

CONTRIBUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BY CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

TO THE GEF 7 SECOND REPLENISHMENT MEETING

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, 4-5 OCTOBER 2017

Introduction

In March 2017, stakeholders and civil society organisations from developed countries compiled and presented a set of contributions to the seventh replenishment of the Global Environment Facility (GEF).¹ The paper provided a set of recommendations and considerations towards the proposed impact and policy programmes proposed in the GEF from 2018 – 2022. Building on that submission, and in light of the revised strategy paper, stakeholders offer the following further recommendations and considerations for the second replenishment meeting in October 2017.

Following the release of the revised strategy proposal on 12th September, the developed country civil society representatives (Climate Action Network Europe and Transparency International) reached out to over 200 non-governmental organisations including private sector, inviting further inputs for GEF 7. A total of 7 responses including numerous general and specific inputs) were received which are presented in this paper. The GEF Secretariat supported stakeholder inputs by providing a webinar presentation on the revised strategy on 15th September 2017. However, it should underscore that this submission misses its potential given the short time frame and limited capacity among civil society organisations to engage with the process.

Financing

The GEF is a unique and highly effective institution for advancing cross-cutting global goals under MEAs, and in turn for the SDGs, and country priorities and should receive financing above the current level. However, the scale of financing for GEF-7 is still far below the need identified by international financial assessments, and even more so in light of the additional responsibilities GEF has assumed in recent years as financial mechanism for the Minamata Convention, CBIT, the Stockholm Convention, SAICM and the Montreal Protocol. For example, the financial need just for the Stockholm Convention is more than five times greater than the proposed GEF-7 allocation.

Further, reducing financial support for climate change is premature. While the Green Climate Fund is a welcome addition to international financial architecture, it is still in its early stages of operationalisation and undergoing start-up challenges. The GEF remains a central actor in addressing climate change as an integral element of all its work as climate specific funding plays an important role in addressing climate change mitigation and resilience. It is also an integral element to supporting nature-based solutions to climate change risks, with integrated approaches that deliver multiple GEBs.

In relation to financing, it is recommended that:

- a minimum replenishment of \$5 billion be secured
- the increased relative allocation for Biodiversity presented in Table 1 be sustained
- resources for International Waters and Land Degradation be increased
- funding for climate action remain at its current (GEF 6) level at minimum, until the GCF is fully operational.

¹ See <http://www.caneurope.org/docman/climate-finance-development/3053-stakeholder-submission-gef-7-replenishment/file>; The inputs have not been included in the GEF 7 replenishment documentation on the GEF's website: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meetings/gef-7-replenishment-first-meeting>

Differentiation

A shift towards greater support to LDCs and SIDs is particularly important given the wide-scale challenges faced by these countries. The approach in providing Middle Income Countries (MICs) and Upper Middle Income Countries (UMICs) with non-grant instruments is appreciable. However, a large share of vulnerable people and communities live in MICs and UMICs; similarly, extensive environmental degradation and climate impacts occur in these countries. Accordingly, the various implications of using non-grant instruments need to be better explained and understood including their public subsidy components.

Targets

The targets set out by the GEF-7 replenishment documents are clearly linked to the overall ambition of the new direction of the GEF; i.e. greater results for the environment in the face of growing challenges. The potential for multiple benefits has not yet be tapped, and that the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and longer term vision of multiple multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) provide an ideal opportunity for the GEF to set out more ambitious targets. In doing so:

- targets must be accompanied by guidelines and indicators that measure to a certain extent the multiple benefits – linked with sustainable development, the environment and including systems change – that GEF-7 programming and policy implementation can bring about.
- the Rationale for GEF-7 Programming Architecture should include reference to [4p1000](#), which represents a unifying framework that cuts across all the Rio Conventions and several of the SDG's and provides a vision for achieving multiple goals and objectives in individual geographies.

Partnerships

Civil society appreciates the long term commitment of the GEF in supporting public involvement, its inclusion and support for indigenous peoples and their organization, and gender concerns, and is keen to develop new ways of engaging stakeholders towards achieving optimum impacts. To this end, civil society and stakeholder engagement should be

- recognised and included in the overall policy agenda;
- supported financially and by other means that encourages national portfolio formulation exercises, which include civil society, indigenous groups, community-based organisations and others and that ensures full project cycle participatory monitoring and engagement. This is critical to ensure enhance national capacities, country ownership and sustainable results.

Collaborations with global climate and environmental funds and initiatives will also increase the GEF's overall impacts. The GEF should:

- build on its experience and support and strengthen communication with the Green Climate Fund to generate greater impact for climate change action: While the GEF can support efforts in a number of cross-cutting areas such as biodiversity, disaster risk reduction water and desertification, it will be increasingly important to guarantee resilience to climate change impacts across all those areas

Private sector engagement & mobilising private finance

Engaging the private sector and finance, promoting public-private partnerships, and expanding the use of non-grant instruments in GEF-7 will be beneficial for meeting global environmental objectives. However, such arrangements are helpful when they additionally contribute to national and/or global goals. They must also come with a robust regulatory and accountability framework. An unregulated private sector will have the opposite effect of positively supporting public goods and services that the GEF is seeking to address. Rather, negative impacts such as the promotion of unsustainable consumption, potential environmental destruction and degradation could be consequences if private sector activities are pursued without adequate transparency, regulation and accountability. In addition, public-private partnerships may be prone to conflicts of interest which can be exacerbated by partners with significant financial capacity and could influence actions that affect governments and other stakeholders in a way that is contrary to GEF's goals and those of the international agreements. Likewise, as the potential for green, clean investments increases, risks that such initiatives could be abused to wash the illicit proceeds of illicit also surmount. Due diligence standards are a necessary precaution. To this end and in line with the views of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office report, it is recommended that:

- the term 'enabling environments' be qualified and clarified with regard to the GEFs role in promoting them through for example supporting capacity building and improving of regulatory policies & procedures for projects that involve mobilised private finance.
- actions be undertaken to strengthen due diligence, transparency, accountability and integrity standards applicable and monitoring processes regarding downstream financing arrangements such as engagements with executing entities and in growing partnerships with private sector actors.
- innovative partnerships be nurtured with non-governmental actors more broadly to deliver sustainable results through transparent and equitable processes.

Transparency and governance

While the GEF has adopted numerous transparency and accountability reforms in GEF 6, GEF 7 will need to translate those policies and standards into practice more broadly. Specific recommendations at the GEF should:

- demonstrate effectiveness of safeguards: develop and implement concrete indicators which measure environmental and social benefits and safeguards including fiduciary standards. This should ensure that the effectiveness of these indicators is reported over projects and programmes.
- improve transparency of country level governance framework including the roles of GEF Agencies and their policies and practices to ensure access to information, complaints handling, whistle-blower protection, and full project cycle stakeholder engagement/participatory monitoring.
- revise the policy regarding the review of compliance of GEF Agencies to include a process whereby beneficiaries and stakeholders are consulted and provide feedback on agency performance and that those inputs are recorded, taken on board and reflected as relevant in the compliance reviews.
- improve transparency in procurement and decision-making processes: Develop procedures and communicate fair and transparent procurement or decision-making processes to select (and develop relationships) with vendors, staff, countries, projects, agencies, partners and stakeholders (including civil society, indigenous people, local communities, and private sector from multinationals to small and medium sized enterprises).
- strengthen top level governance by:

- Monitoring and reporting that Council advice to the GEF Secretariat is taken into account and acted upon while supporting the Secretariat to carry out key operational functions.
- Adopting reforms
 - that the CEO and Council chair positions are separate and independent functions
 - that the Conflict Resolution Commissioner reports directly to guarantee the independence of the role

Focal Areas

In summary, civil society stakeholders support the ongoing GEF funding towards the key environmental focal areas and appreciate the direction towards better aligning efforts in and across focal areas so that outcomes and positive impacts can be felt across several focal areas.

Overall recommendations include that programming should:

- acknowledge the importance of civil society, local authorities and indigenous and local communities to be taken into consideration.
- acknowledge also that community-led initiatives can successfully address challenges in programme areas such as restoring landscapes and improving livelihoods.
- ensure that the overarching ‘social and economic’ systems addressed in the policy and programming paper also properly reflect the country priorities and commitments made in relation to multilateral environmental agreements.
- mainstream the concept of inclusiveness (as has been done in the Conservation section) throughout all focal areas.

Land degradation

- adopt approaches which can be scaled-up in the LD focal area should be more explicitly stated; for example, agroecology, agroforestry, analog forestry, and organic agriculture.
- ensure that those approaches recognise the huge opportunity to *implement and scale-up agroforestry to restore degraded agricultural land*.
- ensure that the role and inclusion of indigenous communities applies more widely (beyond the Conservation Focal Area) to the Land Degradation Focal Area.

Climate Change

- provide continued support for key areas of climate change mitigation such as capacity-building and technology transfer, and highlight the importance of integrating and increasing this support in the context of the Paris Agreement and NDC implementation which will require scaled up efforts by all countries.
- provide support for LDCs and SIDs for better integrating adaptation and enhanced resilience to climate change impacts into overall development policies and planning.

Biodiversity

Civil society supports the **Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting** element of the Biodiversity strategy. In that context, it is recommended that the GEF:

- address the challenge that much of the work on valuing natural capital stocks has been criticized by economists for providing total rather than marginal values, which economists need to integrate natural resource accounting into conventional capital stock and flow assessments. Useful resources are available.

In regard to **Certification schemes**, civil society welcomes that “*national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations*” is part of the 3rd of the proposed GEF core indicators. Certification is now mentioned as a “financial mechanism” (page 32) for “improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity positive”. However, certification is in the first place a tool to change management plans and practices in the forest, farming and fishing sectors, which require, in particular for smallholders, assistance for training, investments, access to specific markets. Therefore, it is recommended that the GEF:

- emphasises more specifically the promotion of this instrument in the current draft (see also our Stakeholder contribution submission of 22nd March 2017).
- acts as an accelerator of certification, particularly in the tropical regions, and focus on schemes with proven track-record, transparent, and third party verification practices.
- includes the paper and pulp sector in the scope of the GEF-7 programme as much more needs to be done in particular in tropical forests.

International Waters

Poorly planned hydropower is a key threat to freshwater resources, ecosystems and biodiversity. In that context, the GEF should:

- support smart hydropower planning principles, which entail the full integration of infrastructure planning with planning for the conservation of environmental and social resources at river-basin or regional scale. This approach also provides an opportunity to engage with large private sector partners, based on robust transparency and accountability measures. There was significant demand for this at the IHA and we encourage the GEF to include space to address it in GEF-7.

With regard to the types of investments in water, food, energy and environmental security (paragraph 203), the GEF should:

- include *training and capacity building* in the deployment of nature-based approaches and solutions to integrated watershed management within shared basins, and in effective approaches to monitoring & evaluation of the biodiversity and ecosystem impacts of such approaches.

Chemicals and Waste

Civil society is concerned about the language used in reference to the Chemicals and Waste Focal Area. To address these concerns, it is recommended that the GEF:

- recognise that the Stockholm Convention objective is the elimination, not the management of persistent organic pollutants, and that hazardous pesticides are not controlled by international law (as Para 207 implies).
- identify and agree on a more precise definition of sustainable chemistry, to better clarify the relationship between hazard reduction and other desirable social or environmental outcomes. This is because using the term “sustainable chemistry” without a clear definition invites labelling all kinds of current chemistries as sustainable chemistry, watering down the term to render it nearly useless and leaving opportunities to greenwash chemistries.

Impact Programmes

Building on the March meeting of the GEF-7 Replenishment, the reduced number of **Impact Programmes** to three is a helpful step to identify the various cross-cutting environmental challenges. The proposed Impact Programs are welcomed as vehicles for addressing systemic threats to the global environment that the GEF can help to address. To this end, the GEG should:

- set out a clear and transparent process for the further detailed design of these Programs, and for the design and approval of individual child projects, that ensures that interested countries can play a core role in designing interventions in collaboration with from the Agencies and Secretariat.

Sustainable Cities Impact Program

Civil society supports this program, including the 'emerging priorities' on 'Green infrastructure and nature-based solutions' and 'conservation of globally significant biodiversity'. GEF-7 correctly notes that cities should work towards reduction of the amount of waste generated, and improve overall waste management processes and programs, by reducing, reusing and recycling. Note that zero waste is the approach most consistent with fulfillment of sustainable waste management objectives because it addresses sustainable resource management.

Food, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program

With regard to "*Promoting sustainable food systems*", civil society suggests four important areas where GEF support for policy solutions can advance the work under this Program:

- **Water scarcity:** promote national policy mechanisms that enable technical solutions to water scarcity to be effective. Solving water scarcity problems requires a robust policy framework, without which technical changes might make the problem worse.
- **Fertilizer inefficiency** is a top issue for both GHGs and water quality, particularly in certain large countries. The GEF can provide critical leadership on national-level policy incentives and regulations to create disincentives for poor fertilizer management practices.
- **Soil health practices.** Promote policies to support improved soil health practices to reduce environmental impacts and potentially provide social benefits through healthier and more resilient soils (especially over the long term).
- **Conversion:** deforestation-free or conversion-free commitments by private companies are important; they are much stronger and easier to implement when there is a strong policy context (such as Brazil's Forest Code).

With regard to "*Promoting deforestation-free agricultural commodity supply chains*", it is further recommended that the GEF:

- consider working through the new [Accountability Framework Initiative](#).² The Initiative, put forward by a coalition of civil society organizations is working to provide consistency and rigor in this space, and provide a globally applicable approach for establishing and implementing commitments on deforestation, land conversion, and human rights in responsible agriculture and forestry supply chains.

² The Framework is not meant to replace or supersede existing initiatives or tools to support responsible supply chains. Likewise, it is not a new certification standard. Rather, it provides an overarching structure that helps to align, improve, and augment the array of available implementation tools while supporting supply chain actors to identify and utilize credible and effective methods to implement their commitments. The Framework is designed to be used by commodity-producing and commodity-buying companies as well as government, advocacy groups, and financial institutions.

- include a target (at Table 1.5 on pages 81-82) for ending conversion of other natural ecosystems recognising that there is already leakage of conversion to non-forested ecosystems (grasslands, shrub lands)

With regard to “*Promoting large-scale restoration of degraded landscapes*”, civil society is concerned that the use of the term “restoration” seems to refer primarily to restoring the functionality of productive working lands rather than ecological restoration. It would be helpful to have explicit goals around ecological restoration to build connectivity and in some contexts to provide ecosystem services to farms and ranches (e.g. pollination).

Regarding sustainable intensification targets, there are strong arguments that improving food distribution should be a core element of efforts to meet current and projected demand for food and to achieve environmental goals. (Hunter et al, Bioscience 2017). To this end, the GEF should:

- consider whether the goal should be not only to respond to food demand shifts by trying to produce more on less land, but also to work in coalitions (ie, with nutrition actors) to *influence demand shifts*. Such coalitions could enhance producer and consumer education on environmental impacts of dietary and food choices; greater awareness raising of more sustainable diets that are healthier for people and the environment.
- give attention to participatory governance and equitable distribution of benefits from sustainable food systems as there is strong evidence that intensification of agriculture usually accumulates benefits to people/communities that are already relatively well off.

With regard to land degradation, the GEF should:

- adopt a temporal approach. This is *critical* to distinguishing between low fertility and degraded systems, which can have big implications for the types of policies and practices to recommend. Understanding degradation requires understanding human impact relative to background environmental processes. It is important to use the right spatial sampling processes when measuring land degradation and improvements in land quality. Much work shows that conventional landscape sampling schemes are insufficient to capture spatial processes; while they may be sufficient to estimate soil carbon stocks across a landscape, for example, they are not sufficient for understanding processes and connecting data that have different underlying spatial processes.
- give explicit attention to addressing equity and indigenous people’s access to land.

Sustainable Forest Management

Specifically with regard to dryland sustainable landscapes (Page 104), it is not clear why the aims of the GEF and the restoration of Dryland forests require smallholder producers to be linked to markets by the private sector (whatever that may mean). Given that 50% of smallholder farmers in Arica are malnourished improving nutrition and food security through cultivation of subsistence foods should be the first priority with access to markets an important but secondary objective to support improved livelihoods.

Small Grants Programme

Increase the programme’s from \$140m to at least \$150 million: Demands are increasing from CSOs in Africa for support to implement forest and land restoration, food security (through agroforestry and agro-ecological food production) and climate resilience initiatives.

To this end, civil society specifically recommends the GEF to:

- strengthen the SGP's governance by opening participation of national steering committees through open, transparent and fair selection processes.
- strengthen country ownership impacts by permitting recipient countries to have direct access to resources instead of having to go through UNDP.
- open the programme to multi-country projects which enable scaling up and replication of best practice bottom-up grassroots initiatives so that impact can be achieved on a wider and larger scale. There is both a need for and considerable potential for CSOs and smallholder farmer associations to contribute to major initiatives like The Bonn Challenge and AFR100. Aligned to this there is a significant requirement for support for capacity building of and peer-to-peer technical advice between CBOs (in particular) and local NGOs to improve the quality and therefore the long term impact of initiatives.
- consider an enhanced grant scheme which supports projects that demonstrate the interconnections between landscape restoration, food systems, agricultural commodities, environmental security, wildlife, natural capital and land degradation and that initiatives may deliver impacts across a number of impact areas
- earmark GEF-7 SGP only for LCDs and SIDCs with a grant size between 100K-250 K/ project and established facility to build the capacities of the local NGOs
- ensure that the funding allocated to various focal areas in the GEF-7 SGP is proportional to the overall GEF-7 programming budget. In doing so, current imbalances can be corrected

Frontier Programmes

Civil society would appreciate **additional information on the concept of 'Frontier Investments'** and whether the four areas identified will be elaborated further in terms of proposed GEF support.

Additionally, further clarity would be useful on how the GEF plans to follow up on the extent to which support for these frontier areas contributes to the objectives of MEAs and the SDGs.

Circular Economy Frontier Program:

Promoting financing for this program could be a very valuable avenue to address multiple issues including land degradation, climate, and pollution. A recent study by the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, '[Urban Biocycles](#)', found that "in theory, nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium nutrients recovered from food, animal and human waste streams on a global scale could contribute nearly 2.7 time the nutrients contained within the volumes of chemical fertilizer currently used." Accordingly,

- circular economy approaches should ensure against the recycling of toxic chemicals, furthering exposure and harm and include specific language to that end.

Integrated National Planning Frontier Program:

This program should:

- acknowledge that science-based smart development approaches that use true cost accounting can enable governments, companies, and communities to consider the impacts of development on natural systems and people and make better development planning decisions and that these approaches could also enhance GEBs under the Impact Programs and Focal Areas.
- enhance its support for coordinated national planning by also assisting countries to use a 'smart infrastructure and resource development' planning approach to minimize, mitigate and offset development impacts and achieve both conservation priorities and development imperatives..

Annex – Specific language suggestions for the GEF-7 Programming and Policy Document

Proposed additions are in blue text

Paragraph 207 Re-wording suggestion:

Due to the global impact on human health and the environment **some** of these highly dangerous chemicals are controlled by international law. **Others, such as highly hazardous pesticides need greater concerted efforts.**

Paragraph 211 Re-wording suggestion:

Globally efforts to shift to sustainable patterns of production and consumption and to implement principles such as the circular economy, green chemistry and **the precautionary principle** ~~sustainable chemistry~~ offers opportunities to leverage resources from these efforts, to ensure that the work of the GEF on chemicals and waste not only supports these actions, but also provides the evidence for acting.

Paragraph 212 Re-wording suggestion:

Past work has established the efficacy of investing in adoption of best available **techniques** ~~technologies~~ and best environmental practices.

Paragraph 222 Re-wording suggestion:

In addition, investments in the sound management of chemicals and waste should seek to promote, as far as is practical, circular economy approaches to resource use **that do not recycle toxic chemicals** and promote sustainable production and consumption.

Paragraph 226 Re-wording suggestion:

This will include ~~the removal of barriers to market access of manufacturing of products containing GEF relevant chemicals,~~ introduction of **safer** alternatives and reduction of production of the ~~pure~~ **harmful** chemicals using ~~sustainable/green chemistry approaches~~ and that promotes a shift to a circular economy **without toxic recycling** and that supports de-toxifying products and material supply chains

Paragraph 227 Re-wording suggestion:

Green ~~Sustainable~~ chemistry/eco-design/strategies encompassing the entire life-cycle of chemicals. Elimination of the use of mercury and persistent organic pollutants in products (Including brominated flame retardants, PFOS, and **short-chain chlorinated paraffins**)

Paragraph 229 Re-wording suggestion:

Where the chemicals are in use, investments will be made to introduce alternatives with a preference given to **agroecology and** non-chemical means.

Paragraph 243 Re-wording suggestion:

In addition, the food system uses 4.6 million tons of pesticides each year, **including unregulated highly hazardous pesticides**, and more than half of the nitrogen fertilizer applied to crops is lost to the environment—placing pressure on freshwater and coastal ecosystems⁴⁹.

Paragraph 251 Re-wording suggestion:

It will engage the **agriculture private sector** ~~agribusiness~~ and **companies involved in food production** ~~the food industry~~, harnessing their ability to scale best practices and standards across global food value chains and their

ability to support small- and medium-sized enterprises...encouraging sustainable intensification (e.g., improving land and water management, harnessing biodiversity and ecosystem services, such as pollination and biological pest control [and implementation of agroecology](#))

Paragraph 256 Re-wording suggestion:

That strategy should [take UN Special Rapporteur recommendations into account and develop](#) ~~be based on science-based,~~ long-term pathway(s) for how the country's or jurisdiction's food and land-use systems will meet national development needs as well as commitments under the multilateral environmental agreements. These could include [small holders](#) and companies involved in any stage of the food supply chain, restoration implementers, and solution providers, among others

Paragraph 260 New bullet point suggestion:

[Implementation of agroecology \(e.g. use of diversified systems and pesticide-free practices that are adapted to local environments and enhance biodiversity and stimulate beneficial biological interactions between different plants and species to build long-term fertility and soil health\)](#)

Paragraph 269 Re-wording suggestion:

Beyond the Rio Conventions, the IP will also contribute to the Stockholm Convention [and SAICM](#) objectives. By enhancing capacity for sound management pesticides and promoting safer alternatives to pesticides [and implementation of agroecology techniques](#), the IP will contribute to reducing and ultimately eliminating the continued reliance on POPs pesticides [and highly hazardous pesticides](#) in food systems

Paragraph 300 Re-wording suggestion:

Promoting the use of innovative (e.g. digital) technologies for various urban development needs, such as smart grids and demand management, monitoring resources consumption, and reducing waste through [waste audits, segregation of waste at source](#), better management, composting, recycling and reuse [without toxic recycling](#) (e.g. through sharing economy). The use of hazardous materials should be avoided, as appropriate, and there should be a reduction and elimination, in the long-run, of POPs such as PCBs, BFRs and UPOPs. Cities should work towards actions to be taken to [implement zero waste approaches](#), reduce the amount of waste generated, and to improve overall waste management processes and programs, by reducing, reusing and recycling, whenever possible re-wording suggestion:

[Enhancing spatial planning](#) - Geospatial tools such as satellite maps and data layers of geographic information systems can be used in the urban context for a wide range of purposes, including mapping underground utilities, tunnels and other urban infrastructure to identify issues, improve efficiency and design retrofit, identifying infill areas such as abandoned land or buildings that are suitable for redevelopment and planning for their reallocation, mapping natural resources such as prime agricultural land and areas where projected growth poses the greatest risks to biodiversity, ecosystems and nature based resilience value, and mapping areas at risk of earthquakes, floods, landslides and other disaster risks and adjusting development plans accordingly.

Paragraph 308 Re-wording suggestion:

Article 6 of the Stockholm Convention and article 11 of the Minamata Convention address the management of waste that contains persistent organic pollutants (POPs) or whose poor management leads to the production of such chemicals, in a situation where cities are the main stakeholders. Moreover, cities are major users and producers of chemicals and waste, and have a key role in the management of a number of the new POPs relevant to cities. [SAICM risk reduction objectives also include reducing, "the generation of hazardous waste, both in quantity and toxicity, and to ensure the environmentally sound management of hazardous waste,](#)

*including its storage, treatment and disposal.*³ SAICM's Global Plan of Action includes items relevant to waste management, such as zero waste.

Paragraph 380: Re-wording suggestion:

Product and Process Redesign [to reduce and eliminate hazard](#) – redesign products, business models, infrastructure and supply chains to enable circular material flows

[Developed Country CSO representation at GEF-7 Replenishment:](#)

Lisa Elges, Transparency International, lidges@transparency.org

Maeve McLynn, Climate Action Network Europe, maeve@caneurope.org

Please Note

As of October 31 2017, Lisa Elges will not be a CSO focal point to the GEF Council and Replenishment. Transparency International will be represented at the GEF Council by Thomas Vink and Christian Poortman until the end of this year; Maeve McLynn will be the lead focal point for GEF-7 Replenishment.

Thomas Vink, tvink@transparency.org

Christiaan Poortman, cpoortman@transparency.org

³ UNEP - WHO (2006) Overarching Policy Strategy para 14, Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management http://www.saicm.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=73&Itemid=475