|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Framework Document (PFD)** | **GEF Portal Hover tips (8/17/2018)** |
| **Type of Trust Fund:** |  |
| GEF Trust Fund |  |
| Least Developed Countries Fund | [Click link (https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-programming-strategy-adaptation-climate-change-ldcf-sccf) to see LDCF eligibility criteria.](https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-programming-strategy-adaptation-climate-change-ldcf-sccf) |
| Special Climate Change Fund | [Click link ( https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-programming-strategy-adaptation-climate-change-ldcf-sccf) to see SCCF eligibility criteria.](https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-programming-strategy-adaptation-climate-change-ldcf-sccf)  |
| Multi-trust Fund | This is for Programs or programs that draw from more than one of the GEF trust funds. |
| **Part I: Program Identification**  | Note that all program modalities are governed by the GEF Program and Program Cycle Policy and Guidelines documents.  |
| Program Title | Give a clear and descriptive title that highlights the main goals of the program. If the title changes after submission, refer to the old title and agency ID in the new submission |
| Country(ies) |  |
| Lead GEF Agency |  |
| Other GEF Agenc(ies) |  |
| Program Executing entity(s) | The organization(s) that executes a GEF program, or portions of it, under the supervision of an Agency. It can include national or sub-national government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), private sector entities, or academic institutions, among others. |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | These are Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, Land Degradation, and Chemicals and Waste. |
| Impact Program |  |
| GEF Program ID | ID will be assigned and generated automatically when the Program is officially submitted. |
| GEF Agency Program ID | Enter your Agency’s internal Program ID. |
| Submission Date |  |
| Program Duration (months) |  |
| Program Commitment Deadline | Refers to the date before which GEF Agencies participating in a Program are required to submit Child Program documents for Secretariat review for CEO endorsement (in the case of FSPs) or approval (in the case of MSPs). |
| **Table A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements** | [Select the relevant code(s) from the GEF 7 Focal Area/Non-Focal Area Dropdown Menu for Table A. Refer to the Programming Document for the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund for additional details.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.19.Rev_.03_Replenishment.pdf) |
| Expected Outcomes |  |
| Trust Fund |  |
| GEF Program Financing |  |
| Co-financing |  |
| Total Program Cost |  |
| **Table B. Indicative Program Description Summary** | For additional entries, expand the table by creating more rows if more than one focal/non-focal area is selected. |
| Program Objective |  |
| Program Components |  |
| Component Type |  |
| Program Outcomes |  |
| GEF Program Financing |  |
| GEF Co-financing |  |
| Program Management Cost | The Program Management Cost (PMC) is calculated as a percentage of the GEF grant. The PMC + the GEF grant equals the Total Program Cost. Note that for GEF Program Financing up to $2 million, PMC can be up to 10% of the GEF grant; above $2 million, PMC can be up to 5% of the GEF grant. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on the focal area Program financing amount in Table D. For multi-trust fund programs, provide the total amount of PMC in table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust funds. |
| Total Program Cost |  |
| **Table C. Sources of Co-Financing for the Program by Source, by Name, and by Type.**  | [Refer to the Updated Co-financing Policy (GEF/C.54/10/Rev.01). As necessary, expand the table for additional entries by creating more rows.](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/updated-co-financing-policy) |
| Source of Co-financing |  |
| Name of co-financier | Provide the name of co-financier if available |
| Type of co-financing |  |
| Amount |  |
| Total Co-financing |  |
| **Table D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency, Trust Fund, Country, Focal Area and the Programming of the Funds.**  | [Refer to the Updating the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) (GEF/C.54/03/Rev.01)to determine country allocations for biodiversity, climate change and land degradation focal areas. For additional entries, expand the table by creating more rows as needed.](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/updating-system-transparent-allocation-resources-star) |
| GEF Agency |  |
| Type of Trust Fund |  |
| Country/Regional/Global | Country name. Otherwise, choose regional or global. |
| Focal Area | Select the focal area. |
| Programming of funds | If the FA is selected as BD, CC, LD, or IW, leave the Programming of Funds blank. If the FA is selected as CW, choose from POPs, Mercury, ODS or SAICM.If the FA is selected as MFA, choose from SGP, or any of the appropriate IPs.  |
| Program Amount (a) |  |
| Agency Fee (b) | [Click [here] to see Annex 8 of the Guidelines on the Program and Program Cycle Policy on Agency Fees that define the revised fee structure to pay for the services provided by all GEF Partner Agencies that implement GEF Programs.](https://www.thegef.org/documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy) |
| Total (a+b+c) |  |
| Total GEF resources |  |
| **Table F. Program's Target Contributions to GEF-7 Core Indicators** | As of July 1, 2018, Agencies, in collaboration with recipient country governments, executing partners and other stakeholders, should provide indicative, expected results across applicable core indicators and sub-indicators for all new GEF Programs and programs submitted for Work Program entry or MSP PIF Approval. At CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies should provide expected results, with adjustments as required reflecting further analysis carried out during Program preparation. |
| Core Indicator Worksheet | [Use Worksheet to compute the indicator values as required in this section to the extent applicable to your proposed Program. Refer to the Updated Results Architecture for GEF 7 (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.02) on Annex I - Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-indicators)](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/updated-results-architecture-gef-7-0) |
| Program Core Indicators | These are the target results anticipated at PIF stage. They may be updated at the time of submission for CEO Endorsement/Approval. |
| Expected at PIF |  |
| **Program Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use** | This indicator is an aggregate of the two Sub-indicators.  |
| Program Core Indicator 1.1: Terrestrial protected areas newly created | Indicate the name and size of the protected area(s) to be created. This sub-indicator captures the hectares of new protected areas that meet the Key Biodiversity Area Criteria and that result from Programs’ support. By mid-term or final evaluation, Programs should indicate the IUCN protected area category (Categories I–VI), as well as the ID number from the World Database of Protected Areas (https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/world-database-protected-areas), if available. |
| Program Core Indicator 1.2: Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness | Indicate the name, WDPA ID, size, IUCN protected area category (I – VI) and METT score. To calculate the METT score, use the GEF-7 BD tracking tool (https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-7-biodiversity-protected-area-tracking-tool). The Sub-indicator is calculated based on the protected areas that show an increase in METT score. In cases where the protected area does not fit the IUCN criteria (e.g. some Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), ‘Other Category’ should be noted. Where the area in question was also newly protected through project implementation, hectares should only be reported under Sub-Indicator 1.1 rather than under Sub-Indicator 1.2. |
| **Program Core Indicator 2: Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use** | This indicator is an aggregate of the two Sub-indicators  |
| Indicator 2.1 Marine protected areas newly created | Indicate the name and size of the protected area(s) to be created. This sub-indicator captures the hectares of new protected areas that meet the Key Biodiversity Area Criteria and that result from Program's support. By mid-term or final evaluation, Programs should indicate the IUCN protected area category (Categories I–VI), as well as the ID number from the World Database of Protected Areas (https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/world-database-protected-areas), if available. |
| Indicator 2.2 Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness | Indicate the name, WDPA ID, size, IUCN protected area category (I – VI) and METT score. To calculate the METT score, use the GEF-7 BD tracking tool (https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-7-biodiversity-protected-area-tracking-tool)*.* The Sub-indicator is calculated based on the protected areas that show an increase in METT score. In cases where the protected area does not fit the IUCN criteria (e.g. some Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), ‘Other Category’ should be noted. Where the area in question was also newly protected through project implementation, hectares should only be reported under Sub-Indicator 2.1 rather than under Sub-Indicator 2.2. |
| **Program Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored** | This indicator will be reported as an aggregate of the four Sub-indicators, to captures the hectares of new protected areas which meet the key Biodiversity Area Criteria and that result from the Program's support. For BD Programs, in addition to explaining the Program's consistency with the biodiversity focal area, also describe which Aichi Target(s) the Program will directly contribute to achieving. |
| Indicator 3.1: Area of degraded agricultural land restored | Indicate the hectares of agricultural land that was in a degraded state but is undergoing restoration through GEF funded interventions. Restoration here is defined as “the improvement of degraded land on a large scale that rebuilds ecological integrity and enhances people’s lives. It is suggested to provide GIS files showing the extent of the degraded land that is undergoing restoration and also indicate the relative state of the area prior to GEF activities. |
| Indicator 3.2: Area of forest and forest land restored | Indicate the hectares of forest and forest land undergoing ecological restoration through GEF funded interventions. This Sub-indicator intends to capture the area of forest and forest land in which best practices for ecological restoration are being applied |
| Indicator 3.3: Area of natural grass and shrublands restored | Indicate the hectares of natural grass and shrublands that are undergoing ecological restoration through GEF funded interventions. This sub-indicator intends to capture the area of natural grass and shrublands in which best practices for ecological restoration are being applied |
| Indicator 3.4: Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored | Indicate the hectares of wetlands, including estuaries and mangroves, that are undergoing ecological restoration through GEF funded interventions. This Sub-indicator intends to capture the area of wetlands in which best practices for ecological restoration are being applied |
| **Program Core Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)** | This indicator will be reported as aggregate total of four Sub-indicators. Ensure that the hectares reported under each Sub-indicator do not overlap |
| Indicator 4.1: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity | Indicate the landscape area that is being managed to benefit biodiversity, but which is not certified. Please provide qualitative description of the benefit provided to biodiversity through the change in management. It is also suggested to provide GIS files showing the extent of the land under this improved management (outside of protected areas). |
| Indicator 4.2: Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations | Indicate the landscape area that achieves certification in which biodiversity considerations are being incorporated, including details of the third-party certification. Ideally, provide GIS files showing the extent of the land under this improved management (outside of protected areas) |
| Indicator 4.3: Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems | Indicate the landscape area that is in production (e.g. agriculture, rangeland, forestry) and whose soil, air and water are managed in a sustainable way. Also include the details of the management practices and where possible provide GIS files showing the extent of the land under sustainable land management |
| Indicator 4.4: Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided | Indicate the area of High Conservation Value forest (HCVF) that would be lost without implementation of the GEF Program. Programs first must indicate the names and areas of HCVF that are targeted (ideally GIS files depicting these areas would be submitted).If not already recognized by the HCV network, Programs should submit documentation that the targeted forests meet one or more of the HCV criteria  |
| **Program Core Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity** | Indicate the hectares of marine habitat under improved management to benefit biodiversity and/or for which management plans have been prepared and endorsed and are under implementation. Ideally, Programs should provide GIS files showing the extent of the ocean under this improved management. Note that two additional Sub-indicators are available to provide any relevant context. |
| Indicator 5.1: Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations | Indicate the number and names of fisheries that are managed to benefit biodiversity, and which are certified through a third-party. In addition, provide details of the third-party certification |
| Indicator 5.2: Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial | Indicate the names and number of LMEs that have achieved a reduction in pollution. These include reductions from nutrient loading that would otherwise lead to hypoxia, which is defined as a state in the oceans where oxygen levels are depleted to less than 2 - 3 ppm. Also provide the type and extent (qualitative or quantitative) of pollution reduction achieved through policy and infrastructure investments to address point and non-point sources |
| **Program Core Indicator 6 Greenhouse gas emission mitigated** | This Core Indicator refers to the total reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs reported in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e). As such, it is reported as the aggregate of the first two Sub-indicators |
| Indicator 6.1: Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector | Indicate the hectares and the quantity of carbon (tons CO2e) stored or not emitted in forests and soils as a result of the Program. The estimate must be based on widely recognized methodology to be clearly presented in the Program document.  |
| Indicator 6.2: Emissions avoided | Indicate the amount of GHG emissions that are expected to be avoided through the interventions of the GEF Program in sectors other than the AFOLU and thus may include GHG benefits from energy efficiency, renewable energy, transportation and urban Programs or Program components. All analyses are conducted in tons of CO2e; emissions avoided reported are cumulative reductions, calculated for the lifetimes of the investments; and there is no discounting for future GHG emission reductions |
| Indicator 6.3: Energy saved | Use this sub-indicator to report Programs that aim to achieve energy savings. This is calculated as the amount of energy use avoided by the intervention over the lifetime of the investment. Fuel savings should be converted to energy savings by using the net calorific value of the specific fuel. End-use electricity savings should be converted to energy savings by using the conversion factor for the specific supply and distribution system.  |
| Indicator 6.4: Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology  | Use this sub-indicator to report Programs that aim to increase renewable energy generation or storage capacity, disaggregated by type of renewable energy technology (biomass, geothermal, ocean, small hydro, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, wind power, and storage). This sub-indicator refers to the rated capacity of a heat or power generating plant or the aggregate potential output of a collection of such |
| **Program Core Indicator 7 Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management** | This indicator captures the commitment of countries to cooperatively manage a shared water system (e.g., river, lake, groundwater, or large marine ecosystem). Projects may cover one or more shared water systems. |
| Indicator 7.1: Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation | Provide a rating from 1 to 4 based on a rating for the level of TDA or SAP formulation and implementation. [Consider: "Provide a rating from 1 to 4 based on the level of…" for 94, 95 and 97] |
| Indicator 7.2: Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation | Provide rating from 1 to 4 based on a rating for the level of Regional Legal Agreements or RMI formulation and implementation |
| Indicator 7.3: Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees | Provide rating from 1 to 4 |
| Indicator 7.4: Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products | Provide rating from 1 to 4 based on a rating for the level of engagement in IWLEARN. |
| **Program Core Indicator 8 Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels** | Provide the name of the fishery targeted, the source for the estimate of the tonnage, and also the justification for considering the fishery to be overexploited initially. Note that there is no strict relationship between the Sub-indicator 5.1. related to certified fisheries and this Core Indicator |
| **Program Core Indicator 9 Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products** | This indicator will be reported as aggregate total (in metric tons) of three Sub-indicators. Two additional Sub-indicators are also available to provide additional [relevant?] context |
| Indicator 9.1: Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and POPs containing materials and products removed or disposed | Indicate the amount of POPs eliminated or reduced broken down by type of POP. For disposal Programs, include information on the technology for disposal and location of disposal. |
| Indicator 9.2: Quantity of mercury reduced | Indicate the amount of mercury, along with details of the approach and the scale at which the figure is reported (Program site, city, province, etc.). Programs should also provide the disaggregated information on the reduced amount of emissions from different sources or different activities. |
| Indicator 9.3: Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste:  | Indicate the number of countries targeted in the Program that have new or improved legislation and policy related to the control of chemicals and waste as a result of GEF support |
| Indicator 9.4 Number of low -chemical / non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities. | Indicate the number of low-chemical or non-chemical systems implemented as a direct result of the GEF Program. |
| **Program Core Indicator 10: Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air-from point and non-point sources** | This indicator captures the reduction in emissions of POPs to air. At Program submission, estimate reduction target based on the baseline calculation of emissions against the expected reductions from implementation of the Program. Subtract a final emissions number, (in gTEQ), at Program completion from the baseline emissions number to determine the reduction. Two additional Sub-Indicators are available to provide any relevant context. |
| Indicator 10.1: Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of Pops to air | Indicate the number of countries with legislation and policies implemented to control emissions of POPs to air. In Programs that are developing new or improved legislation to control POPs emissions to air from unintentional sources, the Program should indicate what legislation is being contemplated and what is the intended impact of it |
| Indicator 10.2: Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented | Indicate the number of emission control technologies or practices implemented as a direct result of the GEF Program. Programs that reduce POPS emissions to air through BAT/BEP should provide information on the type and number of these technologies or practices being proposed in the Program and the expected impact. |
| Program Core Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | Indicate the number of individual people who receive targeted support from a given GEF Program and/or who use the specific resources that the Program maintains or enhances. Direct Beneficiaries are all individuals who are receiving targeted support from a given Program. Targeted support is the intentional and direct assistance of a Program to individuals or groups of individuals who are aware that they are receiving that support and/or who use the specific resources |
| Aichi targets in BD |  |
| **G. Program Taxonomy** | This new feature in the Portal enables you to tag proposals with key words to enhance search and reporting. Select all relevant keywords for this Program from the drop-down lists in the taxonomy table. |
| Influencing Models | [These are the five main approaches used in GEF projects and programs to achieve results (see the sub-categories). They are described in the GEF2020 Strategy [http://www.thegef.org/publications/gef-2020-strategy-gef]](http://www.thegef.org/publications/gef-2020-strategy-gef)  |
| Stakeholders |  |
| Capacity, Knowledge and Research |  |
| Gender Equality |  |
| Focal Area/Theme/Topic |  |
| Rio Markers | This is a mandatory tag for all GEF-financed projects. Indicate whether the project targets climate change adaptation and/or climate change mitigation using the OECD DAC Rio Markers: 0=does not target; 1=targets as a significant objective, 2=targets as the principal objective. Please refer to the OECD DAC Handbook for further details: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Revised%20climate%20marker%20handbook_FINAL.pdf> |
| **Part II: Programmatic Justification** |  |
| 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description); |  |
| 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline Programs, |  |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, |  |
|  |  |
| 4) alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies,  | For programs containing biodiversity funding, please also describe to which Aichi Target(s) the program will contribute. |
| 5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing; | [Refer to Operational Guidelines for Incremental Cost Principle [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/C.31.12\_Operational\_Guidelines\_for\_Incremental\_Costs-2007\_0.pdf]](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/C.31.12_Operational_Guidelines_for_Incremental_Costs-2007_0.pdf) |
|  |  |
| 6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); | [Refer to examples of Global Environmental Benefits as featured in the following link (https://www.thegef.org/documents/global-environmental-benefits).](https://www.thegef.org/documents/global-environmental-benefits)  |
|  |  |
| [7) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/SDG_new_boilerLR_0.pdf) | Address the following: Is the program innovative, for example in its: design; method of financing; technology; business model; policy; monitoring and evaluation; or learning? Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up - over time, across geographies or among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability? |
|  |  |
| 1b. Program Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the Program interventions will take place. | Please enter the geolocation ID number from the geonames.org database, followed by a short description of the site. If there is more than one location or intervention site, please enter all corresponding geolocation ID numbers separated by a coma, followed by a short description of each. If you cannot find the geolocation ID, please enter latitude and longitude of one point in the project area.  |
| **2. Stakeholders.** Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the program identification phase:  | [Refer to the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN\_GEF.C.53.05.Rev\_.01\_Stakeholder\_Policy\_3.pdf) that sets out the core principles and mandatory requirements for stakeholders. If applicable, please provide information on the type of organizations and individuals that took part in the project identification phase. If there were no consultations, please explain the reasons why this was the case.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN_GEF.C.53.05.Rev_.01_Stakeholder_Policy_3.pdf) |
| . . . Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities  | [For Indigenous Peoples, refer to the Principles and Guidelines document (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Indigenous\_Peoples\_Principle\_EN.pdf).](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Indigenous_Peoples_Principle_EN.pdf)  |
|  | [For Indigenous Peoples, refer to the Principles and Guidelines document (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Indigenous\_Peoples\_Principle\_EN.pdf).](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Indigenous_Peoples_Principle_EN.pdf)  |
| . . . Civil Society Organizations;  | [Refer to the following link (https://www.thegef.org/documents/relations-ngos) for further guidance.](https://www.thegef.org/documents/relations-ngos)  |
| . . . Private Sector Entities;  |  |
| . . . If None of the above, please explain why.  |  |
| . . . In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the Program preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.  | [Refer to GEF Policy and Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN\_GEF.C.53.05.Rev\_.01\_Stakeholder\_Policy\_3.pdf]. As part of this indicative information, please describe strategic communication to build awareness of problems and solutions, and to support behavior change.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN_GEF.C.53.05.Rev_.01_Stakeholder_Policy_3.pdf)  |
|  | [See here the link to the Policy on Gender Equality (GEF/C.53/04)](https://www.thegef.org/documents/policy-gender-equality) |
| 3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.  | [Refer to GEF Policy and Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN\_GEF.C.53.05.Rev\_.01\_Stakeholder\_Policy\_3.pdf]. As part of this indicative information, please describe strategic communication to build awareness of problems and solutions, and to support behavior change.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/EN_GEF.C.53.05.Rev_.01_Stakeholder_Policy_3.pdf)  |
|  | [See here the link to the Policy on Gender Equality (GEF/C.53/04)](https://www.thegef.org/documents/policy-gender-equality) |
| . . . Are gender dimensions relevant to the success of the Program | Provide indicative information on how gender differences and gaps between men and women are relevant to the program objectives and context. This can draw on information from initial stakeholder consultations or on already existing sector/country analyses.  |
| If yes, please provide indicative information on these dimensions and how these will be addressed in the program. If no, please explain why? | Note that the GEF Policy on Gender Equality requires Programs and programs that have identified gender gaps to provide information on gender responsive measures. For strategic entry points in GEF-7 programming see GEF Gender Implementation Strategy (hyperlink) |
| . . . In addition, please also indicate whether the program will include gender sensitive indicators in its results framework (yes \_\_ /no \_\_ / tbd \_\_ ) | Check TBD if not sure yet. This information can be revised/ added at the CEO endorsement stage. |
| [4. Private sector engagement. Will there be private sector engagement in the program?](https://www.thegef.org/content/private-sector-engagement-focal-areas) |  As applicable, please explain what role the private sector plays as part of the program theory of change? This section should describe the intervention model(s) chosen to engage the private sector and encourage investment, such as: 1) transforming policy and regulatory environments to encourage sustainable business investment, 2) deploying innovative financial instruments, 3) convening multi stakeholder alliances, 4) strengthening institutional capacity and 5) demonstrating innovative approaches. If the program is using non-grant funding, please also specify the applied financial instrument(s): e.g. loans, guarantees and/or equity investment. Please also explain how the Program helps attract additional private sector investments, and its strategy/approach to avoid displacing of commercial investors, as appropriate.      |
| [5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the program objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from program implementation, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the program design (table format acceptable)](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Policy_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards_2015.pdf) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| [6. Coordination. Outline the institutional structure of the program including defining the role of the lead agency in monitoring and evaluation coordination at the program level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed programs/Programs and other initiatives.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010_0.pdf%22%20%5Co%20%22Refer%20to%20Monitoring%20Agency%20Compliance%20with%20GEF%20Policies) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| *7. Consistency with National Priorities*. Is the program consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes /no). If yes, which ones and how: |  |
| [- National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) under LDCF/UNFCCC](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.19.Inf_.7_NAPA_5.pdf) |  |
| [- National Action Program (NAP) under UNCCD](https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/sessions/documents/ICCD_COP9_2_Add.1/2add1eng.pdf) |  |
| [- ASGM NAP (Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining) under Mercury](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/11371/National_Action_Plan_draft_guidance_v12.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  |  |
| [- Mercury Initial Assessment (MIA) under Minamata Convention](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF.C.45.Inf_.05_Initial_Guidelines_for_Enabling_Activities_for_the_Minamata_Convention_on_Mercury_October_8_2013_Final_4.pdf) |  |
| [- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD](https://www.cbd.int/doc/training/nbsap/b1-train-intro-nbsap-revised-en.pdf) |  |
| [- National Communications (NC) under UNFCCC](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/c22_inf16_rev1_5.pdf) |  |
| [- Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) under UNFCCC](https://www.thegef.org/content/technology-transfer-steps) |  |
| [- National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) under UNCBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD](https://unfccc.int/files/cooperation_and_support/capacity_building/application/pdf/gefsecncsabookeng.pdf) |  |
| [- National Implementation Plan (NIP) under POPs](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.39.Inf_.5_Guidelines_for_NIP.Final__1.pdf) |  |
| [- Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)](http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.aspx) |  |
| [- National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) under GEFSEC](https://www.thegef.org/documents/npfd) |  |
| [- Biennial Update Report (BUR) under UNFCCC](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Policy_Guidelines__for_the_financing_of__Biennial_update_reports_for_Non-Annex_1_Parties.pdf) |  |
| - Others |  |
| 8. Knowledge Management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the program and how it will contribute to the Programs’ overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant Programs/programs, initiatives and evaluations.  | This will include processes to capture, assess and document, in a user-friendly manner, information, lessons, best practices, and expertise generated during implementation; strategic communications; and knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders. |
|  |  |
| *Child Program Selection Criteria.* |  |
| **Part III. Approval/Endorsement by GEF OFP and GEF Agenci**es |  |
| A. Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):  | For regional and/or global Programs with identified countries, OFP endorsement letters are required from these countries |
|  (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template.  | Click [here] for OFP Endorsement Letter. Has the Program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base? |
| Name |  |
| Position |  |
| Ministry |  |
| Date |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |