



GEFTF may 2011 work programme

Dorte Broen

to:

gcoordination@thegef.org, Dorte Broen

05/27/2011 08:04 AM

Cc:

Bjørnebye Erik, Paul Hofseth, Margit Thomsen, Anne Meldgaard, Merete Villum Pedersen, La Paz, Kathmandu, Kampala, Silke Mason Westphal, Mike Speirs

Show Details

Denmark has the following comments to the Nepal – Integrating Traditional Crop Genetic Diversity into Technology Using a BD Portfolio Approach to Buffer Against Unpredictable Environmental Change in the Nepal Himalayas (UNEP, GEF funding: 2,400,000 USD)

- Generally very positive, but from our embassy in Nepal it has been mentioned that NARC seems to be marred with poor documentation and extension of its research due to weak organizational capacity. In this context, in order to achieve outcome of the project, some organizational reform activities integrated in the project has been recommend.

Denmark has the following comments to the Bolivia – Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia (UNDP GEF funding: 4,166,667 USD)

- The analysis of the challenges and opportunities for protected areas management is satisfactory, albeit a stronger institutional analysis could have been desirable.
- While relevant in terms of content, the relatively wide array of different activities could imply a risk of diluting the overall impact of the intervention. However, this may be mitigated by aligning to the existing framework for PA management and the management plans to be elaborated by the PA management committees.
- The project description mentions consultation with national and local institutions, relevant to protected areas management, among others, regarding identification of the 4 areas of intervention and with the PA management committees on the selection of species. While it is described how the project will complement government efforts and other donor supported interventions in the fields at stake, it is not clearly described if and how more direct collaboration and alignment will be promoted between the project interventions and government and local institutions. A point in case is the National Protected Areas Service (SERNAP), which is also receiving support for protected areas management from a series of donors including Denmark. Stronger alignment to relevant national institutions could contribute to enhance the impact and sustainability of the intervention.
- The proposed intervention is in line with both some of the most important international conventions in the fields of biodiversity, land degradation, climate change, wetlands and endangered species, as mentioned in the project documents. In connection with international programmes related to climate change, the REDD+ programmes are mentioned as an opportunity referring, among others to the preparation of the National UN-REDD Bolivia Programme agreed in 2010. However, in this context the political reservations expressed towards the REDD concept by the Bolivian Government it might also have been worth mentioning.

Denmark has the following comments to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kedepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda (UNDP, GEF funding 3.08 Million USD)

- The involvement of people living and settling in the area is key, and understanding and addressing their needs is necessary (also mentioned by the Panel). The natural resources in this area seem

largely to have been left untouched (though that is a bit unclear: is the area suffering from unsustainable use, or did the war facilitate a recovery of woodlands in this area? - both mentioned in PIF), except for limited local use. Now more people are coming into the area, and their expectation to sustain and increase the use of natural resources need to be dealt with. An expansion of the protected area (which implies no extractive use acc. to the PIF) will conflict with other expectations, and this needs to be reconciled. Furthermore, the corridors and adjacent areas to the protect areas are acc. to the PIF formally categorised as communal land, owned by communities, governed by customary law. It is important that the tools for an improved management is not solely enforcement in terms of policing, etc., but also involves creating incentives for sustainable behaviour. All in all, the involvement of people is not dealt with sufficiently.

- The PIF talks about the economic potential of tourism and the utilisation of shea trees for cosmetic purposes etc., but it seems not to be sufficiently included in the analysis and activities (especially tourism is weak). It is essential to understand the market conditions, which seems not to be properly analysed beforehand (a statement on measures to improve market for shea butter is included, and some names of companies are mentioned, but not elaborated). Without a solid market potential, these development perspectives are irrelevant.
- There are some references to the decentralised authorities, but as Uganda is famous for its decentralisation, one could expect more. Considering that the landscape based approach is opted for, this also seems odd. Also, no other natural resources related institutions are mentioned e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Tourism or similar. It is a well-established fact that protected area management need to relate to other sectors and themes and their management.
- No civil society institutions are mentioned, apart from the Rhino fund, which is not a local NGO. Private sector is mentioned, but with only limited details and it is stated they will play only a supportive role. The transboundary aspect of biodiversity is mentioned (South-Sudan), but not entirely clear how the project will deal with that.

---

**DORTE BROEN** / <mailto:dorbro@um.dk>>DORBRO@UM.DK  
MINISTER COUNSELLOR / ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE  
DIRECT 33921673 / MOBILE +45 50876550

**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS**  
ASIATISK PLADS 2 / DK-1448 KØBENHAVN K  
PHONE +45 3392 0000