



**COMPILATION OF NGO INTERVENTIONS AT GEF  
COUNCIL  
DECEMBER 2006**



## **STRATEGY FOR FINANCING BIOSAFETY (DOC/C.30/8 NOV06)**

**By Rajen Awotar (Regional NGO Focal Point for East Africa) and Khadija Razavi (Regional NGO Focal Point for West Asia)**

The present document builds on Doc GEF/C.27/12 of October 2005 and the document “Elements for a Bio-safety Strategy” presented during the June meeting.

During our comments at the June meeting we strongly highlighted the importance of the full participation of all stake-holders particularly civil society groups at all level. We based our comments on the report of the Evaluation Office which rightly noted the lack of proper consultation with Civil Society in most cases.

We therefore welcome the contents of Para 20 at Page 4 “Focus on in country coordination and stake-holder involvement”. We again request that the GEF funding documents make clear recommendation about this issue and make it conditional for countries benefiting the funds to comply fully.

“The strategic focus” at Section III Page 2 Para 6 sub-sections C and E make mention of in country coordination and involvement of stake-holders in the enhancement of awareness raising and public participation.

Stocktaking Assessment (Page 3 Para 8)

The network would wish to be clear on the modalities of this assessment as regards who, which organization will be responsible. The network would wish to be consulted and involved in this process.

Involvement of a broad range of Implementing and Executing Agencies (Page 4 Para 22 & 23)

The network would wish to be represented on the proposed Steering Committee by at least one member.

We welcome the recommendations as regards public participation under item “Awareness Raising, Public Participation and Information Sharing” at Para 25 Page 5. We expect that these are clearly reflected in the GEF project documents. Sustainability (Page 5 Para 27).

The network proposes that countries involved in the “Development of National Bio-safety Strategy”, the National Bio-safety Capacity Building Strategy and the National



Coordination Mechanism mentioned at sub-section a,b, include Civil Society representatives in the true spirit of participation and involvement outlined in the protocol. The protocol is very clear on this issue.

We reiterate our previous requests (Ref June meeting intervention) to be fully involved in all “monitoring/evaluation activities” (Ref Page 6 Para 29).

**Conclusion**

We request UNEP to share its accumulated wealth of knowledge on this issue to the network. We need to share such information to our broader network.

That UNEP involve the network through the country, regional, sub-regional activities in the future, particularly as regards training and capacity building.

We request the GEF capacity building unit to regularly update the network as regards its various capacity building activities – as the network is interested to be a party to all such capacity building activities.

We thank you Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen for your kind attention.



**LEGAL, OPERATIONAL, AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF AN AMENDMENT OF THE GEF INSTRUMENT TO REFLECT THE DESIGNATION OF THE GEF AS A FINANCIAL MECHANISM OF THE UNCCD: (GEF/C.30/7NOV.2006)**

**Rajen Awotar (Regional NGO Focal Point for East Africa) and Khadija Razavi (Regional NGO Focal Point for West Asia)**

First of all we wish to point out the inadequacies of funds as regards this focal area. Everybody is aware that this convention is the “Parent Pauvre” of all the GEF funded conventions.

Projects regarding “Sustainable Land Management”, if correctly designed and taking in account the community driven priorities at the same level as country driven priorities with a participatory approach involving local government, local communities, women, youth, small farmers, pastoralists, civil society etc in the process of decision making, implementation and M&E are bound to make a difference. Poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihood, enhancement of the ecosystems, income generation, sand dune fixation, combating desertification, land degradation, drought and realization of Millennium Goals will be tackled in a holistic manner.

Good governance and the involvement of all stakeholders in the process of sustainable development is a good opportunity to have high-quality project implementation of the Convention.

It would be good to know the countries where land use planning and community driven development have been undertaken as these could be good examples to be replicated in other regions having similar problems.

We thank you Chair, Ladies & Gentlemen for your kind attention!



## **EVALUATION OF PROJECT CYCLE AND MODALITIES DOC/GEF/ MEC.30/5 NOV06)**

**by Andras Krolopp, CEEWEB, Hungary**

Co-chair,

NGO's welcome the excellent, analytical document prepared by the Evaluation Offices. Actually – just as the presentation – it was quite interesting.

The findings and the recommendations are in general on-line with the concerns NGOs were having over the years, regarding the long and sometimes cumbersome processes. We particularly like welcome the recognized need for long term strategic planning.

We would like to see clear guidelines how the countries will be part of the planning processes and feel the ownership – regarding the long term strategies. Here I am referring to page 2, & 9 and page 13, & 55.

On page 3 &1 the paper is talking about pilot projects in cross-sectoral manner. It is unclear for us what such pilot projects will entail.

On page 15 e, the paper talks about regular clearing-up the pipeline. We agree to this, but fail to see the criterion for this and the identified institutions taking the responsibility for this.

On page 18 &68 on the development of the work program the document in front of us lists the actors who should be engaged in the development of the strategies, however, while donor countries are mentioned, the recipient countries are left out. We do not understand why.

Concluding, I would like to pick up the line from page 18 &70, that GEF should be policy and not project driven. With this, few remarks NGOs are endorsing the document in front of us, and looking forward the implementation of the recommendations, which will at the end of the day help implementing GEF's long-term vision.



## **FINAL NGO STATEMENT**

**By Dorothy Manuel, Central Focal Point for GEF NGO Network**

Over the past few days NGOs have met to discuss not only the reform of the GEF but also forge a more unified engagement with the GEF. The NGOs of the Network represent NGOs from country/regional level right up to the international NGOs. We, the NGOs engaged both in the GEF globally and as Civil Society Organizations within the Council's Constituencies, are unanimously in favor of the principles of the redefinition that the GEF is going through.

The new rules of the game are good and what we like is that the principles provide greater transparency, clarity of structure and efficiency. Clarifying the working criteria will be key to success. This will not succeed without group ownership of the processes and systems defined.

The NGOs encourage the secretariat in the formation of working groups/steering committees to support definition of key processes in order to build this important ownership. In line with this proposal and the principle that people will be appointed in their individual capacity as external experts, we remind the GEF that there is great knowledge and expertise among NGOs, which should be drawn upon. This is again important for ownership, since government administrations come and go, but civil society remains and expertise continues to build. This is valid both on the local, grassroots level and in global context as well (this sector is key stakeholder and an important interface with the local level activities).

We believe that the challenge for the next six months is how these principles will be enacted by the council, secretariat, agencies and stakeholders. Once this challenge is met it is our expectation that the council will move onto the next step which is ensuring good operationalization, effective monitoring and decisions following the guidelines of the conventions the instrument is servicing. This is certainly what we will be keeping our eye on. Without this, restructuring will not deliver the desired benefits for the global environment at the centre of which is the people.

To make the GEF reform successful, the council must, in our opinion, demonstrate a level of trust among its members and delegation of authority to the Secretariat that has been sadly lacking in recent years. There is also a need for more clarity on when and why the council acts as a *management team* and when it acts as a *board* – this is needed in order to facilitate the secretariat in its work.



Concluding, the NGOs continue to strongly support the outlined long/term strategy. We truly believe, this is how the GEF should move forward. It will help planning, implementation and management - and we expect to see by the end of the GEF-4 that the GEF is becoming more effective in improving the state and quality of the global environment. The NGOs recall their commitment of support and resources in order to help to move the process forward. But we are also committed to ring the bells if the agreed processes get de-railed.