

France Comments on Work Program

GEF Council April 2008

25 Projects have been reviewed (out of 49 submitted):

Biodiversity (: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10

Climate Change: 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

International Waters: 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31

Multi Focal areas: 36, 40, 41, 43

POP: 44

We consider this sample representative of the main problems out of the April 2008 FIP Work Program, which are the following from our perspective.

- How the proposed project / programme is based on or is taking into account the lessons of past projects and post evaluated projects ?
- How governments / states and other actors are committed to take the incentives (tax) and / or to finance recurrent costs ?
- What is the strength of the partnerships (and of their financial commitments): public sector (states, municipalities) or private sector ? And what is the involvement of the local communities ?
- What are the synergies with projects or programmes already initiated with the support of other donors ?
- What are the respective roles of the World Bank and UNDP (climate change projects)?
- What are the magnitude of the costs of the sub-projects in the “umbrella” projects/programmes ?

Biodiversity

1.Regional: (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago) - BS Regional Project for Implementing National Biosafety Frameworks in the Caribbean Sub-region - under the GEF Biosafety Program(GEF Grant : \$ 3.34 m) UNEP – 3,8 M \$/ 7,5 M \$. GEF Agency UNEP

The project concept is good, but consistency with previous OME evaluation of the GEF Initial strategy on Biosafety, as well as the project overall sustainability remain unclear.

Opinion: favorable, but with the following questions and remarks to be taken into account:

Consistency with previous OME evaluation of the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety (cf. “Strategy for Financing Biosafety” – GEF council meeting, December 5-8, 2006).

The proposed project provides a good rationale of components and activities, but little is built on previous evaluation. It would be good to explain why this new project is not putting some focus on the following recommendation of the GEF OME:

- future support should be better customized to the respective country conditions;
- consider providing longer term training for building and sustaining specialist capacity in risk assessment and risk management;

- emphasize awareness-raising, public consultation and information sharing (to the public and not only to the specialist only);

Sustainability.

The project provide little information on how the maintenance of the equipments needed and the salary of all the specialists to be engaged in the biosafety management scheme at the regional level will be financed after the end of the project.

3. Cameroon - BS Development and Implementation of a National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) - under the GEF Biosafety Program (GEF Grant: \$ 2.80 m) UNEP – 3, 08 M \$/ 11.48 M \$. GEF Agency UNEP

Opinion: favorable, but with the following questions and remarks to be taken into account: Comments are the same as for n°1 above, extended to the subject of Invasive Alien Species.

5. Colombia - Mainstreaming Traditional Knowledge Associated with Agro biodiversity in Colombian Agro ecosystems (GEF Grant: \$ 2.50 m). GEF Agency UNDP COLOMBIA

Executing agency:	UNDP
Financing GEF:	\$ 2,500 M
Total project cost:	\$ 7,530 M
Duration:	5 years
IA fee:	11 %

The project aims at conserving sustainable agro-ecosystems in Colombia by protecting and managing agrobiodiversity and associated traditional knowledge.

The partnerships between private partners and local communities as well as the use of a “supply chain approach” give some credibility to the considered pilot demonstration projects.

Favourable opinion

6. Cuba - Application of a Regional Approach to the Management of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas in Cuba's Southern Archipelagos (GEF Grant: \$ 5.71 m) UNDP – 6, 35 M \$ / 20, 5. GEF Agency UNDP

This project is very important as it cover a biodiversity area of great significance.

Opinion: favorable, but with the following questions and remarks to be taken into Account:

The project should present results, lessons learnt and recommendations of the post-evaluations or mid-term review of the numerous previous projects which contributed to Cuba’s biodiversity conservation.

In particular, according to the importance of the assistance received so far by the Government of Cuba (GoC), and the statement of the poor attention and means derived to sustainably finance the Protected Area Network, and the Marine Protected Area so far, the project should present a fair assessment of the willingness and the capacity of the GoC to sustainably finance the activities after the end of the project. The following statement in §14 “Funding of MPAs will continue to rely on government funds, which are inadequate, and international donor funds, whose varied requirements and durations preclude effective planning and require significant time and effort” is showing that the project don’t build an exit solution to this new project notably in terms of sustainable finance for biodiversity conservation and National Protected Area Network.

8. Honduras - Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia (GEF Grant: \$ 2.02 m). GEF Agency UNDP

Executing agency: UNDP
Financing GEF: \$ 2,018 M
Total project cost: \$ 7,328 M
Duration: 5 years
IA fee: 10 %

The project aims at protecting the biodiversity in the Moskitita region. It considers in particular to developing alternative production systems (subsistence, artisanal and community based commercial) with indigenous communities which favour biodiversity. In this regard, the PIF should indicate more clearly which partners are going to be sought to work on market access of the productions developed. The involvement of such partners (public, private, NGO) will be crucial to ensure that the alternative productions reach markets and start generating real and significant benefits for the indigenous communities.

- No objection subject to precisions provided:

9. Mexico - Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia (GEF Grant: \$ 2.02 m). GEF Agency UNDP

The project aims at strengthening the capacities of the local populations as regards natural resources management through the certification of the forest products. The objectives of the project seem relevant and flow in the direction of a sustainable management of the natural resources.

Opinion: favorable

10. Venezuela - Strengthening the Financial Sustainability and Operational Effectiveness of the Venezuelan National Parks System (GEF Grant: \$ 7.18 m). GEF Agency UNDP

Executing agency: UNDP
Financing GEF: \$ 7,197 M
Total project cost: \$ 23,679 M

Duration: 5 years
IA fee: 10 %

The project aims at strengthening Venezuelan National Parks System with a focus on its financial sustainability and the improved effectiveness of its protected areas management.

The PIF raises the following questions.

The PIF mentions the importance of involving local communities, while INPARQUES (National Parks Institute) appears to be the main public organization involved. When it comes to indigenous population, the PIF should clearly state, who are going to be the other partners involved whether governmental, NGO...

Coordination with the existing projects supporting Venezuelan national parks should be sought to ensure consistency between the tools, management methods that will developed with GEF support. The FGEF, in relation with Inparques and The Nature Conservancy, is currently supporting a project in Venezuela focused on Canaima National Park and its indigenous communities.

- No objection subject to precisions provided:

Climate Change

12. India - IND Chillers Energy Efficiency Project - under the Programmatic Framework for Energy Efficiency (GEF Grant: \$ 6.30 m). GEF Agency WB

The project aims at accelerating the process of the replacement over 3 years of 440 old and energy inefficient CFC chillers by the mobilisation of a comprehensive mechanism made of incentives (GEF-MLF and CDM), technical assistance and demonstrative projects. The financial mechanism is planned to be run as a revolving fund. The total cost of the project is 99.5 millions \$.

Comments: The participation of the GoI does not appear clearly in this project. It could have been included in the global mechanism some fiscal incentives (for example).

Opinion: favorable opinion subject to clarifying GoI significant participation

13. Iran - Facilitating Sustainable Mobility in Tehran (GEF Grant: \$ 5.33 m) UNDP

The project aims at organizing the transport sector in Teheran (planned and integrated system, BRT, traffic regulations). The experience of Teheran could be replicated in other Iranian cities. The project is a kind of follow-up of a WB project.

Comments: The added value of this UNDP project compared to the WB project is not very clear at all. The comparative advantage of UNDP itself is not clear, and its contribution is mean (350 k\$).

Opinion: there is a need to clarify in depth the relationship between the 2 projects and to increase significantly the UNDP contribution.

15. Mexico - Mexico Rural Development (GEF Grant: \$ 10.50 m). WB

This project comes after a previous project PERA (Renewable energy for agriculture) which has been already supported by the GEF (8.9 M\$) between 2000 and 2006 with the WB. The new project will focus on environmentally and economically sustainable agro-processing facilities in small and medium sized producers and processors (use of biomass and of energy efficient processes). The GEF grant will be blended with a 60m\$ IBRD loan.

Comments: The number and the size of the investments (sub-projects) are not indicated therefore it is difficult to understand and to justify such a level of subsidize requested by the Bank.

Opinion: favourable in principle subject to more detailed justification.

16. Russian Federation – RUS Improving Efficiency in Public Buildings in the Russian Federation - under the Energy Efficiency Umbrella Program (GEF Grant : \$ 9.21 m). EBRD

The project aims at facilitating of investments in the field of energy efficient technologies in the public buildings (school, hospitals, etc). The project is structured around the classical application points such as assistance to audit, investments support and innovative financial instruments. The project will capitalize on the new legislative development, the development of new public-private partnerships and Energy savings companies (ESCOs). The EBRD plans to mobilize a 62 m\$ loan in the context of EBRD's Sustainable Energy Initiative (1,5 B\$ in 2006-2008).

Comments: the main innovation in the project is the new financial mechanism based on “forfeiting” (sales of receivables) which is indeed quite interesting and well fitted to the context of municipalities. The participation of the GoR is not known but will certainly be limited (200 k\$).

The concept is excellent, however the public finance is rather limited. No reference is made to the GEF/UNEP project with CEENU, UNF and FFEM (6 M\$) “Facilitating investments in EE in Eastern Europe (2006)”. These 2 projects should liaise and develop synergy.

Opinion: favourable subject to the above recommendation.

17. Russian Federation - RUS Improving Urban Housing Efficiency in the Russian Federation – under the Energy Efficiency Umbrella Program (GEF Grant: \$ 9.67 m). EBRD

The project aims at encouraging the reconstruction and refurbishment of municipal housing in selected area of FoR (p.e city of Surgut in the Khanty-Mansi okrug). EBRD will mobilize 50 m\$ loan and a line of grant of 1.7 M\$. The “Russian Municipal Housing Reform Fund” (9,8 B\$) will participate with grant up to 50% of the cost of the value of the investments. Municipalities will pay up to 45%.

Comments: the GEF grant will support the housing municipality planning, building code implementation and incentives for demonstration projects.

Opinion : favorable

18. Turkey - Market Transformation of Energy Efficient Appliances in Turkey (GEF Grant: \$ 2.71 m). UNDP

The project aims at upgrading the efficiency of electrical household appliances in Turkey (refrigerators, air conditioners, electrical ovens, etc) through capacity building, increase of awareness, communication and statistical survey of the transformation market.

Comments: this project is one of the cornerstone for the improvement of the global energy performance of the residential sector and should be supported.

Opinion: favorable

19. Turkey - Promote Energy Efficiency in Buildings (GEF Grant: \$ 2.62 m). UNDP

The project aims at introducing the use of an integrated building design in the building sector with the construction ministry with the view to improve energy efficiency while containing over-costs. It follows a similar project with GTZ which is closed (creation of an energy center to promote the benefits of EE in the building sector). The GoT has pledged a significant contribution in cash (11 millions \$) and 7.68 millions in kind. The UNDP contribution is not precised.

Comments: there are currently no GEF climate change in Turkey. The UNDP contribution is weak in cash terms. The added value of UNDP taskforce is not very specific.

Strategic project strongly supported by the GoT. UNDP should invest more of its own resources. **Subject to an additional and visible contribution from UNDP, opinion favorable.**

International Waters

24. Regional (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa) - Development and Adoption of a Strategic Action Program for Balancing Water Uses and Sustainable Natural Resource Management in the Orange-Senqu River Transboundary Basin (RESUBMISSION) (GEF Grant : \$ 6.30 m). UNDP

Executing agency: UNDP
Financing GEF: \$ 6,300 M
Total project cost: \$ 33,586 M
Duration: 4 years
IA fee: 11 %

The project targets the improved management of the Orange River between Botswana, Lesotho, South Africa and Namibia through the development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Plan (SAP).

As indicated in the PIF, this project will interact and complete several others on going initiatives supported by bilateral and/or multilateral donors (FGEF, GTZ, EU...). The FGEF is supporting in particular a project which is to carry out 10 of the 30 priority surveys identified by ORASECOM.

Coordination between the different initiatives will be crucial and it is hence important to ensure that the consultation and coordination process that took place during the first phase of this GEF project continues.

Favourable opinion

25. Regional (Belarus, Ukraine) Implementation of the Dnipro Basin Strategic Action Program for the reduction of persistent toxics pollution

Executing agency: UNDP
Financing GEF: \$ 2,035 M
Total project cost: \$ 8,135 M
Duration: 3 years
IA fee: 13 %

The project concerns the DNIPRO river basin shared between Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. It follows up a first GEF supported program with these three countries, which led to the development of a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Plan (SAP). It targets persistent toxic pollution generated by the industrial discharged through the municipal waste water treatment systems.

The proposal raises several issues that need to be addressed during the project preparation.

The PIF indicates that Russia is not part of the project due to political consideration. The PIF indicates further that 20% of the Basin is situated in Russia. It should also indicate the amount of pollution coming from this part of the Basin, compared to the 80% covered by the project to know what share of pollution the project will actually address.

The PIF should have been clearer about the target of the pilot projects:

- Is it the industries themselves with cleaner production methods?
- Is it the management and technologies of municipal waste water treatment systems?
- Is it both and then what kinds of interactions are considered between the private sector (industries) and municipal and public entities?

- **No objection subject to precisions provided:**

27. Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu) - PAS Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in the Pacific Island Countries – under the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF Grant : \$ 9.03 m). UNDP/UNEP

The wastewater management in the states of the Southern Pacific is a major problem for biodiversity. The innovative propositions that the project will contribute to put in place should be relevant for the protection of the marine ecosystems in this area.

Opinion: favorable

28. Regional (Argentina, Uruguay) - Reducing and Preventing Land-based Pollution in the Rio de la Plata/Maritime Front through Implementation of the FrePlata Strategic Action Programme (GEF Grant: \$ 2.85 m). UNDP

The high level of land based pollution in Rio de la Plata justifies actions suggested by the project. The strengthening of policy and legal frameworks have to be examined with special attention.

Opinion: favorable

30. Regional (Mauritania, Senegal, Gambia, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ghana) - Strategic Partnership for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems of Sub-Saharan Africa (Tranche 1, Installment 2) (GEF Grant: \$ 15.60 m). WB

Opinion: mitigated

The demand for the second installment of the strategic partnership is built on several assumptions which are raising concerns and could be more documented.

1/ (A. p4 last §) *“by improving the value of the resources from in-land processing (and improved post-harvest handling of fish catch), the investments will develop the artisanal sector and create jobs from small-scale processing activities, thereby decreasing the pressure on the resource.”* This assumption is not convincing. Since the last ten years several

international projects (from France, UE, World Bank) tried to increase the value added generated by the artisanal sector and it didn't reduce the pressure on the resource: it was the opposite as the size of the fleet of artisanal fishers increased in the period. This assumption implies also a massive reconversion of some artisanal fishers toward some post-harvest handling activities: the political, technical and financial feasibility of these reconversions remain to be demonstrated.

2/ (B. p5 first §) *“Each of the 9 participating countries of West Africa has shown strong interest and commitment at the highest political level, by engaging discussions with the CSRFP (sub-regional commission for fisheries) to establish a common vision for sustainable fisheries management in their waters.”* This statement is overoptimistic and doesn't reflect the still weak capacity of the CSRFP to actively engage the 9 participating countries in a common vision. Strong support and lobbying remain to be done to convince the 9 participating countries to actively engage a regional cooperation for sustainable fisheries management.

3/ (F. p7 (iii) on weakness in the investment climate and banking toward increased value added captured locally) *“This risk would be reduced through an integration of the project's objectives and activities into the ongoing macro-economic dialogue of the World Bank in the countries, and through collaboration with the International Finance Corporation (IFC).”* The capacity of IFC to engage in this sector needs to be documented, particularly in terms of eligible projects, minimum amount of loans (which usually is too high to allow small local investors to qualify), transaction costs. The project should present what will be the financial mechanism to bank the projects of local investors and how it will encourage some fishermen to turn out from fishing activities to enroll in these new activities ?

4/ (G. p8 last §) *“The sustainability of the operations [...] will be assured by the nature of these investments, which will be focused on institutional capacity-building and national policy and regulatory reforms that would enable sustainable management of the fisheries resources of the LMEs long after the completion of individual projects”.* It is not convincing that investment in capacity building and national policy will be sufficient to secure sustainability of the activities of the projects, particularly in regards of the financial cost of the monitoring, control and enforcement of the regulation which will be promoted by the project.

5/ (Annex I. p9) One of the target indicator of *“Area of the sea in SSA under networks of MPAs increased...”* is supposed to jump in 3 years from 1000 to 2000 sq Km. (between 2012 and 2015) which seems overambitious according to the context in 2008, as currently it is still challenging to bring the existing MPA into full operation. This target could increase the area under *“paper MPA”*. A detail localization and assessment of the feasibility of this target should be provided during project preparation.

Moreover, this target is not taking into account the existing work of several international NGOs in SSA who started to establish a West African MPA Network (Programme Régional de Conservation côtière et Marine – PRCM).

31 – Sustainable Fisheries Development Project in nine West African Countries

This PIF assumes that fisheries are *“currently being depreciated due to the inability of countries to control the use of the marine fish stocks and prevent their overexploitation and depletion (mostly from illegal or ‘pirate’ vessels)”* which is overemphasizing the role of *“control and enforcement”* activities while hiding the role of the absence of regional

management plan of fish stocks and the low capacities and political will to manage regional fishing efforts.

As it is a multicountry project and not a regional project, it is neither clear in the present PIF how the management and coordination of all local stakeholders at the national level will be secured, neither the coordination between the national and regional level (again the capacity of the CSRP will need to be strongly fostered to play the regional coordination role)

The project is not sufficiently identifying and articulating with the numerous stakeholders already engaged in the sector besides the ministries: professional organization of fishers and artisanal fishermen, NGOs, etc...

On another side, environmental and socio economic impact assessment of investments which will be promoted by the project "*to encourage greater domestic benefits*" should be systematically implemented. There are several prospects in the region to open new extractions activities to diversify local revenues and lower pressure on the fisheries, but with little if no real impact assessment to date.

31. Regional (Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan) - The Caspian Sea: Restoring Depleted Fisheries and Consolidation of a Permanent Regional Environmental Governance Framework (GEF Grant: \$ 4.70 m). UNDP

Multi- Focal Area

36. China - PRC-GEF An IEM Approach to the Conservation of Biodiversity in Dryland Ecosystems - under the PRC-GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystem Program (GEF Grant: \$ 4.55 m). IFAD

Land degradation in China results of anthropic pressure and economic development. The project aims at reducing this two constrains with actions focused on the involvement of local population.

Opinion: favorable

40. Philippines - Mindanao Rural Development Program Phase II – Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Conservation Component (GEF Grant: \$ 6.49 m). WB

The project aims at improving the incomes of the local populations with a better access to the market for agricultural and fishery products whose production does not affect the natural resources.

Opinion: favorable

41. Tunisia - MENARID Support to Sustainable Land Management in the Siliana Governorate (GEF Grant: \$ 5.00 m). IFAD

The drought and socio-economic development strongly affect the land degradation in Tunisia, especially in agricultural area as Siliana Governorate. The objectives of the project are relevant. They should promote agricultural practices taking into account the local conditions and sustainable development.

Opinion: favorable

43. Colombia - Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching (GEF Grant: \$ 7.00 m). WB

The project aims at protecting the biodiversity of Colombia by using natural resources by the farmers in sustainable conditions. This objective seems particularly relevant.

Opinion: favorable

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

44. Regional (Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan) - DSSA Demonstrating and Scaling up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the control of vector borne diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia (GEF Grant: \$ 2.05 m). UNEP

The project aims at trying out alternatives to DDT and at destroying part of existing stocks. For this reason, the objectives of the project are relevant.

Opinion: favorable

45. Belarus - Persistent Organic Pollutant Stockpile Management and Technical/Institutional Capacity Upgrading (GEF Grant: \$ 5.50 m); WB