



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Belize Chemicals and Waste Management Program			
Country(ies):	Belize	GEF Project ID: ¹	5094
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5158
Other Executing Partner(s):		Submission Date:	2014-02-01
GEF Focal Area (s):	Persistent Organic Pollutants	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	94,050
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) CHEM-1	GEF 1.3 POPs releases to the environment reduced	GEF 1.3.1 Action plans addressing un-intentionally produced POPs developed and implementation started	GEF TF	780,000	5,800,000
(select) CHEM-1	GEF 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed, and disposed of	<p>GEF 1.4.1 Amount of PCBs and PCB-related wastes disposed of, or decontaminated; measured in tons as recorded in the POPs tracking tool</p> <p>GEF 1.4.2 Environmentally sound management of obsolete pesticides, including POPs, programme developed and implementation started</p>	GEF TF	210,000	300,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
Total project costs				990,000	6,100,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project Objective: To strengthen national institutional, technical, and legal infrastructure and capacity for POPs phase out and sound chemicals management

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
<p>Component 1: Environmentally sound management and regulatory strengthening of chemicals and waste, including POPs</p>	<p>(select)</p>	<p>1.1 Institutional capacities strengthened through enhanced policies and regulatory framework supporting sound management of chemical life cycle</p> <p>1.2. Management and disposal of existing POPs waste</p>	<p>1.1.1: Development of a coherent Legal and Institutional framework for the sound management of chemicals in Belize</p> <p>1.1.2: Industrial chemicals regulation developed in order to develop and incorporate PCB's enabling regulations and standard operating procedures in the legal framework.</p> <p>1.1.3. National regulatory instruments on consumer chemicals, including pharmaceuticals, cosmetics and precursor chemicals revised and updated to address POPs waste, UPOPs, mercury and other hazardous chemicals</p> <p>1.1.4. Regulations for rural solid waste stream management developed.</p> <p>1.1.5. Chemicals regulation and Solid waste management compliance promotion and enforcement rules legislated and capacities for enforcement enhanced</p> <p>1.2.1. Training in buyer's competence for disposal services for hazardous waste, including POPs as well</p>	<p>(select)</p>	<p>249,000</p>	<p>700,000</p>

			<p>as safe practices for handling, packing and transportation.</p> <p>1.2.2. Repacking and disposal of obsolete PCB and DDT stockpiles as well as associated waste through export to a dedicated facility.</p>			
2.Dioxin release reduction in waste management operations and agriculture	TA	<p>2.1 Measureable reduction in dioxin release from formal and informal waste dumps</p> <p>2.2 Reduction of UPOPs releases from uncontrolled, open burning of agricultural and other wastes</p>	<p>2.1.1. Closure of waste dumpsites and their upgrade for avoiding waste burning and associated UPOPs releases</p> <p>2.1.2. Waste separation for high POPs releasing waste streams.</p> <p>2.2.1. Piloted alternatives to agricultural burning in sugar cane farming</p> <p>3.2.2.Promotion of farmer voluntary programmes and guidelines regulating agricultural burning</p>	GEF TF	610,000	5,400,000
3. Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation.	TA	3.1. Project's results sustained and replicated.	<p>3.1.1. M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted;</p> <p>3.1.2. Lessons learned and best practices are disseminated at national level.</p>	GEF TF	41,000	150,000
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		

	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					900,000	6,250,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	90,000	400,000
Total project costs					990,000	6,650,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			0

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				0	0	0

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	62,000	5,000	67,000
National/Local Consultants	130,000		130,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: Minor re-alignments in the approach introduced, mainly due to new initiatives supporting overall chemicals and waste capacity building in general and agricultural pesticides in particular. These initiatives allows for some re-direction of financial resources towards technical assistance resulting in more tangible POPs release reduction. To be noted is also an identification of a 7 ton stockpile of PCB contaminated oils which will be addressed in the refined project framework. The final Project has also re-organized some of the activities as per stakeholder involvement in order to facilitate the implementation stage.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

In the baseline scenario, the awareness of decision-makers of the economic and social benefits for promoting sound POPs management is not high enough to lead to substantial improvements in the country.

Eventhough there is a will to update the chemicals regulatory framework, there is a concern that, without a comprehensive understanding of chemical safety aspects, such regulatory changes made would yet again be too narrow in scope and not comprehensive enough associated enforcement gaps, and leave certain sectors and chemicals such as POPs unaccounted for. GEF support is also incremental in improving the country’s institutional capacity to address the UPOPs challenges.

The intentional POPs waste stockpile, consisting of DDT and PCB contaminated oils, would not be solved without the project interventions due to lack of technical expertise and financial assets.

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

In the Baseline scenario there will be improvements to Belize municipal waste management but the approach is not comprehensive enough for allowing the UPOPs release reduction to be optimized. Indeed, without the project there would be several locations where uncontrolled burning would continue. Only through a concerted effort and financing from local and GEF resources all loopholes and gaps, particularly informal dumps, will be brought under control.

The small scale sugar cane farmers would not get the push and incentives for introducing the Green Harvesting without the project. There may be some increase under non-burning agricultural practices as larger scale sugar estate owned areas would increase acreage under such cultivation.

The Global Environment Benefit from the project would consist of the safe disposal of 21 tons DDT and associated waste and the newly identified 7 tons of PCB contaminated oil as well as reduction of UPOPs into the global environment.

The GEB in form of UPOPs reduction will result from action stopping uncontrolled waste burning by integrating these into the overall waste management structure. During the project it can be expected that 95 % of all uncontrolled burning in the Western Corridor can be integrated into the overall system through GEF and Baseline project action. Some minor burning of waste may still be happening in smaller municipalities without appropriate collection systems.

The initial UPOPs inventory had very optimistic figure of the share of uncontrollably burnt waste at landfill sites. As the project will address both urban and rural waste in the Western Corridor it can be expected that correspond to approximately 5.7 g I-TEQ in air and 11.5 g I-TEQ in land releases of UPOPs. The contribution from changing agricultural practices towards non burn practices is expected to reduce UPOPs releases with around 1 g I-TEQ both in air and land releases. Overall the project will reduce around 7 g I-TEQ of UPOPs releases to air and some 12 g I-TEQ to land per year.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: Further refinement. Updated version

Insufficient financial resources available to continue national interventions for sound management of chemicals Low
Awareness raising among decision makers and resource managers within the context of SAICM and the Stockholm Convention and wider sustainable chemical management is being further continued throughout the project, especially component 1.

Institutional weakness to implement regulations Low The project seeks to address those capacities and to augment current national programmes designed to facilitate monitoring and enforcement.

Climate Risks are related to Belize classification as a SIDS in an area that is prone to tropical storms / hurricanes. Low
The component 2 considering UPOPs releases from municipal and agricultural waste management improves the resilience to climate change by constructing adequate waste management infrastructure at a non-flooding prone area. The facility includes also surface water system for the control of flooding and leachate generation. While no landfill gas recovery is considered in the first phase the emissions should be neutral as a compared with current uncontrolled burning scenario.

Conflicting interests of key ministries in developing sound chemicals management policies, legal instruments and institutional responsibilities. Low Project's multi-stakeholder coordination and frequent meetings will ensure appropriate information exchange, coordination and venues for finding agreements between the ministries.

Risk of unsuccessful demonstration projects and low replication. Low The municipal waste management part will not suffer from unsuccessful demonstration as there is sufficient capacity and funding available. Demonstration stage risks are higher in Green Harvesting of sugar cane, where the acceptability and cultural traditions may be

difficult to overcome. Due consideration for information and community outreach has been included in project approach to address this.

Risk of low replication for full project impact. Moderate Replication of both sound municipal waste management and Green Harvesting of sugar cane will require considerable cash investments beyond the project's capabilities. For waste management tangible amelioration of local environment is expected to bring forward additional national resources. For green harvesting, working with premium trade schemes, like Fairtrade, is expected to bring in both the impetus as well as the financial resources to continue replication.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives There are recent initiatives financed by GEF which has given reasons to slightly realign the project approach, particularly lessening the need to undertake direct capacity building in the single country project as the two regional projects will cover most of these and as Belize, due to its size, do not have a large cadres of officials that can benefit from specific POPs training.

For Industrial POPs and UPOPs emissions, GEF/ UNIDO Regional Project on Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Management Mechanism for POPs in the Caribbean, which will provide training and capacity building through the Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer for the Caribbean Region (BCRC-Caribbean).

For POPs pesticides the coordination will be ensured with a recently proposed GEF/FAO regional project on Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs, Promotion of Alternatives and Strengthening Pesticides Management in the Caribbean. While the actual disposal of known POPs waste in Belize that contain DDT used in vector control and PCBs will be disposed through this project the remaining work on agricultural POPs pesticides such regulatory strengthening, capacity building, pesticide container management etc will be in the realm of the regional project.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation. Outside direction and oversight will be provided by a Project Steering Committee consisting of the National Project Director - a senior-level representative of the Department of Environment - as well as senior representatives of the Ministries, NGOs as well as UNDP. This committee will provide management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager. The Project Steering Committee will also have final authority on matters requiring official review and approval, including annual work plans, budgets, and key hires.

This broad constituency, initially assembled in context of the Belize-UNDP-UNEP Cooperation Project, will continue to be engaged by this project and serve as its Project Steering Committee. Its participation include:

- Belize Agricultural Health Authority
- Belize Customs & Excise Department
- Belize SAICM Initiative
- Caribbean Agricultural Research & Development Institute
- Department of the Environment– (Chairperson)
- Fabrigas Belize Ltd.
- Ministry of Economic Development, Industry and Consumer Protection
- Ministry of Health,
- Pesticides Control Board
- Prosser Fertilizer and Agrotec Co. Ltd

- United Nations Development Programme

This very comprehensive representation and very frequent meeting schedule of the PSC will ensure that all stakeholders of Stockholm Convention and further chemicals management in addition to the PSC, the Solid Waste Management Authority, the Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Health and the Pesticide Control Board, will form a Project Execution Group. The involvement of these entities is key to ensure the alignment of proposed actions with ongoing as well as planned policies and interventions.

Other key stakeholders, such as sugar cane farmers will be engaged through the farmer association which is providing also co-financing to project. Initially the project will work more closely with the farmers association in Orange Walk District but will later engage also Corozal farmers association, particularly in the replication and discussions concerning premium price for Green Harvesting. It is foreseen that this will be conducted at meetings after the first harvesting season when new harvesting approach has been demonstrated in the field.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF): The sound management of chemicals is key for Belize's continued economic and social development. The benefits of chemicals are most clearly evident in its use in the productive sector. Much of the Belize's economy and livelihoods are based on agriculture (agriculture continues to provide over 70 per cent of the country's total foreign exchange earnings, and employs almost a third of the total labour force). This industry is believed to be the most chemical intensive in the country however "An increase in overall GDP coming from agricultural labor productivity is on average 2.5 times more effective in raising the incomes of the poorest quintile in developing countries than an equivalent increase in GDP coming from non-agricultural labor productivity" (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (UNEP TEEB).

The growing use of chemicals nationally has led to increasing concern over the potential effects of certain substances upon both people and the environment. The adoption of appropriate chemical management structures nationally and the building of capacities to effectively operate within this structure is expected to reduce the threat of chemicals on the population and the natural environment.

This overall initiative proposed by the country of Belize aims to strengthen the governance regime for chemicals, including POPs that will benefit the society and protection of biodiversity as a whole, as part of its overall development and poverty alleviation planning. However, there are some groups within the society that are more vulnerable to unsound management of chemicals.

There are significant gender and demographic dimensions to be addressed either directly or indirectly through interventions related to sound POPs and chemical management as men, women, and children are exposed to different levels of chemicals contamination.

Indeed, based on the information obtained from various reports that review the SMC and development situation in Belize, the following population groups are more vulnerable to the unsound chemicals management practices in Belize, including POPs exposure:

- Women and children (usage of household products, agricultural, waste pickers)
- Agricultural workers (pesticide usage, transport and disposal)
- Workers in industrial sector (raw materials usage, hazardous chemicals, chemical wastes)

The protection of human health is a key benefit of the interventions being proposed through this planned initiative.

To ensure that these vulnerable groups are adequately represented during the implementation of the project it will be very important to ensure that representative ministries for vulnerable populations participate (Ministry of Health, Education, Agriculture, Industry, Labor etc.) but equally important is the participation of NGOs and CSOs working

on gender, health and environmental issues as well as labor organizations that represent the concerns of workers of sectors affected by the unsound management of chemicals.

Last but not least, it will be important to ensure that institutions such as chemical associations and universities that play an important role in education, awareness raising and information dissemination are adequately involved in the implementation of the project.

In the project approach, the development of the waste management schemes will take current waste pickers and securing their livelihoods into consideration. The waste transfer stations will provide organized, much safer job opportunities for waste recyclers (former waste pickers) . It has been agreed that the unorganized pickers will be given preference when filling the waste presorting job opportunities.

The sugarcane farming community is due to competition and decreasing world market prices for sugar under some economic stress. This means that the Belizian sugar cane farmer needs quickly to find ways of increasing profitability through reduction of input costs and raising yields. Green Harvesting, introducing mechanical harvesting will provide a part of the efficiency gain required. The input that is lost will be manual labor input. While this may look like a socio-economic loss in form of employment opportunities, the reality is that the profit margins are not enough to pay decent wages either for Belizean or foreign farm help.

Overall the project will in addition of providing global environmental benefits provide a clear socio-economic benefit in form of higher yields, cost effective production and economic benefits to farming communities. At the same time considerable health benefits can be assumed particularly for people living close or at previous waste dumps while retaining work opportunities. Also the overall health status of the Belizian population can be expected to ameliorated.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design: Cost effectiveness of the project has been achieved by closely analyzing the capacity building needs and the current as well as planned interventions in the region when it comes to POPs and chemicals management. As synergies have been found savings have been realized in Outcome 1.1. budget

Outcome 1.2. safe disposal of the POPs stockpile will be medium level for its cost-effectiveness. Due to small amounts of POPs and the long transportation, the disposal prices can not be expected to be in the low range, if Mexican facilities will not be willing to accept the waste. This lower price scenario needs to be further assessed at actual bidding. In all cases, export disposal is by far more cost-effective than looking at upgrading local facilities for disposal.

Project component 2 will provide a low-medium cost approach for Municipal solid waste management . The short distances in the Western corridor will enable efficient use of waste transfer centers, making the scheme quite cost-effective. With the amount of waste and fairly low UPOPs emission factors reducing burning of municipal solid waste will never become low cost interventions for reducing UPOPs reduction alone. The same applies for open burning of agricultural waste in the field, such as sugar cane.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities.

Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first two months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- e) Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Steering Committee meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (around end 2015). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development

and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Audit: The project will undergo annual audit by a certified auditor according to UNDP rules and regulations, policies and procedures.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects.

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 [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Martin Alegria	Chief Environmental Officer and GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT	12/19/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).
Please see Annex A. of the UNDP Project document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

N/A

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 50000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Total	0	0	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)