

EU submission to the CBD notification 2012-090 on part C) views on the preliminary report of the assessment of needs for GEF-6

2 July 2012

Part C of notification: Views on the preliminary report of the assessment of needs for GEF-6

WGRI4 invited Parties, other Governments, and relevant organizations to provide views on the draft report on the full assessment of the amount of funds that are necessary to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition for the sixth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/4/INF/10).

EU and its member states appreciate the ongoing work of the expert team and acknowledge that it is a challenging task, especially as it is the first comprehensive needs assessment of this kind being based on the new Strategic Plan of the CBD, and anew methodology has to be developed with only an incomplete knowledge and information base at its disposal.

We take note of the preliminary results of the assessment, and recognise it as a useful contribution to the general discussion on resource mobilisation.

EU and its member states would like to use this opportunity to emphasise the importance of coordinating this exercise with other ongoing assessments and processes, such as in particular the work conducted by the high-level panel on financing for biodiversity, co-sponsored by India and the United Kingdom, but also to other relevant technical information about financing for sustainable development and on the costs of implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

While recognising the challenges linked to conducting the study, the EU and its member states believe that the draft report can be improved on a number of points:

- In its current form, the draft study does not sufficiently take into account existing funding and ongoing initiatives related to the Aichi targets and potentials for up-scaling. Although it is a very difficult task to assess the current status and investments, it should be done at least for selected cases or Aichi targets, which would lead to a more accurate and realistic estimate for the remaining funding gap for some targets, taking into account the budgetary situation in many countries. To avoid an overestimation of the financing gap, the information on activities that are already funded and on the potential for alternative sources of funding beyond GEF - public and private - should be provided and become more complete as more countries submit their national needs assessments.
- Although the expert team has made a considerable effort to compare and contrast the targets in order to avoid double accounting and thereby an overestimation of the needs, the final version of the study should make explicit where activities relate to more than one target as well as highlight multiple benefits and synergies between different targets. For the final report, the expert team should scan all proposed activities and estimates with regard to their eligibility for funding under the current GEF rules and mandate. If proposed activities are identified as not being eligible, support for these activities should be excluded from the cost estimates.
- It should be made clearer how the incremental reasoning percentages are arrived at.

- The rationale behind the scenarios is not always clear, as several variables are moving at the same time. There would be some merit in presenting more transparent scenarios, which might require some simplification in their construction.
- There is an underlying assumption that all countries need to carry out all the proposed activities under each target, but this might not be the case as it depends on the specific national circumstances and on activities already undertaken. Again, it will be important in the final report to analyse and incorporate additional inputs from national needs assessments, which would allow differentiating the need for and scoping of specific activities under each target according to the requirements identified by each country.
- In addition, we would like to also highlight the importance of taking into consideration the respective existing institutional and technical capacities of governments, organisations and agencies related to GEF with regard to the subsequent implementation of the proposed activities in a four year framework.

EU and its member states look forward to the final report of the assessment and to use it as a helpful contribution to the general discussion on resource mobilisation.