



GEF CSO Network Statement
Agenda item 7: Proposal for STAR for GEF 6
46th GEF Council Meeting, Cancun, Mexico

The GEF CSO Network welcomes the proposed revision of the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) for GEF 6.

We support the proposed changes to increase the floor for LDCs and increase the weightage of per capita GDP. This will enhance the level of GEF resources for LDCs and other lower income developing countries. We also support the proposed increase in flexibility for countries with more than \$7 million in STAR allocation.

We are however disappointed that the recommendation by GEF replenishment process to increase the weightage of Land use, Land use change and Forestry (LULUCF) emissions in calculating the country allocations has not been acted upon. For many GEF recipient countries emissions from LULUCF and also the agriculture sector comprise more than 50% of the emissions. This is particularly the case in LDCs and Lower Middle income countries.

GEF has recognized the importance of addressing these emissions by the inclusion of action to address LULUCF and Agriculture sector emissions in the GEF 6 Focal area strategy for climate change. However those countries with significant LULUCF and agriculture emissions which want to submit projects to address this - will only have small GEF 6 country allocations under the STAR as their industrial and transport emissions (which are the basis for most of the country allocations) may be relatively low. This is a serious inequality and also perverse incentive as the only way to get more resources to address the problem can come from increasing their industrial or transport emissions.

It is stated that the reason not to consider LULUCF emissions is inadequate information on the Land use related emissions from recipient countries. If this really is the case then GEF should allocate some resources to enhance data availability and assessment of trends.

As an interim measure it is proposed to make some adjustment to the GEF 5 formula from 5% to 10%. An alternative could be to increase the weightage on remaining forest area as this would give more resources to countries with significant forests that may be at risk from future conversion. It is understood that there is better data available on remaining forest areas.