**GEF-6 Project Identification Form (PIF)**

**Project Type:**

**Type of Trust Fund:**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://www.thegef.org/gef/home)

PART I: Project Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Integrated Health and Environment Observatories and legal and institutional strengthening for the Sound Management of chemicals in Africa (African ChemObs) | | | | | |
| Country(ies): | Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mali Senegal,Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe | GEF Project ID:[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | | 9080 |
| GEF Agency(ies): |  | GEF Agency Project ID: | | | | 01361 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | WHO, BRS Sec and Regional Centres | Submission Date: | | | | 25/03/2015 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): |  | Project Duration (Months) | | | | 60 |
| Integrated Approach Pilot | IAP-Cities  IAP-Commodities  IAP-Food Security | | | Corporate Program: SGP | | |
| Name of parent program: | [if applicable] | | Agency Fee ($) | | 945,000 | |

A. indicative [Focal Area Strategy Framework and Other Program Strategies](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF6%20Results%20Framework%20for%20GEFTF%20and%20LDCF.SCCF_.pdf)[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs) | Trust Fund | (in $) | |
|  |  | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| CW-1 Program 1 |  | 2,000,000 | 23,000,000 |
| CW-2 Program 3 | GEFTF | 2,000,000 |  |
| CW-2 Program 6 | GEFTF | 6,500,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost |  | 10,500,000 | 23,000,000 |

B. indicative Project description summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Objective: To contribute to improved health and environment through strengthening national and regional institutions, and implementing priority chemicals and waste related interventions | | | | | | |
| Project Components | Financing Type[[3]](#footnote-3) | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | (in $) | |
|  |  |  |  |  | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| 1. Strengthen capacity of relevant national government departments and institutions to monitor pollution, prioritize areas for intervention as well as plan and implement solutions through active involvement of local communities |  | Barriers preventing adequate management of harmful chemicals and wastes reduced and sound data are available. | Output 1.1: Integrated health and environment Observatory established in each country  Output 1.2: Major chemicals, waste and pollution problems requiring action are identified and prioritised  Output 1.3: Key progress indicators established to measure improvements in sound chemicals management  Output 1.4: Institutional/legal and capacity building needs assessed, and capacity building activities identified |  | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 2. Development of broad-based action plans to promote sound chemicals management and reduce negative impacts on health and the environment |  | Sound management of chemicals mainstreamed into the decision making processes and national planning and national implementation of chemicals related MEAs and voluntary instruments advanced | Output 2.1: Country reporting under Basel and Stockholm Conventions and notification of final regulatory actions under the Rotterdam Convention and identification of new POPs improved  Output 2.2 Identification of population sub/vulnerable group needs that are particularly exposed to chemicals  Output 2.3: Benefits and cost of action to mitigate risks and specific interventions are defined and compared to the estimated costs of inaction.  Output 2.4: National action plans developed, including business case for investment, and integrated into national development plans. |  | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 3. National action plan implementation |  | Reduced exposure of humans and the environment to harmful chemicals and waste through reduced emissions | Output 3.1: Key stakeholders with strengthened capacities for on-the-ground action to mitigate health risks mobilised  Output 3.2: Communities informed about the local level public health risks of chemicals exposure, and communication for behavioural impact undertaken to support community–based responses and reporting to regulators  Output 3.3: Implementation of situation-specific interventions and policy measures (including clean-up, import control improvements, and pilot activities)  Output 3.4: Dissemination of accessible, policy-relevant messages, on scope of pollution, and impacts of hazardous chemicals and wastes |  | 6,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | | | |  | 10,000,000 | 22,000,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)[[4]](#footnote-4) | | | |  | 500,000 | 1,000,000 |
| **Total Project Cost** | | | |  | 10,500,000 | 23,000,000 |

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 here: (     )

C. Indicative sources of [Co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing) for the project by name and by type, if available

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financier** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount ($)** |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Ethiopia | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Gabon | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Kenya | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Madagascar | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Mali | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Senegal | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Tanzania | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Zambia | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
|  | Min of Environment and Health, Zimbabwe | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
| GEF Agency | UNEP Chemicals | Grant | 600,000 |
| GEF Agency | UNEP Chemicals | In-kind | 2,000,000 |
| Donor Agency | Kemi | Grant | 500,000 |
| Donor Agency | Kemi | In-kind | 2,000,000 |
| Donor Agency | SIDA | In-kind | 400,000 |
| Donor Agency | WHO | In-kind | 3,000,000 |
| Donor Agency | WHO | Grant | 1,000,000 |
| Donor Agency | EC | Grant | 1,500,000 |
| Donor Agency | EC | In-kind | 1,500,000 |
| CSO | Blacksmith Institute | In-kind | 1,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total Co-financing** |  |  | 23,000,000 |

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies) and the Programming of Funds a)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Agency** | **Trust Fund** | **Country/**  **Regional/ Global** | **Focal Area** | **Programming**  **of Funds** | **(in $)** | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | **GEF Project Financing (a)** | **Agency Fee (b)**b) | **Total**  **(c)=a+b** |
|  |  | Regional (Africa) |  |  | 10,500,000 | 945,000 | 11,445,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| **Total GEF Resources** | | | | | 10,500,000 | 945,000 | 11,445,000 |

1. Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/gef-fee-policy.pdf).

E. Project preparation grant (ppg)[[5]](#footnote-5)

Is Project Preparation Grant requested? Yes  No  If no, skip item E.

**PPG Amount requested by agency(ies), Trust Fund, country(ies) and the Programming of funds**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Preparation Grant amount requested: $**      PPG Agency Fee: | | | | | | | |
| **GEF Agency** | **Trust Fund** | **Country/**  **Regional/Global** | **Focal Area** | **Programming**  **of Funds** | **(in $)** | | |
| **PPG** (a) | **Agency**  **Fee[[6]](#footnote-6)** (b) | **Total**  c = a + b |
|  |  |  |  |  | 200,000 | 18,000 | 218,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| **Total PPG Amount** | | | | | **200,000** | **18,000** | **218,000** |

F. Project’s Target Contributions to Global Environmental Benefits[[7]](#footnote-7)

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Corporate Results** | **Replenishment Targets** | **Project Targets** |
| 1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society | Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares | *NA hectares* |
| 1. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) | 120 million hectares under sustainable land management | *NA hectares* |
| 1. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services | Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins; | *Number of freshwater basins NA* |
| 20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels | *Percent of fisheries, by volume NA* |
| 1. 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path | 750 million tons of CO2e  mitigated (include both direct and indirect) | *NA metric tons* |
| 1. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern | Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides) | *1,000 metric tons* |
| Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury | *NA metric tons* |
| Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC) | *NA ODP tons* |
| 1. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks | Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries | *Number of Countries: NA* |
| Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries | *Number of Countries: 9* |

part ii: project JustiFication

1. *Project Description.* Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/incremental_costs)/[additional cost reasoning](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1325) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing); 5) [global environmental benefits](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEB) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.R.5.12.Rev_.1.pdf) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers: Africa’s contribution to global chemicals production is currently small but a clear trend indicates a shift in chemicals production and use from developed to developing countries. The chemicals sector is thus expected to play an increasingly important role in the economies of specific African countries (UNEP, GCO, 2012). In most African countries, industrial and agricultural production has intensified, accompanied by the corresponding use of chemical inputs. UNEP’s Costs of Inaction Report reveals that the costs of injury (lost work days, outpatient medical treatment, and inpatient hospitalization) from pesticide poisonings in sub-Saharan region alone amounted to USD $4.4 billion in 2005, and conservatively projected to US$6.2 billion in 2009.

Heavy metals such as lead and mercury; Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); and highly hazardous pesticides which are either controlled or withdrawn in the developed world, continue to be used in Africa with major environmental and health impacts.

The root causes of the current problems include lack of awareness and capacity. Consistent with the GEF6 Programing Direction, greater awareness of the impacts, including the health impacts, of harmful chemicals and waste needs to be communicated to policy makers at the national level so that sound management of chemicals and waste is fully integrated into national budgets and sector level plans, is required to overcome current barriers.

Baseline scenario: Realizing the dramatic health gains that could be achieved through preventive strategy that protects populations from major environmental hazards, African health and environment Ministers gathered at Libreville on 29 August 2008, and adopted the Libreville Declaration on Health and Environment in Africa. Reflecting on the need for an environment and health information system to support decision-making, Ministers agreed in the Declaration to support the establishment of an African network for surveillance of communicable and non-communicable diseases, in particular those with environment determinants. In November 2010, at the Second Inter-ministerial Conference on Health and Environment in Africa in Luanda, Angola, Ministers adopted the Luanda Commitment in which they committed to accelerate the implementation of the Libreville Declaration and identified chemicals management as one of the top continental health and environment priorities to be addressed for the years to come.

A Situation Analysis and Need Assessment exercise (SANA) completed in 2013 in 34 African countries, including project countries, reveals that quantitative up-to-date data for immediate use in decision making and action is crucially missing. This is due to incomplete information systems, fragmentation of surveillance activities, insufficient coordination among the various established systems, unharmonized methodologies, obsolete tracking tools and lack of standardized indicators. Even where data are available, its analysis to adequately inform decision-making processes remains poor. In circumstances where policy recommendations exist, there are challenges in the uptake and implementation of such recommendations.

Regional assessment conducted in 2014 by WHO in 40 African countries reveals that only 38% of the countries have legislation that govern all chemicals comprehensively, 27% of the countries have established intersectoral coordination, 60% have no surveillance capacities.

Proposed alternative scenario (with component outline): This project proposed to develop a prototype of national integrated health and environment observatory, including a core set of indicators enabling data aggregation, to provide timely and evidence based information to predict, prevent and reduce chemicals risk to human health and the environment.

Component 1: Is focused on strengthening capacity of selected existing relevant national government departments and institutions to monitor pollution, prioritize areas for intervention as well as plan and implement solutions through active involvement of local communities. This will lead to removal of barriers preventing adequate management of harmful chemicals, providing decision makers with access to objective data to support SCM. Activities include: establishment of integrated health and environment Observatory in each country based on an initial capacity assessment completed under the leadership of the relevant Basel / Stockholm regional centre; identification and prioritisation of major chemicals, waste and pollution problems requiring action; establishment of key progress indicators to measure improvements in sound chemicals and waste management; assessment of institutional/legal and capacity building needs; and, identification of priority capacity building activities.

Component 2: Is focused on the development of broad-based action plans to promote sound chemicals management and reduce negative impacts on health and the environment. The component will be executed in partnership with the relevant Basel / Stockholm Regional Centre. This will lead to the mainstreaming of chemicals and waste issues in decision making processes and national planning and the advancement of national implementation of chemicals and waste related MEAs. Activities include: identification of the main immediate and longer term chemicals, and pollution risks and priorities for action; improved country reporting under Basel and Stockholm Conventions and notification of final regulatory actions under the Rotterdam Convention; identification of population sub/vulnerable group needs that are particularly exposed to chemicals; definition of benefits and cost of action to mitigate risks and specific interventions; and, development of national action plans.

Component 3: This component will focus on the support of countries to redice risks from chemcials and wastes identified as posing specific risks to public health and environment. The interventions foreseen include the development of integrated waste management approaches to chemcials and waste issues at national level with targeted pilot interventions to remove risks in high priority cases from wastes such as POPs and highly hazardous pesticides, PCB, electronic wastes, flame retardents such as PBDE and related compounds used in the textiles and building products sectors, specific Mercury waste issues identified at national level and reduction of risks form recycling of lead acid batteries. Therefore the component can be seen to focus on assisting countries to implement the national action plans developed under Components 1 and 2, leading to reduced risk of exposure of humans and the environment to harmful chemicals and waste through reduced exposures and emissions. Activities include: mobilisation of key stakeholders with strengthened capacities for on-the-ground action to mitigate health risks; informing of communities about the local level public health risks of chemicals exposure and communication for behavioural impact undertaken to support community–based responses and reporting to regulators; implementation of specific interventions and policy measures to reduce exposure to harmful POPs chemicals and other highly toxic substances resulting the environmentally sound disposal of prioritized stockpiles of waste and / or remediaton of contaminated sites posing the greatest risk; and, dissemination of accessible, policy-relevant messages, on scope of pollution, and impacts of hazardous chemicals and wastes.

Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from baseline: This project is intended to serve as a demonstration and proof of concept, with eventual replication and roll out of chemical observatories to many more African countries and in other regions. Without this project, participating countries lack the resources to overcome barriers and systematically assess vulnerable populations, set national priorities, and manage chemicals soundly. This project will provide incremental support to improve institutional capacity to define the benefits of sound chemicals management and the costs of inaction at the national level, and to extensive consultations with communities, resulting in communities that are empowered to protect themselves and to communicate chemicals issues to their national chemical observatory, allowing governments to take informed decisions and action.

Global environmental benefits: The project will increase the awareness of the health, environmental and economic impacts of harmful chemicals, leading to increased priority of SCM issues, and mainstreaming into national development plans in nine African countries. It contributes to the enabling conditions and provides tools to remove the barriers currently preventing adequate management of harmful chemicals and wastes through: the provision of the sound data; analysis and policy framework to mainstream chemicals and hazardous waste management concerns into the national budgets, national planning and policies; and, development agenda as well as sector policies. It will also include actions to reduce specific health and environment risks caused by current unsound management of chemicals, protecting vulnerable populations in priority locations, as well as reducing emissions to the global environment.

*2. Stakeholders*. Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from [civil society](http://www.thegef.org/gef/csos) and [indigenous people](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/GEF%20IndigenousPeople_CRA_lores.pdf)? (yes  /no) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation.

The following stakeholders will be involved in the project design:

UNEP Regional Office for Africa (ROA): Will take the lead on consulting with country partners, discussing co-finance contributions, and seeking input into the project design.

National governments: UNEP ROA will maintain close contact with Environment and Health Ministry representatives in the 9 project countries during the project design phase, to ensure specific country needs are reflected in this regional approach. National governments will also be responsible for identifying key civil society groups for additional consultation.

WHO Afro works closely with the Ministries of Health in each project country. As well as consulting directly with country counterparts on design of project components, WHO Afro will identify active civil society partners, and work closely with UNEP on the design of the executing arrangements to ensure the project design builds on each agencies comparative advantage.

BCRCs (West Africa and Africa Institute): Will be consulted during the project design phase, and respective roles in the project, including monitoring and evaluation roles, will be defined.

Civil society groups: will be identified by national governments and WHO Afro and consulted on the design of project components and approaches to working with local communities.

*3. Gender Considerations.* Are [gender considerations](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/gender) taken into account? (yes /no ). If yes, briefly describe how gender considerations will be mainstreamed into project preparation, taken into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

Gender will be considered in all project components. Component 1 will include an institutional needs and capacity assessment, and development of capacity building activities, and opportunities for women will be identified. Component 2 includes identification of groups vulnerable to chemical exposure. In identifying these vulnerable groups, special attention will be paid to the gendered roles of communities, and the specific needs of women. These findings will then be integrated into national action plans to ensure that gender needs are addressed. Similarly, the needs of women will be considered in Component 3, which is focused on implementing national action plans. This includes informing communities directly about local level public health risks and the opportunities for community-based responsibilities to regulators. As consultations will be undertaken direct with communities, where appropriate men and women will be consulted separately to ensure their needs and concerns are clearly heard.

*4 Risks.* Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable).

1. Governments supportive, but lack adequate resources to be engaged: Co-financing discussions have already been initiated and are being considered on a country-by-country basis, acknowledging the different situations faced by each country in terms of capacity to contribute. Efforts are also being made to bring in a broad base of stakeholders to support efforts, including research institutions and academia.

2. Business case for investment in SCM can be identified: The project plans to calculate the cost of SCM and compare it to the eventual cost of inaction, and developing a business case for partner governments to mainstream chemicals management into national planning. There is a risk that governments lack the funds to improve chemicals management and prevent bearing the eventual costs of inaction. To mitigate this, the project will focus on a suite of measures to improve chemicals management including low-cost, locally available measures.

3. Stakeholders, communities and NGOs are not interested in the project: Anecdotal evidence from discussions with project counterparts during PIF development indicates this risk is low and that local communities are very interested in protecting their own health, through looking after their environment. In areas where understanding about the links between environment and human health and chemicals management are low, the project will seek to build capacity and inform communities through extensive consultation.

4. Situation-specific policy measures are outside the project budget: The project will identify specific chemicals management measures in each country. Should these measures be found to cost more than the project budget, additional action will be undertaken to identify additional co-finance through development partners. Where funds cannot be identified, low cost measures will be developed to ensure risks are reduced.

*5. Coordination.* Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives.

Country Task Teams (CTTs) for the Liberville declaration: these are inter-sectoral groups of competent professionals from a range of interested institutions including ministries, academia, research institutions, as well as representatives of other stakeholders such as development partners and civil society. CTT teams work under the supervision of the government and are established in all project countries. The project will utilize strengthen existing structures for national coordination to avoid duplication and to ensure coordination between ministries. The CTT will serve as the interface between the governments and the national technical institutions that will be identified as key executing institutions at the country level.

The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) has proposed a seven part strategy to assist countries in strengthening their national chemicals management capacities. Among them the strategy focuses on increasing capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge: increasing capacities to research, acquire, communicate, educate and make use of pertinent information, to be able to diagnose and understand chemicals management challenges and identify potential solutions. This project is consistent with the IOMC approach and will draw on all available IOMC resources to ensure complimentarity and avoid duplication of efforts.

*6. Consistency with National Priorities*. Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessements under relevant conventions? (yes  /no ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.

The activities planned for this project are consistent with the priorities outlined in the participating countries’ NIPs:

Ethiopia submitted it’s NIP in May 2008, and prioritized establishing a mechanism for information collection and dissemination.

Gabon submitted it’s NIP in May 2008, and prioritized information collection as key to improved chemicals management.

Kenya submitted it’s NIP in April 2007, and prioritized improving health impact monitoring and survellance of POPs.

Madagascar submitted it’s NIP in September 2008, and prioritized informing the public about SCM and survellance of health impacts.

Mali submitted it’s NIP in August 2006, and prioritized protecting human health and the environment through restoration of contaminated areas.

Senegal submitted it’s NIP in April 2007, and prioritized action on the establishment of a poison centre and early warning system.

Tanzania submitted it’s NIP in December 2006, and prioritized establishing chemical information systems.

Zambia submitted it’s NIP in November 2009, and prioritized the evaluation of DDT persistence in environmental matrices, as well as impacts and risks to communities.

Zimbabwe submitted it’s NIP in April 20012, and prioritized the establishment of monitoring and evaluation for POPs risks to human health and the environment.

*7.* *Knowledge Management.* Outline the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

Consistent with UNEP Chemicals Branches Communication Plan, all project reports will be made publically available on the UNEP Chemicals Branch website, and actively shared with the wider chemicals and wastes community, to promote lessons learned and shared experience through Chemicals and Wastes Policy and Practice (http://chemicals-l.iisd.org), hosted by the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

part iii: approval/endorsement by gef operational focal point(s) and GEF agency(ies)

A. Record of Endorsement[[8]](#footnote-8) of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):   
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/webpage_attached/OFP%20Endorsement%20Letter%20Template-Dec2014.doc)(s) with this template. For SGP, use this [SGP OFP   
 endorsement letter](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/webpage_attached/OFP%20Endorsement%20of%20STAR%20for%20SGP%20Dec2014.docx)).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Ministry** | **Date** *(MM/dd/yyyy)* |
| **Ms. Ghrmawit Haile GEBREHIWOT** | Director, Strategic Planning and Resource Mobilization Directorate | Ministry of Environment and Forest of Ethiopia |  |
| **Louis Leandre EBOBOLA TSIBAH** | General Director | General Directory for Environment and the Protection of Nature of Gabon |  |
| **Dr. Richard Lerisian LESIYAMPE** | Principal Secretary | Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources of Kenya |  |
| **Ms. RALALAHARISOA Christine Edmée** | Director | Ministry of Environment, Ecology and Forests of Madagascar | **12/03/2015** |
| **Sekou KONE** | Chief, Section of Partnerships and Funds Mobilization | Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development of Mali | **06/03/2015** |
| **Mariline DIARA** | Director | Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Senegal | **12/03/2015** |
| **Julius NINGU** | Director of Environment | Vice President's Office |  |
| **Godwin Fishani GONDWE** | Director | Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection |  |

B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification

|  |
| --- |
| **This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies[[9]](#footnote-9) and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation under GEF-6.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency name** | **Signature** | **Date**  *(MM/dd/yyyy)* | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email** |
| Brennan Van Dyke  Director, GEF Coordination Office,  UNEP | sig | March 25, 2015 | Kevin Helps  Task Manager | +254-20-762-3140 | Kevin.Helps@unep.org |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**GEF\_PIF\_60**

C. Additional GEF Project Agency Certification (Applicable Only to newly accredited GEF Project Agencies)

For newly accredited GEF Project Agencies, please download and fill up the required [**GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information Template**](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/webpage_attached/GEF%20Project%20Agency%20Certification%20Template.docx) to be attached as an annex to the PIF.

1. Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC and to be entered by Agency in subsequent document submissions. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [*GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF*](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF6%20Results%20Framework%20for%20GEFTF%20and%20LDCF.SCCF_.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For GEF Project Financing up to $2 million, PMC could be up to10% of the subtotal; above $2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.  
    [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. PPG requested amount is determined by the size of the GEF Project Financing (PF) as follows: Up to $100k for PF up to $3 mil; $150k for PF up to $6 mil; $200k for PF up to $10 mil; and $300k for PF above $10m. On an exceptional basis, PPG amount may differ upon detailed discussion and justification with the GEFSEC. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the Agency fee over the GEF Project Financing amount requested. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Provide those indicator values in this table to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [*GEF-6 Programming Directions*](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.C.46.07.Rev_.01_Summary_of_the_Negotiations_of_the_Sixth_Replenishment_of_the_GEF_Trust_Fund_May_22_2014.pdf)*,* will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and/or SCCF. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For regional and/or global projects in which participating countries are identified, OFP endorsement letters from these countries are required   
    even though there may not be a STAR allocation associated with the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF [↑](#footnote-ref-9)