



Global Environment Facility

July 28, 2008

COMPILATION OF TECHNICAL COMMENTS
SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS
ON SCCF INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM
APPROVED BY COUNCIL ON JULY 28, 2008

NOTE: This document is a compilation of technical comments submitted to the Secretariat by Council members concerning the project proposals presented in the June 2008 SCCF Intersessional Work Program approved by the Council on July 28, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
GENERAL COMMENTS	1
CLIMATE CHANGE	2
1. Mexico: Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts on the Coastal Wetlands in the Gulf of Mexico through Improved Water Resource Management [World Bank]	2
2. Mongolia: Mongolia Livestock Sector Adaptation Project [IFAD]	3
3. Philippines: Climate Change Adaptation Project [World Bank]	4

**SCCF INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL
MEMBERS
(REFERENCE TO SCCF/IS/2)**

GENERAL COMMENTS

COMMENTS FROM AUSTRALIA

Australia approves the SCCF Intersessional Work Program.

**SCCF INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL
MEMBERS
(REFERENCE TO SCCF/IS/2)**

CLIMATE CHANGE

1. Mexico: Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts on the Coastal Wetlands in the Gulf of Mexico through Improved Water Resource Management [World Bank]

COMMENTS FROM GERMANY

We support (this) project without a need for further comments.

**SCCF INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS
(REFERENCE TO SCCF/IS/2)**

2. Mongolia: Mongolia Livestock Sector Adaptation Project [IFAD]

COMMENTS FROM GERMANY

Germany welcomes the proposed project, but encourages coordination with the German bilateral project on “Climate Change and Biodiversity”. It is the second phase of an ongoing project and will be implemented from 2009 to 2014 in cooperation with the Ministry of Nature and Environment of Mongolia. The project will focus on policy advice and decentralized management in the field of natural resource management, including pasture management.

**SCCF INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS
(REFERENCE TO SCCF/IS/2)**

3. Philippines: Climate Change Adaptation Project [World Bank]

COMMENTS FROM AUSTRALIA

Overall the proposal addresses general key constraints in this area – however, problem and risk analysis could be more specific. We are pleased to see that the project has a reasonable contribution from the GOP (refer table C) and implies a level of seriousness that the GOP/DENR is applying to this issue. Also WB is well placed in the Philippines to look at these issues and use existing linkages as leverage for this agenda - given current work in the rural sector. The challenge for WB is to capitalize and build on what others have undertaken, and go beyond what WB is doing in the concerned sectors and partner with other donors.

Title and Phase: The title of the proposal “Climate Change Adaptation Phase 1” indicates a next phase. If the intention is to have a next phase, then the proposal should present the long-term plan on how the program would evolve with a caveat for a review on the need to proceed to the next phase. Otherwise, the “Phase 1” in the title should be dropped.

Component 1 – Improve coordination of adaptation policy by DENR: Targeting DENR and in particular IACCC (chaired by DENR Secretary) as primary GOP partners is warranted given these are critical bodies with a major role to play on climate change. A critical entity that needs to be engaged is the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change (PTFCC) (chaired by DOE Secretary), a body created by President Arroyo in February 2007 to address and mitigate the impact of climate change in the country. The project through World Bank could facilitate coordination between these bodies given that impacts of climate change do not respect sectoral delineation. However, if this project is to look at the productive sectors including agriculture and land management, Department of Agriculture and Dept of Agrarian Reform are also key if GOP coordination is to be effective.

- Given that this component tackles policy and planning, the coordination should also be elevated to a higher level making sure that the climate change sensitive sectoral policies are captured in the medium and long term socioeconomic development and physical plans and relevant proposed legislation. Other multi-sectoral bodies that should be noted are the Philippines Council for Sustainable Development and National Land Use Committee.

Component 2 – Implementing climate risk reduction measures in key productive sectors: Looking at how climate change and adaptation information can be built into policy and implementation decisions is extremely positive – particularly in the current climate of heightened awareness around food security, land use and productivity. It is also noteworthy that the

proposal is covering both climate change and disaster management. The challenge though is bringing these together.

- Climate change and disaster management should not only be left to technical/sectoral agencies. The policy makers should also be engaged. There are two important proposed legislations in Congress – one is on climate change framework, and the other on disaster management framework. This is another avenue where the proposed project could make a difference – ensuring that these proposed legislations are complementary and if necessary facilitating the passage of legislation on a comprehensive framework that addresses both climate change disaster management.
- Feasibility of strengthening weather insurance is also constructive from both a productivity and disaster mitigation perspective (particularly if this insurance is also made accessible to small producers and enterprises).

Risk assessment: Other key risks not acknowledged in the proposal involve: Low absorptive capacity of government agencies given competing demands and high turnover rate of technical personnel; and a lack of coordination and clarity across the GOP about the responsibility for parts of the Climate Change agenda, which poses a risk when projects are trying to: (a) identify key stakeholders and implementation agents; and (b) work with entities to progress the agenda when the entity they are focusing on may not have the political leverage or authority to progress certain issues.

COMMENTS FROM GERMANY

The outputs stated do not seem to be sufficiently ambitious compared to the resources allocated to the respective components, in particular for components 1 and 3. The description of component 2, the largest component of the project to which 70% of resources are allocated, is still very vague (e.g., the output is stated as “documented examples of climate proofing in the selected sectors”).

While climate proofing investments in vulnerable sectors is important in the Philippines, it does not become clear, how the project will identify the specific practices and investments which are envisaged to make investments more resilient to climate change. Under this component a systematic approach for climate proofing should be foreseen that would guide the mainstreaming efforts.