|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Identification Form (PIF)** | **GEF Portal Hover tips (8/17/2018)** |
| **Project Type:** |  |
| Full-sized Project | Projects for which GEF funding is above $ 2million |
| Medium-sized Project | Projects for which GEF funding is up to $2 million |
| **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)  |
| Capacity-Building Initiative forTransparency Multi-trust Fund | This is for projects or programs that draw from more than one of the GEF trust funds. |
| **Part I: Project Information** | Note that all project modalities are governed by the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy and Guidelines documents.  |
| Project Title | Give a clear and descriptive title that highlights the main goals of the project. If the title changes after submission, refer to the old title and agency ID in the new submission |
| Country(ies) |  |
| GEF Agency(ies) |  |
| Project Executing Entity(ies) | The organization(s) that executes a GEF project, 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 Areas | These are Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, Land Degradation, and Chemicals and Waste. |
| GEF Project ID | ID will be assigned and generated automatically when the project is officially submitted. |
| GEF Agency Project ID | Enter your Agency’s internal project ID. |
| Submission Date |  |
| Project Duration (months) |  |
| **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) |
| Trust Fund |  |
| GEF Project Financing |  |
| Co-financing |  |
| Total Project Cost |  |
| **Table B. Indicative Project Description Summary** | For additional entries, expand the table by creating more rows if more than one focal/non-focal area is selected. |
| Project Objective |  |
| Project Components |  |
| Component Type |  |
| Project Outcomes |  |
| Project Outputs |  |
| GEF Project Financing |  |
| GEF Co-financing |  |
|  |  |
| Project Management Cost | The Project Management Cost (PMC) is calculated as a percentage of the GEF grant. The PMC + the GEF grant equals the Total Project Cost. Note that for GEF Project 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 project financing amount in Table D. For multi-trust fund projects, provide the total amount of PMC in table B, and indicate the split of PMC among the different trust funds. |
| Total Project Cost |  |
| **Table C. Indicative Sources of Co-financing** | [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 | Co-financing source should not have been previously identified or reported as co-financing towards another GEF-financed project or program. |
| Name of co-financier | Provide the name of co-financier if available. |
| Type of co-financing |  |
| Investment Mobilized | These are co-financing that exclude recurrent expenditures. Describe how they were identified. |
| Amount |  |
| Total Co-financing |  |
| **Table D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested** | [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 |  |
| 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 from any of the mentioned IPs.  |
| GEF Project Financing |  |
| Agency Fee | [Click [here] to see Annex 8 of the Guidelines on the Project 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 projects.](https://www.thegef.org/documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy) |
| Total  |  |
| Total GEF resources |  |
| **E. Project Preparation Grant** | For additional entries, please expand the table by creating more rows as necessary. |
| PPG amount requested by Agency(ies), Trust Fund, and Programming of Funds | PPG requested amount is determined by the size of the GEF Project Financing (PF) as follows: Up to $50k for PF up to$2m (for MSP); up to $100k for PF up to $3m; $150k for PF up to $6m; $200k for PF up to $10m; and $300k for PF above $10m. |
| GEF Agency |  |
| Trust Fund |  |
| Country/Regional/Global |  |
| Focal Area |  |
| Programming of Funds | These are set-aside funds for POPs, Mercury, ODS, SAICM, SGP, Non-Grant, FOLU IP, SC IP, and SFM IP. Select the appropriate fund, if applicable. Otherwise, leave the column blank. |
| PPG |  |
| Agency Fee |  |
| Total |  |
| Total PPG Amount |  |
| **Table F. Project'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 projects 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 project preparation.  |
| Core Indicator Worksheet | [Use Worksheet to compute the indicator values as required in this section to the extent applicable to your proposed project. 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) |
| Project 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 |  |
| **Project 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.  |
| Project 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 projects’ support. By mid-term or final evaluation, projects 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. |
| Project 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. |
| **Project 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 project's support |
| 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 (https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/world-database-protected-areas). 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. |
| **Project 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 Critera and that result from the project's support. For BD projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area, also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project 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 |
| **Project 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 project. Projects 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, projects should submit documentation that the targeted forests meet one or more of the HCV criteria  |
| **Project 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, projects 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 |
| **Project 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 project. The estimate must be based on widely recognized methodology to be clearly presented in the project document.  |
| Indicator 6.2: Emissions avoided | Indicate the amount of GHG emissions that are expected to be avoided through the interventions of the GEF project in sectors other than the AFOLU and thus may include GHG benefits from energy efficiency, renewable energy, transportation and urban projects or project 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 projects 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 projects 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 |
| **Project 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.  |
| 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 IW:LEARN. |
| **Project 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. |
| **Project 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 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 projects, 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 (project site, city, province, etc.). Projects 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 project 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 project. |
| **project 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 project submission, estimate reduction target based on the baseline calculation of emissions against the expected reductions from implementation of the project. Subtract a final emissions number, (in gTEQ), at project 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 projects that are developing new or improved legislation to control POPs emissions to air from unintentional sources, the project 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 project. Projects 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 project and the expected impact. |
| Project 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 project and/or who use the specific resources that the project maintains or enhances. Direct Beneficiaries are all individuals who are receiving **targeted** **support** from a given project. Targeted support is the intentional and direct assistance of a project 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. Project 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 project 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: Project Justification** | To see what STAP looks for in these sections, [please click here](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CWB155260%5CDesktop%5CSTAP_8518screening.docx). |
| 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 projects, |  |
| 3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, |  |
| 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 biodiversity projects, please also describe to which Aichi Target(s) the project 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) |
| [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 project 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? |
| [7) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/SDG_new_boilerLR_0.pdf)1b. *Project Map and Coordinates.* Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. | Address the following: Is the project 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?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 project 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 Local Communities, refer to the Policy on Public Involvement (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Public\_Involvement\_Policy-2012.pdf) in GEF projects.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Public_Involvement_Policy-2012.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 project 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)  |
| [3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Gender_Mainstreaming_Policy-2012_0.pdf)  | [Refer to the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy (GEF/C.54/06) that provides detail on the practical steps and required actions to implement the principles and mandatory requirements specified in the GEF Policy on Gender Equality.](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-gender-implementation-strategy)  |
|  | [See here the link to the Policy on Gender Equality (GEF/C.53/04)](https://www.thegef.org/documents/policy-gender-equality) |
| . . . Gender dimensions relevant to the project | Provide indicative information on how gender differences and gaps between men and women are relevant to the project objectives and context. This can draw on information from initial stakeholder consultations or on already existing sector/country analyses.  |
| . . . Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment? (yes \_ /no \_ / tbd \_) | This information can be revised at the CEO endorsement stage. Note that the GEF Policy on Gender Equality requires projects 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 (GEF/C.54/06)](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-gender-implementation-strategy) |
| . . . Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality\_\_\_: access to and control over resources \_\_\_; participation and decision making \_\_\_; and or economic benefits or services \_\_\_. | [These result areas correspond the three gender gaps most relevant to the GEF programming strategy (see GEF Gender Implementation Strategy (GEF/C.54/06). Note: you can leave this empty or choose one or more result areas. This information can be up-dated at the CEO endorsement stage](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-gender-implementation-strategy) |
| . . . Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (yes \_\_ /no \_\_ / tbd \_\_ ) | This information can be revised/ added at the CEO endorsement stage. |
| [4. Private sector engagement. Will there be private sector engagement in the project?](https://www.thegef.org/content/private-sector-engagement-focal-areas) | As applicable, please explain what role the private sector plays as part of the project 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 project 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 project helps attact 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 project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project implementation, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable)](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Policy_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards_2015.pdf) |  |
| [5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project implementation, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project 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 project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects 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) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| [6. Coordination. Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects 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 project 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 | 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. |
| [8. Knowledge Management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.](file:///%5C%5CGeffile%5Cgef-div%5CRAMON%5CGEF%207%5CGEF%207%20Template%20Cursor%20Definitions%5CKM%20Tooltip%20at%20PIF%20submission.docx)  |  |
| [8. Knowledge Management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.](file:///%5C%5CGeffile%5Cgef-div%5CRAMON%5CGEF%207%5CGEF%207%20Template%20Cursor%20Definitions%5CKM%20Tooltip%20at%20PIF%20submission.docx) **Part III. Approval/Endorsement by GEF OFP and GEF Agencies** |  |
|  |  |
| A. Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):  | For regional and/or global projects with identified countries, OFP endorsement letters are required from these countries |
|  (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template. For SGP, use this SGP OFP endorsement letter) | Click [here] for OFP Endorsement Letter, and [here] for SGP OFP Endorsement Letter. Has the project/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 |  |
|  |  |