



**SUMMARY OF NGO INTERVENTIONS AT GEF COUNCIL  
NOVEMBER 2007**



**Agenda Item 7: Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol, GEF/C.32/5  
by Yabanex Batista (Regional NGO Focal Point for North America)**

As we all know the operationalization of the Adaptation Fund is critical, as climate change is already impacting countries around the world, particularly the poorest ones.

We welcome the openness and flexibility of the “Note on the Adaptation Fund” presented to Council, particularly with regard to the establishment of an independent governing body for the Adaptation Fund following the guidelines provided by the UNFCCC COP/MOP Decision 5/CMP 2. In particular, we would like to remind the GEF Council of the guidance from the COP/MOP to prioritize the most vulnerable countries, in particular the SIDS and LDCs.

Were the GEF Secretariat selected to be the entity to manage and serve as the Secretariat of the Adaptation Fund, we believe it could bring important expertise and experience on adaptation, as it already manages the SPA Pilot Program in the GEF Trust Fund and the LDCF and SCCF funds. This would ideally provide for an environment conducive to creating synergies and lessons sharing with the wider GEF biodiversity, climate change, international waters and land degradation portfolios.

Notwithstanding any UNFCCC decision, however, the GEF Secretariat proposal to function as the Secretariat of an independent governing body of the Adaptation Fund should also confirm that the following principles will be applied:

- A country-driven approach.
- Simple and transparent application processes.
- Open to applications from NGOs and CBOs that meet the modalities, priorities and criteria for the Adaptation Fund.
- Reflect independence from potential donor contributions.
- Efficiency and effectiveness in the management and operation of the fund.
- Independent monitoring and evaluation.

Finally, as the countries present here today are also parties to the UNFCCC, we would like to encourage you, and all parties of the Convention, to finalize a decision on the governing structure and entity to be entrusted with the operation of the Fund during COP-13 in Bali.



**Agenda Item 11: Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Review of the RAF  
GEF/ME/C.30/6  
by Yabanex Batista (Regional NGO Focal Point for North America)**

The Network would like to congratulate the Evaluation Office for its comprehensive work and open consultation process in writing the TORs for the RAF Mid-Term Review.

We are aware that all of us (GEF Secretariat, agencies, countries, civil society) have been learning how to adapt to the RAF in the last 1½ years and that this coincided with the revitalization process of the GEF. As such, we would like to emphasize the importance of taking a closer look at the GEF project prioritization process.

We are particularly concerned with the fact that the process by which a country defines its priorities under the RAF has insufficient guidelines and structure to guarantee a speedy prioritization process. Lessons from this first RAF should be taken into account for the next round of prioritizations.

With respect to Annex B (sub-questions per key questions)

- 1) On Question 5 --- We would like to ask for an additional bullet point focus on civil society, which we suggest could read as follows: “To what extent civil society has been involved in the RAF prioritization process”.
- 2) On Question 6 --- We would like to request for the evaluation to explicitly include how the role of civil society in GEF has been affected/changed by the RAF.

**Pacific Position on GEF RAF Review  
By Rex Horoi, RFP, Pacific**

As has been the consistent position of Pacific SIDS since the inception of the RAF, we remain concerned by the RAF indices and weighing system for GBIO. The current weighting system of 20% for marine biodiversity and 80% for terrestrial biodiversity results in smaller allocations being made available for marine biodiversity-rich countries versus terrestrial biodiversity-rich countries. Given that we live on a blue planet and the oceans may hold the secret to much of the world’s future medical, food security and economic development prospects this weighting does not seem to have any justification at all. The CBD is not biased towards terrestrial biodiversity protection *vis-a-vis* marine biodiversity protection. Prioritization is a mandate of the CBD COP, not the GEF.

One of the justifications given at the time of the development of the unbalanced weighting system for GBIO was that there weren’t enough universally applicable data available on marine biodiversity to develop similar indices to those calculated for



terrestrial biodiversity. Pacific SIDS have examined this contention over the last year and our preliminary findings refute this line of thinking. There are indeed global data sets available relating to marine biodiversity that could be used and preliminary testing shows that they could be used in the context of an improved GBIO. We hope that the CBD Secretariat and the GEF with their respective reviews of the RAF will reconsider this issue with the seriousness it deserves and we are happy to provide the preliminary assessments and calculations we have done. If there aren't sufficient data available then we need to start investing more effort in its collection. Even a simple re-weighting of the existing split to 50:50 instead of 20:80 would go a long way in leveling the playing field. It is time to implement the precautionary principle in its true sense.

**Agenda Item 9: Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Program – Executive Version  
GEF/ME/C.32/2  
by Rajen Awotar, RFP East Africa**

SGP has done well in terms of cost-effective, comparative advantage and achieving global and local benefits, compared with GEF full and medium-sized projects. We commend SGP for accomplishing both global and local benefits.

We understand that to make room for new countries some existing countries will need to graduate. If possible, GEF can advocate for RAF at country level to have better ownership and hand holding. If this does not happen we are worried that we will see graduated SGP projects collapsing in the next few years. We must be mindful of risks in terms of sustainability of very good performing projects.

We propose that the graduation process take into account the capacity and GDP of the country. We would like to point out that the graduation policy pay special attention to LDCs and their vulnerabilities.

We would also like it to be recognized that some of the countries involved in the SGP have been deemed successful particularly where NGOs are involved in the management. It should be noted that the success in some countries could not have been achieved without the commitment of NGOs. We propose that SGP find more areas to collaborate with NGOs for the best results. The network is prepared to take part in the monitoring and evaluation aspects of SGP.

Apart from the SGP core activities, we propose that SGP align itself with the GEF programmatic approach to achieve a more integrated and synergetic effect. For instance, the Pacific can be a window for SGP as well as to mobilize more resources.