/criteria for eligible activities.
- Overall, it is recommended to review the concept with regards to its socio-economic / legal rationale. The envisioned mandatory certification scheme for sustainably produced fuel wood should include appropriate environmental criteria with regards to conservation of biodiversity and local ecosystems, the use of agro-chemicals and water use so as to avoid negative environmental impacts.

✓ USA's Comments

- The U.S. appreciates both the importance of improved and biodiversity-oriented management of forested land areas and the role that these actions would have in climate change mitigation through carbon sequestration, as well as the importance of the training and knowledge dissemination component of this project.
- We concur with STAP's assessment that encouraging local community participation in forest management will be key to this project's success.
- However, the United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, abstains from participating in the decision.

36. Haiti: Increasing Resilience of Ecosystems and Vulnerable Communities to CC and Anthropogenic Threats through a Ridge to Reef Approach to BD Conservation and Watershed Management - UNDP - GEF ID = 5380

✓ *USA's Comments*

- The United States supports the goals of this project as it will help address some very important aspects of biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation in Haiti.
- With a view toward further strengthening this PIF, we ask UNDP, as it prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, to meet with the IDB to clarify (i) the geography and extent of IDB investment in the Three Bays; and (ii) some possible duplication of UNDP-SNAP management planning and sustainable finance planning activities already in their current work plan.
- Prior to CEO endorsement, the GEF Secretariat should confirm the co-financing for the project, including whether it is properly being accounted as incremental co-finance rather than existing under the baseline project.

37. Indonesia: Strengthening Forest and Ecosystem Connectivity in RIMBA Landscape of Central Sumatra through Investing in Natural Capital, Biodiversity Conservation, and Land-based Emission Reductions (RIMBA) - UNEP - GEF ID = 5285

✓ *Japan's Comments*

- This project involves many execution partners such as Ministry of Public Works; Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Environment etc. It needs clarification and elaboration how Ministry of Home Affairs coordinates this project since this project covers various technical fields such as biodiversity, climate change, and forestry for the purpose of avoiding coordination problems in advance.

✓ *Germany's Comments*

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

Germany supports all comments by the STAP and would like to add the following comments:

- The project proposal is sound and covers broadly all important aspect so ensure a positive impact and the sustainability of the proposed measures. However, the term “Green Economy” frequently used in the proposal is not defined or used to describe activities that would lead to a “Green Economy” concept and a green economy policy.
- The ongoing reform of the forestry sector (establishment of Forest Management Units, FMUs at the district level) is not mentioned and not taken into account. However, this reform plays a critical role to improve the “Good Governance” of Indonesia’s forest resources. The proposed project shall therefore actively support or/and make use of these new administrative structures.
- Non-Forest Areas (APL areas) as an important part of the forest cover are not mentioned

in the proposal at all. These so called non-forest areas are a considerable part of Indonesia's forests and will influence the expected results. Therefore this issue should be clarified.

- Agro-forestry is not part of degraded forests; on the contrary agro-forest systems can improve the well-being of small farmers and the economic risks of farmers reduce through diversification. Agro-forestry can serve as a sustainable management system by using natural resources, lowering the pressure on the remaining forest resources, rehabilitating degraded land and improving the biodiversity of the degraded areas, while at the same time building up the carbon stock. For this reason, the support of agro-forestry systems shall be incorporated in the project proposal.

✓ USA's Comments

- We ask that the GEF Secretariat confirm that the expected project co-financing has been secured prior to CEO endorsement.

38. Kenya: Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Agrobiodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya - UNEP - GEF ID = 5272

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

The proposal is well structured and reflects a broad approach from capacity development on SLM practices for small-holder farmers, participatory monitoring and evaluation of SLM practices using the LADA tool, and strengthening SFM practices at landscape level through participatory development of SFM plans, increasing incentive of smallholders with help of the PES scheme to supporting of bio-enterprises from non-wood forest products. However, it should further consider the following aspects to ensure the effectiveness of the envisaged actions:

- Whereas the project proposed can build on extensive knowledge on SLM practices to be used, there is only limited knowledge on the use of the incentive-based mechanisms such as PES or on supporting of alternative livelihoods in the region. Therefore we suggest focusing mainly on these innovative aspects of the Component 2 and reducing the focus of the study on the Component 1. The latter has already been covered by a number of previous projects in the region (see Baseline Project Summary, p. 8).
- The project should further explore how the PES scheme pilot is to be designed. Several factors has to be considered such as, for instance:
 - Equity and pro-poor issues – who can participate,
 - Conservation payment setting – how much to pay to whom
 - Action-based or outcome-based PES – what to pay for and how to monitor,
 - Community based or private land based PES.
 - The project should further explain the gender strategy in view of the landholders

being mostly male, while women are in charge of firewood collection and of many farming activities. This might be addressed by training women on the SLM practices while men decide on the land-use.

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States supports the goals of this project in reducing environmental degradation in small scale agriculture in western Kenya. While we are not requesting additional Council review prior to CEO endorsement, we would appreciate more information and explanation regarding the capacity of the Farmer Field Schools to take on new training programs envisioned under this project (e.g., do they have a flexible curriculum and ability to propose new topics from the community level)?
- Para 19 on Page 10 notes that an additional activity under this proposed project would be Community Forest Association-facilitated development of an Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) framework for Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) scheme. We would appreciate more details on the process by which such an ABS framework would be developed, who would be engaged in the process, and to what kinds of activities it would apply (e.g., academic research or specimen collection). Access and Benefit Sharing issues span multiple sectors (e.g., crops, pharmaceuticals, forests), so we see coordination as important to avoid creating potential redundancies or inadvertent barriers to access and benefit sharing in non-forest sectors. Additionally, we would appreciate more information on how developing an ABS framework is envisioned to contribute to a PES scheme.

**39. Mozambique: Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project
- World Bank - GEF ID = 5225**

✓ **France's Comments**

- The project will try to strengthen the effective management of conservation areas and their contribution to the diversification of economic opportunities. The GEF component is designed to promote the production of environmental services in selected areas of Mozambique to improve the sustainability of the protected area system.
- We support the initiative and particularly the project objective and rationale.
- The cofinancing from the AFD was discussed with WB. There was an agreement to look positively at this project and consider using resources from debt swap between France and Mozambique. Confirmation of AFD cofinancing to this project is thus conditioned to the decision process and further due diligences by the AFD.
- To facilitate the project review at AFD, we strongly recommend the World Bank staff to continue to invite the AFD to participate in the project preparation in order to prepare the project in a coordinated manner.
- Despite our support to the project, we would appreciate getting more information on the justification for the mobilization of financing from the Climate Change Mitigation focal area and more precisely: (i) what activities the CCM financing will be supporting and to what extent they will pave the way to a lower-carbon development model; (ii) deforestation drivers should be better identified and to what extent activities supported by

CCM financing will lead to an appropriate, substantial and sustainable modification of these drivers.

Opinion: favourable provided our question on the justification of CCM financing is addressed

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. Prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed. In particular, we ask for a clearer explanation of the Global Environmental Benefits associated with the project, along with quantifiable targets and indicators. We also request greater detail regarding how the Climate Change component of the project will be implemented.
- We also that ask that the project consider alternatives to involuntary resettlement and, if there are no viable alternatives, that the revised concept note indicate steps that will be taken to ensure that the project is compliant with the GEF minimum safeguard standards for involuntary resettlement.

40. Russian Federation: Save the Source: Catalyzing Market Transformation of Breweries from a Major Natural Resource Consuming Industry to a Pro-active Steward for Resource Efficient Cleaner Production (RESUBMISSION) - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5293

✓ **Canada's Comments**

- Canada has serious concerns regarding how this project fits in with GEF programming.
- Given the proposed beneficiary, Baltika Breweries, is fully owned by Carlsberg, we request the GEF Secretariat clarify the GEF policy on funding investments in multi-national corporations based in developing countries. We understand, by way of example, that this against Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund rules.
 - More fundamentally, the project includes funding for Climate Change Mitigation in an Annex 1 country. It is not clear, based on the GEF eligibility, whether this project should qualify for GEF support. This point is elaborated on in our "overall comments" on the work program, and we request clarification on eligibility, particularly in the context of scarce GEF-5 uncommitted resources.
- If the project proceeds, the re-drafted proposal should clarify how the project addresses International Waters objectives, as asserted in the project proposal; the proposal makes no reference to transboundary waters management.

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- Japan acknowledges the importance of these projects and would like to have detailed information on them, including the area in which they will be implemented. We sincerely request the Secretariat to provide us the final project documents for these two projects to be reviewed by the Council prior to CEO endorsement. (For the "Save the Source" project, we were once informed by the secretariat that this will be implemented in Voronezh, Tula and Samara Oblasts. But these names seem to have been deleted from the latest version of the PIF on GEF HP.)

✓ USA's Comments

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. We are requesting to see this project again prior to CEO endorsement because it appears to be focused on local rather than global benefits, and does not provide compelling evidence that it is consistent with the stated focal areas or that grant resources are necessary.
- We ask that project documentation include an explanation of how the project addresses trans-boundary elements to be eligible for International Waters funding, and also how the project addresses the land degradation focal area more specifically.
- We also ask for an explanation of how the GEF funding for the waste to energy project was calculated.
- We suggest that the other concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision be addressed, including the need for more detailed information about the specific energy efficiency measures.
- Lastly, we would like to see information on how project managers will engage with the government on the negative externalities of price regulation.

41. Russian Federation: Sustainable Land Management and Ecosystem-based Climate Change Mitigation in the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion (RESUBMISSION) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5104

- *No comments were received for this project.*

42. Sao Tome and Principe: Promotion of Environmentally Sustainable and Climate-Resilient Grid-based Hydroelectric Electricity through an Integrated Approach in Sao Tome and Principe - UNDP - GEF ID = 5334

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The proposed project addresses important challenges in the rural areas of Sao Tome and Principe, which are facing difficulties in energy supply.

- The current setup focusses on establishing proven technologies. However, with regard to the new technologies, especially the mini hydro technologies, a stronger capacity building component shall be considered in order to ensure local operation and maintenance.
- The involvement of the private sector should be explored further. This could, for example, include exploring business schemes for the establishment of sustainable energy sources and of necessary grids and storage capacities.

43. Thailand: Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Peat-swamp Ecosystems - UNDP - GEF ID = 5330

- *No comments were received for this project.*

44. Yemen: Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago - UNEP - GEF ID = 5347

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany requests for the following projects that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

1. Selection of Socotra as the Intervention Area – Priority Setting

Socotra is an island in the Indian Ocean characterised by an outstanding biodiversity. GEF has acknowledged this importance through providing funding for the project “Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of Socotra Archipelago” (GEF contribution US\$4.9 million, 1997-2003), and the “Strengthening Socotra’s Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity” (“Socotra Governance and Biodiversity Project”, GEF contribution US\$1.0 million, 2008-2013), which was approved in 2008 and is an ongoing (albeit suspended) operation. In addition to that, Socotra benefitted from regional GEF funds,

GEF Small Grants and from the support of the EU and many international donors.

In the light of this concentration of efforts by GEF and other donors and also in the light of limited financial resources, the new project proposal does not sufficiently justify why GEF should fund another project on this tiny, thinly populated island (0.7% of the surface area of the country, 0.17% of the population of the country), while other, highly endangered species and habitats in the rest of the country do not receive the necessary attention.

2. Lessons Learnt

Previous projects funded by GEF and others have achieved a lot in bringing Socotra on the international donor agenda and in scientifically exploring the outstanding biodiversity of the island, but have so far brought only marginal benefits to local communities and practical conservation measures. This even created some opposition of local people against donor-funded projects.

The current GEF “Socotra Governance and Biodiversity Project” is one of the projects which show a low delivery rate with the consequence that all operations were suspended. The new project proposal does not sufficiently reflect that it is based upon acritical assessment of the results of the previous projects funded by GEF and others. It is not clear whether and how this new project should balance the shortcomings of previous GEF operations, and how the new project will overcome the difficulties previous operations were facing.

3. Intervention logic

The list of components, outcomes and outcomes does not follow stringent intervention logic (logical framework) but rather appears as a conglomeration of various ideas and initiatives.

Examples are:

- The establishment and operation of a “Socotra World Heritage Site Trust Fund” is a very ambitious task. It is questionable, whether this goal can be fully achieved within the duration of the project.
- The outcome of Sustainable Land Management is a stand-alone outcome not clearly linked to the other outcomes; implementing this outcome is a special challenge as it would require special implementation structure, quite different expertise and different project partners;
- “Institutional Strengthening & Capacity Building” is listed as project component 4, while this is also one of the core tasks of the German support to the Government of Yemen in the field of biodiversity, which is a US\$7.7 million operation. It is not clear why this new project feels that additional funding should be provided for this, and what the specific value-added of this support will be.
- “A unified management structure for the Socotra WHS is established to reflect the changing governance structure in line with Yemen’s decentralization process...” (output 1.2.2.). Decentralization and the governance structure of Socotra WHS is the core task of the UNDP/GEF project “Socotra Governance and Biodiversity Project”. There is a risk of duplication and even of diverging approaches.

4. Recommendations

In sum, Germany requests that the following comments are taken into account:

- A strong argumentation is required why GEF should finance a new biodiversity project on Socotra, although another GEF-funded biodiversity project in Socotra is still not completed.
- The shortcomings of the active GEF “Socotra Governance and Biodiversity Project”, which finally lead to the suspension of the project, shall be carefully analyzed and be taken into account in a transparent way as “lessons learned” in the design of the new project;
- The intervention structure shall follow a stringent logic without overlapping mandates with other donor-funded operations.

POPs

45. Global: Global Project on the Updating of National Implementation Plans for POPs - UNEP - GEF ID = 5307

- *No comments were received for this project.*

46. Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines and Vietnam): Demonstration of BAT and BEP in Open Burning Activities in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5082

- *No comments were received for this project.*

47. Cote d'Ivoire: POPs Pesticides Management Project - World Bank - GEF ID = 5362

✓ *USA's Comments*

- We note a significant part of the project will be devoted to capacity building and strengthening the regulatory framework. The comprehensive review of hazardous waste regulations should include a review of labor regulations, such as minimum age, wage and hour and occupational health and safety regulations. Technical guidelines and trainings should be designed to include workplace safety and health and reach workers handling POPs.
- It will be important to engage the labor ministry, in an effort to ensure safe handling of POPs. The International Labor Organization (ILO) also works in-country and could be a helpful partner in addressing labor concerns.
- When the project is reviewing and working towards the modification of legal texts relating to pesticides and environmental concerns, it should also update the relevant hazardous pesticides in Cote d'Ivoire's List of Hazardous Work Prohibited to Children Under Age 18.

48. Macedonia: Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS - UNIDO - GEF ID = 4385

✓ *Canada's Comments*

- While we are supportive of Macedonia's, and indeed of all Parties' efforts to clean up their POPs-contaminated sites, we note that it is not necessarily the GEF's role to provide funding for the clean-up.
- The Stockholm Convention does not specifically require countries to clean up contaminated sites. Article 6(1)9e) states that Parties should "Endeavor to develop appropriate strategies for identifying sites contaminated by chemicals listed in Annex A, B or C; if remediation of those sites is undertaken it shall be performed in an environmentally sound manner."
- In addition, the GEF-5 POPs Strategy states that the GEF will support "inventories and development of management plans for contaminated sites, including risk assessment and prioritization; and, where warranted by pressing health or environmental concerns, supporting partnerships for remediation and piloting remediation technologies."
- Therefore, please elaborate on how this project relates to the GEF-5 POPs Strategy. Specifically, how the project is "warranted by pressing health or environmental concerns" and/or how it supports "partnerships for remediation and piloting remediation technologies".

✓ *USA's Comments*

- We appreciate the project recognizes the importance of addressing occupational health and safety (OHS) when implementing clean-up measures.
- We also appreciate that the project intends to work with the Institute of Public Health on OHS. Consideration should also be given to what role the Macedonian labor ministry

plays on the OHS legal framework and enforcement and whether they should be a partner in the project as well.

- The International Labor Organization (ILO) has a National Coordinator in Macedonia. The ILO could be considered as a partner to help address occupational safety and health and other worker rights considerations when designing clean-up plans and implementing the project.

49. Mexico: Sound Management of POPs Containing Waste - UNDP - GEF ID = 5179

✓ **USA's Comments**

- United States believes that this project is valuable to improving the quality of clean energy technology initiatives already underway, and is supportive of efforts to better coordinate activities of the relevant stakeholders.

50. Sri Lanka: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs Wastes and PCB Contaminated Equipment in Sri Lanka - UNIDO - GEF ID = 5314

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects, opposes this project and therefore does not join a Council decision that would support this project.

PROJECTS SUBMITTED UNDER PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES

**51. Regional (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Timor Leste, Vietnam):
EAS: Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas
of East Asia - UNDP - GEF ID = 5405**

✓ **USA's Comments**

- The United States requests to review this project again prior to CEO endorsement. Prior to CEO endorsement we ask for an explanation of how the concerns raised in the STAP's request for major revision have been addressed. In particular, we would like additional details about how policy-relevant information will be delivered to, monitored and utilized by key regional decision-making bodies.
- Prior to CEO endorsement we also recommend the project explain how it has taken into account recommendations from the 2012 Annual Impact Report as they pertain to projects in the South China Seas.

52. Regional (Cook Islands, FS Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu): R2R: Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries - UNDP - GEF ID = 5404

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

53. Regional (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam): EAS: Sustainable Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the West Pacific and East Asian Seas - UNDP - GEF ID = 5393

- *No comments were received for this project.*

54. Cook Islands: R2R: Conserving Biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Functions through a Ridge to Reef Approach - UNDP - GEF ID = 5348

✓ *Japan's Comments*

- In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

[Japan UNDP Partnership Fund]

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000
Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	\$300,000
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

✓ *Germany's Comments*

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

The project should consider activities to implement a participatory bottom-up approach to increasing management effectiveness and the quality of governance of the Cook Islands Marine Park.

- During the design of the final project proposal more weight should be put on considering the establishment of a comprehensive zoning plan for the Marine Park. This would require the consideration of marine and coastal spatial planning as an approach to resolve unsustainable trajectories for biodiversity, land and water uses within the marine and coastal zones of the Marine Park by establishing classifying levels of protection in

the Marine Park.

- There is a clear need to better connect and establish clearer linkages between this child project and its regional parent program in terms of scientific and technical linkages as well as knowledge management and experience sharing.
- Furthermore, a stronger collaboration between regional partners (especially between SPC/SOPAC and SPREP) is recommended to facilitate synergies, sharing of good practices and lessons learned, for implementation of conservation efforts.

55. Fiji: R2R: Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods - UNDP - GEF ID = 5398

✓ Germany's Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

Germany asks to undertake further consultation with the Fiji Forestry Department on the advancement of the National REDD+ Programme and exchange on its results thus avoiding duplication of work (especially relevant to outputs 2.2.2 and 2.2.3). Along the same lines, some of the watersheds under component 3 are already covered in the current GEFPAS-FPAM project (GEF ID = 3819). It needs to be clarified which outputs of the proposed R2R project support existing efforts and which are new initiatives.

- We recommend including technical requirements for the determination of a baseline carbon stocking value as well as the subsequent measurement of carbon stock for the “enhancement of carbon stocks”. These technical requirements are not included in the current proposal.
- The project shall actively coordinate with other on-going projects in order to ensure synergies and complementarities and avoid duplication of efforts, as well as consult with concerned national and local authorities for improved coordination and cooperation.
- To put more thought on how the ridge-to-reef approach can be better demonstrated in specific watershed areas or zones as the project components still seem a bit disconnected in terms of implementation arrangements. It might be a challenge in MFA projects to aggregate activities when distinct project components are formulated along the line of the different constituent focal areas.
- To consider spatial planning on land- and seascape level for entire catchments and the marine protected areas to support a more integrated approach.

56. Nauru: R2R: Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions in Nauru (R2R Nauru) - UNDP - GEF ID = 5381

✓ **Japan's Comments**

- Following project of JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) will be implemented in the same area and scope of activities of GEF Project. In order to avoid duplication of assistance then create synergy between projects, close coordination with JICA is highly recommended.

JICA Project:

- Project Title: Project for Sustainable Management of Coral Reef and Island Ecosystems: Responding to the Threat of Climate Change
- Implementation Agencies: Palau International Coral Reef Center & Ryukyu University
- Duration: 5 years (2013 – 2017).

✓ **Germany's Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- The urgent need to sustainably manage both terrestrial and marine ecosystems to promote biodiversity conservation is clearly described. However, it is requested that realistic, target-oriented and long-term options for establishing alternative livelihood options for the local communities are used as a basis for project planning and implementation. Site selection for LMMAs should be based on specific ecological criteria. Scientific expertise sharing and knowledge transfer from the regional parent program as well as from other inter-governmental organizations would certainly increase the long-term success of the proposed project. The same is true for capacity development. Furthermore, it is recommended to rationalize the roles and responsibilities among government organizations and other stakeholders.