



## PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 06/14/2010

### PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID<sup>1</sup>: PROJECT DURATION: 36 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Vietnam

PROJECT TITLE: Wildlife Consumption in Vietnam: Reforming Policies and Practices to Strengthen Biodiversity Conservation

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Biodiversity Conservation Agency (MONRE)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S)<sup>2</sup>: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP4 (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): N/A

### INDICATIVE CALENDAR\*

Milestones	Expected Dates mm/dd/yyyy
Work Program (for FSP)	
CEO Endorsement/Approval	11/30/2010
Agency Approval Date	01/15/2011
Implementation Start	02/15/2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	
Project Closing Date	02/15/2014

\* See guidelines for definition of milestones.

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Select only those focal areas from which GEF financing is requested.

## A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective:</b> Strengthen biodiversity conservation in Vietnam through significant reduction of wildlife consumption								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA <sup>b</sup>	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing <sup>a</sup>		Indicative Co-Financing <sup>a</sup>		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Policy reform and capacity building	TA	<p>a) Regulatory environment adequate for effective protection of wildlife and biodiversity</p> <p>b) Strengthened institutional capacity in GoV regulatory bodies and non-traditional enforcement agencies</p>	<p>a) Decrees and implementing regulations on management and protection of wildlife; MOH guidelines on pharmacopeia and training curricula revised; National Tiger Recovery Plan endorsed by Prime Minister</p> <p>b) Training modules, workshops, communication tools, guidelines, databases, intelligence analysis systems, wildlife crime reporting protocols</p>	370,000	38	400,000	62	970,000
2. Innovation to change wildlife use practices	TA	<p>a) Attitude changes toward minimizing consumption of protected wildlife</p> <p>b) Reduction in number of restaurants serving protected wildlife</p> <p>c) Enhanced role of Vietnamese private sector in supporting biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>a) Campaigns targeting medical and pharmacological communities, zoo/wildlife farm owners</p> <p>b) Campaigns to target wildlife restaurants and their customers</p> <p>c) Pro-conservation initiatives launched by targeted businesses; public corporate commitments to halt illegal consumption of wildlife</p>	400,000	3800.00%	450,000	62	1,050,000

		initiatives						
3. Knowledge management and outreach	TA, STA	a) An informed and active pro-conservation media  b) Better understanding of the scale of consumption and of the scientific merits of wildlife products  c) Improved inter-agency communication, coordination, and cooperation  d) Transparent monitoring and evaluation mechanism of policy and enforcement practice	a) Training of media, production of media materials  b) Vietnam-specific research programs  c) Fora supported for communication between concerned agencies (NGOs, GoV)  d) National Biodiversity Conservation Committee monitoring protocols, mission reports; Interagency-monitoring group established	150,000	21	450,000	79	700,000
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8. Project management				80,000	62	50,000	38	130,000
<b>Total project costs</b>				A1,000,000		B1,350,000		2,350,000

<sup>a</sup> List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

<sup>b</sup> TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

**B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE and by NAME** (in parenthesis) if available, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project
Project Government Contribution	In-kind	100,000
GEF Agency(ies)	(select)	
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies)	Grant	250,000 (TBD)
Multilateral Agency(ies)	(select)	
Private Sector	Unknown at this stage	250,000
NGO	In-kind	250,000 (TBD)
Others	Grant	500,000 (GTI)
<b>Total Co-financing</b>		<b>B1,350,000</b>

**C. INDICATIVE FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)**

	Previous Project Preparation Amount (a) <sup>3</sup>	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing		A1,000,000	1,000,000	100,000
Co-financing		B1,350,000	1,350,000	
<b>Total</b>		2,350,000	2,350,000	2,450,000

**D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY (IES)<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
			Project (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
(select)	(select)				
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>					

<sup>1</sup> No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

<sup>2</sup> Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:**

Issue and Causes:

Forest coverage in Vietnam has increased to 40% but this is due to expansion of low conservation value plantations; the country has experienced widespread decline in natural forest cover over the last 70 years. Today, only a few percent of forest is considered primary. Furthermore, even where good quality forest remains, the problem of "empty forests" is widespread with a very low density of wildlife due to high levels of poaching and illegal consumption of wildlife. Unsustainable levels of wildlife consumption is one of the greatest threats to the sustainability of Vietnam's protected area system and biodiversity conservation efforts more broadly.

Over-hunting and illegal wildlife trade are thought to have played the major role in the decline of a number of globally important species now thought to be extirpated or reduced to extremely low numbers in the wild in Vietnam. These include the kouprey *Bos sauveli*, wild water buffalo *Bubalus bubalis*, Eld's deer *Cervus eldii*, hog deer *Cervus porcinus*, banteng *Bos banteng*, gaur *Bos gaurus*, sambar deer *Cervus unicolor*, Siamese crocodile *Crocodylus siamensis*, mangrove terrapin *Batagur baska*, and the Javan rhinoceros *Rhinoceros sondaicus annamiticus*. The case of the tiger *Panthera tigris* is particularly compelling in this "Year of the Tiger". The Global Tiger Initiative (GTI) aims to double tiger numbers worldwide; in Vietnam there may now be only a handful of wild tigers in the wild and urgent measures are needed to prevent its imminent and tragic disappearance from this country.

The Indochinese tiger (*Panthera tigris corbetti*) is the only subspecies of tiger which have naturally distributed in Vietnam. Tiger is always considered as one of the most endangered mammal in Vietnam (CPVN, 1963, 1992, 2002, 2006). Nevertheless, population of wild tiger is accelerating decline in Vietnam due to a high demand on tiger parts for traditional medicine preparation as well as tiger's habitat and prey declining in all its ranges. The majority of wild tiger's

<sup>3</sup> Include project preparation funds that were previously approved but exclude PPGs that are awaiting for approval.

population in Vietnam found in remote forest at the common border of Vietnam-Laos and Vietnam-Cambodia (FPD, 2004; Vietnam's CITES MA, 2008). The tiger population in the country is further declining as the result of the continuing flourished of illegal wildlife trade recently which tiger and tiger's part is always considered a high price and high demand item among the traded species (Nguyen et al., 2007).

Despite clear wildlife protection laws prohibiting the exploitation and use of wild tigers, as well as advances and steady improvement in the quality and accessibility of health care in Vietnam, use of traditional forms of medicine ranging from endangered to common species such as tiger bone glue, rhino horn, bear bile, pangolins, snakes, monitors, turtles and deers etc. remains deeply rooted in Vietnamese culture. The annual demand for wildlife used for food, medicines, and ornamental purposes and export is reported to vary between 3,700 tons to 4,500 tons (excluding birds and insects)<sup>4</sup>. Thousands of articles about the illegal wildlife trade have appeared in various in all regions of the country. Research studies estimate the number of confiscation cases of illegal wildlife trade to represent only from five per cent to 20% of the actual figures. Extrapolating from this, thousands of tons of wild species and hundreds of thousands of individual specimens have been smuggled annually.

Vietnam has quickly transformed from a source state feeding export markets to a major consumer of wildlife. Surveys have indicated that the majority of wildlife including tigers traded in Vietnam is for domestic use, not for international trade. This transition has resulted in continued pressure upon native species, as well as changed the dynamics of trade in the region as Vietnamese consumer markets have increasingly become the destination for species such as tigers and bears, pangolins, freshwater turtles, snakes, and monitor lizards sourced from other Asian and Southeast Asian countries, as well as high value animal products like rhino horn, elephants ivory sourced from as far away as southern Africa.

Vietnam is however also a key link in an international wildlife trade distribution network to China, Europe, North America and other Asian countries. Surveys show that the Mong Cai border gate in Quang Ninh province is probably the most important route from Vietnam to China with huge quantities of wildlife being smuggled across this porous border.

However, surveys and law enforcement investigations have indicated that most wildlife traded in Vietnam is for domestic use in speciality restaurants and traditional medicine remedies, not for international trade. This is driven by the rapid growth of Vietnam's economy over the past 20 years that has resulted in an increase in the standard of living giving rise to consumer demand for luxury goods, including high value wildlife products, without as yet a corresponding shift in attitudes toward a conservation agenda that is more typical of a middle income countries. This demand is greatest in large cities (e.g. HCMC and Hanoi) where there are many wealthy businessmen and government officials.

The prevention of crimes against biodiversity is weak and compromised by conflicting government policy. For example, traditional medicine departments of the Ministry of Health (MOH) promote the use of protected and endangered species such as tigers, rhino and bear in their official pharmacopeia and training curricula for traditional practitioners. The detection and prosecution of people violating wildlife protection regulations is also weak. Punishments are so minor that they do little to suppress criminal behavior.

Although media coverage on conservation issues is increasing, it currently does not fulfil its potential as a positive tool for strengthening policy and regulation of biodiversity conservation. E.g., poorly written and inadequately researched articles often inadvertently promote locations that sell illegal wildlife and highlight the high profits that can be gained from trading wildlife.

Solutions:

Reducing illegal trade and consumption of wildlife must ultimately rely on three broad strategies: i) stopping illegal poaching in forests and protected areas through better management and protection; ii) reducing the trade in wildlife both nationally and internationally; and iii) reducing domestic demand for wildlife products.

This proposed project focuses on the third solution, reducing domestic demand, while also targeting selected agencies to help reduce trade, agencies that are not traditionally on the front lines of wildlife trade enforcement and which are not covered under other projects in Vietnam to reduce wildlife trade. Such an approach must go hand in hand with better management of protected areas, which a number of other projects and agencies are supporting, particularly a GEF full-sized project on protected areas (through UNDP). Attention to more traditional wildlife trade control agencies is being supported through limited funding in Vietnam under the regional GEF Tiger Futures Project.

The focus of the project is on those species of animals that are most traded and consumed in domestic markets. These for the most part are smaller ungulates and smaller mammals but also includes small numbers of higher-order carnivores,

---

<sup>4</sup> Sources: Project 104. Vie.1.MFS2/21 Strengthen capacity of CITES Implementation and Enforcement in Vietnam

particularly tigers. Tigers are globally of tremendous importance, and currently the objective of a region-wide last stand effort to save them. The smaller animals are not endangered with extinction (with some exceptions such as Saola) but their numbers in Vietnamese forests are uniformly low making them vulnerable to external shocks and ecosystemic shifts. Furthermore, the smaller animals are the prey base of keystone predators such as tigers which are arguably absent from many Vietnamese forests primarily because of an absence of food.

There is no specific geographic focus to the project as it targets illegal wildlife consumption throughout the country. Forests with the ecological potential to support greater prey numbers and thus restore functional ecosystems with top-order carnivores could benefit the most from the success of this project. These are primarily located along the border with Laos and Cambodia.

#### Specific Objectives:

The project seeks to achieve its objectives through three substantive components that together will achieve a real impact on how wildlife is considered in Vietnam. The three components target:

##### i) Policy reform and capacity building

Under this component the project will support the revision and development of regulations on the production, trade and consumption of protected wildlife to ensure they support biodiversity conservation values. To support policy implementation, the project will strengthen the technical capacity of government agencies and their capability to work together to reach shared objectives that have important roles to play but are not sufficiently targeted in similar projects (e.g. Customs, Police, Border Security, Market Control, People's Procuracy and the Court authorities). These two outcomes will be achieved by strengthening the institutional capacity of the key policy making agencies, namely MONRE and MARD in leading this reform process.

##### ii) Innovation to change wildlife use practices

Changing the practice of illegally retailing and consuming wildlife requires direct engagement with those actors involved, which to date have been largely omitted from conservation interventions. A key outcome will be reducing the use and promotion of illegal wildlife products in the health sector. MOH and university training programs will be assisted to bring their work into line with emerging regulations in Vietnam (necessary changes in MOH policies will be promoted under Component 1). This will be achieved through a variety of communication media (e.g., policy dialogues, National Assembly briefings, Party seminars). The project will also support enforcement campaigns targetting illegal retailers of wildlife in key urban sites. Studies show that businessmen are one of the largest consumer groups of wildlife in Vietnam. Businessmen traditionally entertain colleagues, customers, investors and guests with wildlife meals, often targeting endangered species such as tigers because of their rarity and prestige. Currently this sector has little incentive to support biodiversity conservation and has low awareness of the values of wildlife. However, as Vietnam increasingly enters international markets and faces changing attitudes domestically and internationally, companies must evolve. This project will give considerable focus to working with major private sector actors in Vietnam both to reduce demand and, more importantly, to harness the potential of a more proactive role of business in conservation.

##### iii) Knowledge management and outreach

There is an emerging receptivity in the public, particularly among younger generations, for improved information on conservation. Currently, the media do a poor job carrying out this role and worse, are still a vehicle for incorrect and damaging information. This project will work closely with networks of journalists to improve their role as a proactive force for conservation in Vietnam through workshops, site visits, media materials and facilitating dialogues with key agencies.

There is a need to provide accurate and reliable information on the scale of consumption and to provide Vietnam-specific scientific information on the perceived properties of wildlife products in order to initiate the societal attitude change required. No scientific studies have yet supported the supposed pharmacological value of wildlife products but this basic information is not being disseminated.

The control of illegal wildlife trade from suppliers to end consumers requires the involvement of a range of agencies. Inter-agency communication and coordination is a critical component of any effort to improve practices of wildlife consumption and the project will support and develop various fora to facilitate information exchange both official (e.g. through the national steering committees) and informally.

#### Global Environmental Benefits:

By focusing on the demand side of wildlife trade and consumption, the project will begin a process of reducing consumption of smaller forest animals and top-order carnivores such as tigers. Any incremental support to tiger populations will have considerable global value as this species is arguably one of the most iconic animal species that both needs global protection and is galvanizing global support for conservation. Tigers will benefit from reductions in direct poaching and consumption but also by having access to a greater prey base. Small animal populations will ultimately be restored in some forest areas and although these species may not be globally threatened, they will allow Vietnamese ecosystems to be functionally restored, and these are some of the most threatened and globally important ecosystems in southeast Asia.

The GEF has made and continues to support the GoV in making major investments in supporting habitat protection in Vietnam. The value of these global investments is diminished if there is not a corresponding decrease in consumption of wildlife - filling the empty forests.

Additionally, from a global point of view, as populations of commercially valuable species in Vietnam have diminished, Vietnamese wholesale traders have started sourcing wildlife from other Asian countries and even from African nations. Vietnam for example is one of the major global transit points for African ivory and rhinoceros horns. Thus we are seeing a Vietnamese transboundary impact on wildlife populations of other countries. Addressing trade and consumption in Vietnam will reduce pressure on critical wildlife resources worldwide.

**B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL/REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:**

Vietnam has been a member of both CBD and CITES since 1994. The Government of Vietnam has issued policies, strategies and approved national action plans on biodiversity protection such as the "Biodiversity Action Plan 2010 toward 2020" which is articulated around 5 major objectives, of which one is the effective protection of endangered wildlife including control and prevention of illegal exploitation through trade and consumption. In that context, the Government also approved the National Action Plan to strengthen the control of trade in wild fauna and flora.

The issuance of the Biodiversity Law in 2008 highlighted the importance of wildlife conservation and the importance put on changing public attitudes and behaviors towards preserving wildlife species and the use of their products.

These above mentioned policies and plans have created the appropriate legal and policy framework for a mobilization in support of the protection of highly endangered species, and as a result for the conservation of the biodiversity of Vietnam.

Lastly, Vietnam is also actively participating in the Global Tiger Initiative (GTI). The implementation of the project will directly contribute to the implementation of the priorities identified in the national action program for Vietnam through reducing the threats to tiger and its preys. Therefore, the project is fully supportive and consistent with the common vision developed under the global initiative for tiger conservation which is seen in Vietnam as one flagship in support of the broader agenda of biodiversity conservation in the country.

o

**C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:**

The proposed project is consistent with the GEF strategy for biodiversity. Project activities will work to mainstream biodiversity conservation through policy dialogues, institutional capacity building, and building incentives in both public and private sectors (BD-SP4). Additionally it has major implications for markets (SP-5), and support to PA networks (SP-3).

**D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES:** GEF resources continue to be needed in Vietnam to foster what is still an incipient conservation agenda. Now approaching middle-income status, sources of financing from bilaterals and NGOs are drying up but conservation priorities do not yet have much support from the Government itself. Biodiversity conservation is thus falling through the cracks - neither supported by the ODA community nor by domestic sources of financing. GEF financing is needed as a bridge to greater commitments of financing from national sources.

- E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:** Given the magnitude of the problem, there is surprisingly little attention being paid to the issues of wildlife trade and consumption. Through a regional GEF MSP, the Tiger Futures Project, there is important support being provided for training of traditional government actors (primarily the Forestry Protection Department and the Environmental Police). Because of global momentum leading to the Russia summit in late 2009, the Global Tiger Initiative will be an important partner of this MSP and a source of cofinancing. The Government's role in addressing wildlife trade and consumption issues is generally little developed but there are a number of active national and international NGOs who are playing important roles at this time (Education for Nature-Vietnam, a national NGO; WCS; Traffic, WWF, IUCN, Birdlife International and others).
- F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :** The "baseline scenario" in Vietnam is one where gradually greater and greater attention is being paid to protection of habitat in Vietnam. The GEF itself has contributed and continues to contribute to this goal through various projects (Chu Yang Sin and Green Corridor Projects, both now closed; the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund; the Vietnam Conservation Fund (VCF) supported by a World Bank GEF Project and the new UNDP-supported project to support the protected area system in Vietnam). Unfortunately, however, we are increasingly protecting empty forests, with very low densities of small animals and extremely low or extirpated populations of large carnivores and large mammals. In the absence of this project, an existing GEF project (Tiger Futures) will provide training to some traditional actors involved in control of wildlife trade. There will be almost no attention paid to reducing demand and consumption in other sectors and there is a risk that the emerging regulatory environment will not adequately address issues of exploitation, trade, and consumption of wildlife. The value added and incremental impact of this proposed MSP will be to leverage an emerging governmental, public, and corporate consciousness to effect real changes in how wildlife is viewed and conserved in Vietnam.
- G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:** It will not be possible in a small project to fundamentally change conservation attitudes of millions of people nor introduce major changes in incentive systems that allow wildlife trade to flourish in this country. The project objectives are necessarily more modest and are achievable but there are still many risks. These include most notably a difficulty to work across ministerial boundaries (with the MOH, Ministry of Security, Ministry of Education, etc.) from the project's base in MONRE. The project intends to address this through the explicit strengthening of inter-ministerial communication and coordination mechanisms. There is a risk of not being able to generate sufficient corporate interest in a "new agenda" at a time of economic difficulties and difficult changes needed as Vietnamese companies enter the global economic system. The project intends to minimize this risk by turning it into an opportunity: to succeed internationally, companies need to act more responsibly and proactively on various environmental agenda and this project will provide the tools for this to happen.
- H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:** The reasonable assumption that the project will leverage a good level of additional resources, particularly from corporate and private sector sources, suggests that the GEF investment itself should be cost-effective. In addition, and importantly, wildlife consumption which tends to empty the forest of Vietnam as well as those of neighbouring countries, makes more expensive all attempts to secure natural habitats in Vietnam by increasing pressure on a declining resource. In terms of an internal rate of return, this project will build on the existing regulatory reform window to provide the resources necessary to leverage long-lasting change.
- I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:** The World Bank is proposed as the Implementing Agency for this project. A primary reason for this is the Bank's leadership of the Global Tiger Initiative, which is an important conceptual partner and source of cofinancing for this effort. The Bank is also implementing three other conservation-focused GEF investments in the country and will be a vehicle to reach non-traditional actors, like the Ministry of Health, through its large existing set of partnerships in the country.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**

(Please attach the [country endorsement letter\(s\)](#) or [regional endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE ( <i>Month, day, year</i> )
Dr. Tai	Director General ISPONRE	MONRE	06/22/2010

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date ( <i>Month, day, year</i> )	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Steve Gorman		06/16/2010	Jiang Ru	202-473- 8677	<a href="mailto:jru@worldbank.org">jru@worldbank.org</a>

**GEF Trust Fund PIF Preparation Guidelines**  
(This template is applicable to both FSPs and MSPs)

**Unlocking instruction:** The template, by default, is locked to allow the pull-down menu to function. However, in order to access the various documents through the hyperlink, the template has to be in an unlocked form. To unlock the template follow this path: Go to **View > Toolbars > Forms**. You will then see a pop up menu. Click on the right most icon (a lock) to unlock.



When inputting information in the fields in the template, please use the “locked” mode.

**Length of PIF Submission:** We recommend the PIF to be as short as possible (4-8 pages), excluding Part III of the template.

**Submission date:** self explanatory

**PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

The first part is the project core information and standard selections are provided to the extent possible for ease of preparation. The Strategic Programs for each focal area have to be filled in manually, due to limitations by Microsoft Word which prevented the provision of the full range selections for all focal areas through a pull-down menu. For convenience, the strategic programs (SP) in each focal area are listed below. Please write exactly as indicated below. For example, fill in **BD-SP1-PA**, not just SP1 or any other combination.

<b>Biodiversity</b>	<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>International Waters</b>	<b>Land Degradation</b>	<b>POPs*</b>	<b>ODS*</b>	<b>SFM*</b>
<b>BD-SP1-PA</b> Financing	<b>CC-SP1-</b> Building EE	<b>IW-SP1-</b> Coastal Marine Fisheries	<b>LD-SP1-</b> Agriculture	<b>POPs-SP1-</b> Capacity Building	<b>ODS-</b> <b>SP1</b>	<b>SFM-SP1-</b> Financing
<b>BD-SP2-</b> Marine PA	<b>CC-SP2-</b> Industrial EE	<b>IW-SP2-</b> Nutrient Reduction	<b>LD-SP2-</b> Forest	<b>POPs-SP2-</b> Investment		<b>SFM-SP2-PA</b> Networks
<b>BD-SP3-PA</b> Networks	<b>CC-SP3-RE</b>	<b>IW-SP3-</b> Freshwater Basins	<b>LD-SP3-</b> Innovation	<b>POPs-SP3-</b> Demonstration		<b>SFM-SP3-</b> LULUCF
<b>BD-SP4-</b> Policy	<b>CC-SP4-</b> Biomass	<b>IW-SP4-</b> Toxics/Ice				<b>SFM-SP4-</b> Policy
<b>BD-SP5-</b> Markets	<b>CC-SP5-</b> Transport					<b>SFM-SP5-</b> Markets
<b>BD-SP6-</b> Biosafety	<b>CC-SP6-</b> LULUCF					<b>SFM-SP6-</b> Biomass
<b>BD-SP7-</b> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)						<b>SFM-SP7-</b> Forest
<b>BD-SP8-</b> ABS- Capacity Building						

\* POPs = Persistent Organic Pollutants; ODS = Ozone Depleting Substance; SFM = Sustainable Forest Management

**Indicative Calendar:** Firstly, it is well understood that the dates are subject to change as new developments unfold. The expected CEO endorsement date for FSPs and MSPs will be included in the PIF clearance letter from CEO to the Agencies. In fixing these milestones, please take into account project cycle paper provisions of not exceeding 22 months from PIF/work program approval by Council to CEO endorsement. For MSPs, the maximum is 12 months from the time the PIF is approved by CEO to its final approval. The GEF Management Information System will be sending alerts to the Agencies about a month prior to the dates indicated in the letter to alert Agencies of these impending deadlines. It is therefore advisable that should there be any anticipated delay in the endorsement/approval date, Agencies should inform GEFSEC immediately and seek GEF CEO’s agreement to the new dates/milestones. For all other dates on the template (i.e. Agency approval, Mid-term review, etc.), Agencies should inform GEFSEC of any deviation from those indicated in the PIF template so that the GEFSEC database could be updated to reflect the changes. Agencies should also indicate any change in the milestone dates in its annual implementation reports submitted to GEFSEC. In order to avoid confusion on the various terms under the Indicative Calendar section, please refer to the definitions below:

**GEF Agency Approval** - The date on which the GEF Agency Board or Management approves the Grant proposal. This is equivalent to the WB's Board approval date, UNDP's Project Document signature date, or IFAD's approval date.

**Implementation Start** - The date on which project becomes effective and disbursement can be requested. This is the equivalent to the WB's grant/legal agreement effectiveness date and UNDP's Project Document Signature Date. This is also the trigger date for the Trustee to allow Agencies to apply for disbursement.

**Project Closing** - This is the date when all project activities are financially committed, but not necessarily all disbursements completed. Generally, Agencies provide a grace period of 6 months, or more, for final disbursement after project closing, but the sums paid may not be increased from the amounts originally committed. Agencies should submit a report to GEFSEC and the Trustee on the financial closure of the project.

A. *Project Framework*: The main objective of the section is to sketch out the overall design of the project and to provide information about what the GEF grant will finance in relation to other sources of funding.

Since many agencies utilize their own terminology for project design, it is important to clarify what the Secretariat is asking for under each heading. The definitions are based on those developed by OECD/DAC, *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* (2002).<sup>5</sup>

**Project Objective** (refers to OECD/DAC *development objective*): intended impact contributing to global environmental benefits via one or more development interventions.

**Outcomes**: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs (e.g. energy efficiency of existing heat and hot water supply companies in X city improved, new trust fund for the conservation of the PAs established, laws and bylaws approved to reduce impact of forestry practices on biodiversity)

**Outputs**: The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention, and are relevant to the achievement of outcomes. Outputs should be as concrete as possible at this stage; if it is not possible to give a discrete number for quantitative outputs providing a quantitative range would be helpful (e.g. x-staff trained to operate and maintain an early warning system, data capture in x-regions of coastal lowlands).

The **Project Component** is the division of the project into its major parts; an aggregation of a set of concrete activities (e.g. strengthening regulatory and legal frameworks, introduction of innovative financial mechanisms, investment to overcome financial barriers to energy efficient technologies, institutional capacity building)

The indicative financing of the project should be broken down by Project Component. For each component also indicate whether it is of investment in nature, technical assistance, or scientific and technical analysis. Here, A=Indicative GEF Financing; B=Indicative Co-financing.

The percentage under the indicative GEF and co-financing is the percentage of GEF or co-financing of the total amount for the component, i.e. the amount listed under GEF and Co-financing for a particular component should add up to 100% of the component total (add horizontally).

B. *Indicative Co-financing for the project by source and by name (in parenthesis, if available), (\$)*: Indicate the estimated sources of co-financing by the co-financing source categories listed in the first column. Sources indicated are general categorization of co-financiers at this stage. However, if more specific information on the names of co-financiers is available, please include the names after the category (in parenthesis). In the column on types of co-financing, please pull down menu to select whether the co-financing is a grant, soft loan (or concessional loan according to OECD classification), hard loan, guarantee, in-kind contribution or unknown at this stage. B= Indicative Co-financing.

C. *Indicative Financing Plan Summary for the Project (\$)*. Provide the total indicative GEF grant and co-financing amounts. Please note that the co-financing amounts do not receive an Agency fee. In the project preparation column (the 2<sup>nd</sup>), please include preparation funding received previously either through PDF-A or PDF-B and indicate as a footnote on whether the grant is given under GEF-3. This template excludes the reporting of new PPG amount, either submitted together with PIF or to be submitted at a later date. Total amount column is the sum of previously funded project preparation grant and the project grant and does not include Agency fee. The last column on Agency fee is

---

<sup>5</sup> The full glossary in English, French and Spanish is posted on the following website:  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

calculated based on the total amount in the previous column. In providing Agency fee amount, especially in Table D where there is split between/among Agencies, the rule is that total amount should not exceed 10% following the Fee Policy provisions. If for whatever reason the amount is less than 10%, please provide explanation since we will follow whatever amount Agency requested as long as it is within the 10% limit. The explanation should be included in the cover letter that accompanies the submission of PIF to GEFSEC. A=Indicative GEF Financing; B=Indicative Co-financing.

- D. GEF Resources requested by Agency (ies), focal area(s) and country (ies): This table provides the share of the project amount by focal area, Agency and country. No project preparation grant is included in this table as the preparation grant amount is captured separately in the PPG template. For biodiversity and climate change focal areas, this section provides the amount of resources used by the country from its RAF allocation. For non-RAF focal areas, leave 3<sup>rd</sup> column blank. For single country, single focal area and single Agency implemented projects, this table should be skipped.

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

- A. When discussing the issue, state the background and baseline, discuss how the project seeks to address it (GEF alternative), and the expected value added of GEF involvement and global environmental benefits to be delivered (incremental reasoning).
- B. State if the proposed project is consistent with country/regional priorities and how it builds on ongoing programs, policies and political commitments. Responding to this question will also show country ownership of this project.
- C. Describe the project's consistency with the GEF focal area strategies and fit with strategic programs. All projects have to be consistent with the focal area strategies to be eligible for GEF financing.
- D. Justify the type of financing support with resources provided by the GEF. For instance, explain the rationale to provide a loan rather than a grant, or setting up of revolving funds, etc.
- E. Describe the coordination with other GEF agencies, organizations, and stakeholders involved in related initiatives; if similar projects exist in the same country/region, including GEF projects, report on synergies/complementarity with this proposal and demonstrate that there is no duplication.
- F. Refer to the June 2007 Council paper on incremental reasoning which is linked to this section. The objective is to describe the situation that would happen without GEF support and what would be the expected change in global environmental benefits. This differs from Section A in the sense that the former describes what the project will deliver while this section describes the question: what if there is no GEF support?
- G. The objective is to ensure that in designing the project, all risks, including climate change risk have been taken into consideration and that proper measures are in place and that the project is resilient to climate change. Please outline the risk management measures, including improving resilience to climate change, that the project proposes to undertake.
- H. Demonstrate that the selected project design is the best use of the GEF funding for achieving the global environmental benefits described in the project (e.g. \$/ton of CO<sub>2</sub> abated). One way of showing the proposed project is cost-effective is to demonstrate alternatives that may not be as cost effective. If cost-effectiveness is not presented at PIF, outline the steps that project preparation would undertake to present cost-effectiveness at CEO endorsement.
- I. Use the matrix of comparative advantage as a guide (a link to the paper is provided). If the GEF Agency is within the comparative advantage matrix, please provide a short sentence to justify its comparative advantage. However, if the Agency has good reason to implement the project even though it is outside the comparative advantage matrix for the particular type of project that it is proposing, the Agency should provide more detailed justification in this section.

## **PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(CIES)**. (The following sections are signatures of respective authorities and do not count as the four-page limit to the PIF).

- A. Record of endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on behalf of the government. Please add fields to this section if more than one country is involved in the project. There are two types of endorsement letters linked to this section: one for regular projects while the other for regional projects, basically to provide a section where detailed information regarding the allocation of the project amount by focal area, by Agency and by country is provided.

B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification: This section provides Agency's certification to the submission as well as contact information for project.