

## GEF-6 Replenishment

### Comments Received on the draft Joint Summary of the Chairs from the Paris December 2013 Meeting

#### Canada

Good afternoon Ramesh,

At this time, Canada has two quick comments on the documents circulated yesterday, one on each the revised Policy Recommendations paper (GEF/R.6/21/Rev.02) and the draft Co-Chairs' Summary of the recent Replenishment meeting in Paris.

- Policy Recommendations, Enhancing Gender Mainstreaming, paragraph 31 -- The last sentence of this paragraph should be revised to read "Participants further request that the Secretariat acquire the necessary capacity in this area to help develop and implement the gender action plan." We note that gender expertise within the GEF Secretariat is key to both the formulation of the plan and its implementation.
- Co-Chairs' Summary, Financial Issues paragraph -- We would appreciate the last sentence specifying that the investment strategy options will be presented for consideration at the "May 2014 Council meeting", instead of "at an upcoming Council meeting", unless the Trustee's timelines have changed since the Paris meeting. .

Kind regards,  
Michelle

+1.819.934.8538 | michelle.kaminski@international.gc.ca | Télécopieur/Facsimile:+1.819.997.2637

Gestionnaire | Manager

Programmes de financement climatique et environnement mondial | Global Environment and Climate Finance  
Direction générale des enjeux mondiaux et du développement | Global Issues and Development Branch  
Affaires étrangères, Commerce et Développement Canada | Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada  
Gouvernement du Canada | Government of Canada  
200 promenade du Portage, Gatineau, Québec, Canada, K1A 0G4



Affaires étrangères, Commerce  
et Développement Canada

Foreign Affairs, Trade and  
Development Canada

## China

To: ziqian liang <ziqianliang@yahoo.com>, Jvonamsberg <Jvonamsberg@worldbank.org>, nishii <nishii@thegef.org>  
From: 李瑞 Rui Li <liruimof@139.com>  
Date: 12/24/2013 01:05AM  
Cc: jdye <jdye@mof.gov.cn>, 雅玲 <wylmof@163.com>, ZHANG Wen <zhang.wen@mepfeco.org.cn>  
Subject: Re:Fw: GEF-6 Replenishment - Third Meeting, Paris, Dec 10-12, 2013 - Summary of the Co-Chairs

Dear Mr. Amsberg and Ms. Ishii,  
China would like to suggest to make a small modification to the draft of the summary of the Co-chairs. In the paragraph of Financial Issues, from line 2, we would like to suggest to delete "by all contributing participants, regardless of size to", which we think will be more precise to reflect the discussion during the meeting. In addition, we would like to take this opportunity to wish both of you and your team Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

Regards.

李瑞 Rui Li (Mr.)

国际金融组织三处 IFI Division III

财政部国际司 Int'l Department, Ministry of Finance, PRC

Tel (Fax) : +86 10 68553101

## India

Dear Chairperson,

Ref trail mail dated 23rd Dec, pl note the following comments from India:

1. As regards the point on greater emphasis on non-grant instruments in the architecture of GEF, kindly include that “some participants however felt that GEF’s primary architecture should be grant- based as non-grant instruments may introduce complexities and that grants would provide a degree of concessionality to projects co-financed with non-concessional funding. They felt that GEF should not replicate what IDA, IBRD, IFC or ADB do.”

The present formulation conveys complete consensus on the issue when it was not really the case.

2 We agree with the formulation of the Chairperson’s Summary with regards to private sector engagement, financial issues, improving efficiency of the project cycle, enhancing gender mainstreaming, strengthening the results-based management and knowledge management systems.

3. As far as the programming directions are concerned, the following comments on the proposed climate change focal area strategy may please be noted.

- COP-19 decisions may be taken into account. The decision document is at annex: b.
- Paragraph 61 under programme 4 talks about the reduction of GHG emission from agriculture sector. This issue is under discussion in the UNFCCC negotiation process. It is therefore, proposed that GHG reduction component should be deleted from this document (if mitigation is included this will weaken the position of developing countries in future negotiations). We and most other developing countries emphasize that priority should be given to adaptation in agriculture rather than mitigation from the climate change angle.
- In paragraph 73 and in some other paragraphs commitment for the 2015 agreement and voluntary targets are mentioned. As per the decision/C.19 (ADP) the world commitment / target are to be replaced by “intended nationally determined contribution”.
- It is also mentioned that project supported through GEF-6 cycle will facilitate developing country to identify their potential contribution for the 2015 agreement. Considering the long project cycle, it may not be feasible for developing country to fulfil of the said objective by availing GEF funds. It is therefore, suggested that the GEF cycle should be shortened and project approvals expedited.”

with warm regards and best wishes for a Happy New Year

S Sharan

Dir, DEA, Min of Finance, GOI

## Norway

Dear both,

I attach some Norwegian comments on the programming document. With regard to the policy recommendations, we have no particular problems with the recommendations as such. On the other hand, we do have some comments on the background offered in para 4 of the Rev. 02 document, as follows:

From the text as it stands, one can get the impression that the GEF is virtually alone in facing the challenges of environmental degradation and threats to the global commons, as if the GEF operates in a vacuum. We think the presentation of the GEF and its challenges would benefit from including a perspective on, and more references to, surrounding arenas, processes and tasks picked up by others in the common endeavours, allowing the GEF and its important role to stand out more distinctly. (Ref., inter alia, MEA focus on drivers, UNEP's role in normative environmental guidance, etc). We also note that the proposed Integrated Approaches do not go very far in identifying drivers at the most basic levels. We are not suggesting that the GEF should start addressing such basic issues directly, but they need to be referred to in clear terms in order to identify GEF's operative range and how its efficiency and effectiveness may be promoted.

Best regards, and a Happy New Year!

Erik

Sweden

Dear Naoko

Please find Sweden's comments to the chair summary attached to this email.

While we agree in large with the summary been made, from our perspective there is no full agreement yet on the adjustment of the STAR when it comes to the level of increase of the floors as well as the GDP-factor.

In regards to the policy recommendations we would like to see the section on gender revised along the following lines:

31. Participants welcome and acknowledge the GEF's commitment to engage in and systematically enhance gender mainstreaming at corporate and focal area levels during GEF-6. Participants request the Secretariat, in collaboration with the agencies, and other relevant partners to develop an action plan, for enhancing gender mainstreaming, including use of relevant gender sensitive indicators and sex-disaggregated data, and to present the action plan to the Council at its November 2014 meeting. Participants further request **THAT THE SECRETARIAT ACQUIRES THE NECESSARY CAPACITY IN THIS AREA TO HELP DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT THE GENDER ACTION PLAN.**

All the best

Lars(*See attached file: Co-chair summary comments SE.docx*)