



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: May 12, 2009

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID¹: PROJECT DURATION: 36 months
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4274
COUNTRY(IES): Rwanda
PROJECT TITLE: Rwanda - Management of PCBs stockpiles and equipment containing PCBs
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)
GEF FOCAL AREA (S)²: Persistent Organic Pollutants
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): POPs-SP1, POPs-SP2 (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): NA

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates mm/dd/yyyy
Work Program (for FSP)	
CEO Endorsement/Approval	06/2010
Agency Approval Date	08/2010
Implementation Start	09/2010
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	01/2012
Project Closing Date	08/2013

* See guidelines for definition of milestones.

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Protection of the environment and human health through management and disposal of PCBs in electric equipment, oils and waste materials in Rwanda								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA ^b	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing ^a		Indicative Co-Financing ^a		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$) ^a	%	(\$) ^b	%	
1. Complete PCB inventory through enhanced cooperation with the Government bodies and equipment holders and selection of options for PCB disposal	TA	PCBs numbers in stocks, equipment and waste are updated; and early/mature equipment replacement schemes are in place to be subject to agreed disposal options	1.1. Updated the PCB inventory per category of holders (database) and reinforced local capacity to maintain and update PCB inventory on annual basis; 1.2. ElectroGaz (principal PCB holder) and other possible holders are accessed to establish partnership scheme(s) for early/mature equipment replacement	50,000	50	50,000	50	100,000
2. Legislative support to aid the operation of PCB management system	TA	PCB legislation and management guidelines adopted	2.1 PCB legislation and technical guidance developed 2.2 Developed and established rules to avoid cross-contamination of the oils and equipment; rules/procedures on handling contaminated oils/equipment and labeling	50,000	50	50,000	50	100,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Select only those focal areas from which GEF financing is requested.

3. Stakeholders and public sensitized and PCB equipment holders handle equipment in well informed and responsible manner	TA	- Public sensitization and information of PCB risks. - PCB holders aware and avoid equipment leakages and cross-contamination.	3.1 Public awareness campaigns conducted. 3.2. Promoted safe and proper equipment handling at holders; holders trained on leak handling, safeguarding and repairing of old/damaged equipment	105,000	41	150,000	59	255,000
4. Safe disposal of PCB equipment, oils and waste material	TA	PCB equipment and oils collected, transported and stored; export for disposal of PCBs equipment, oils and waste is operational	4.1. Assessed existing locations for safe PCB equipment storage; selected existing storage facility upgraded for storage and transformer draining and PCB packaging, facility safety procedures setup. 4.2. Collected PCB equipment / packaged oils and waste sent for storage location(s); 4.3. Agreed disposal plan put in place: - equipment replacement scheme promoted at ElectroGaz to replace up to 100 transformers in use; - up to 150 tons of PCB oil disposed of through export; - up to 350 tons of PCB contaminated solid waste material packed and safely stored	650,000	50	650,000	50	1,300,000
8. Project management				95,000	39	150,000	61	245,000
Total project costs				950,000	48	1,050,000	52	2,000,000

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

^b 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	Grant (in-kind)	250,000
Private sector	Grant (cash, in-kind)	800,000
Total Co-financing		1,050,000

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

	Previous Project Preparation Amount (a) ³	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing	⁴	950,000	950,000	95,000
Co-financing	0	1,050,000	1,050,000	
Total	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	95,000

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)^{1 N/A}

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

⁴ To be requested along with the PIF through PPG procedure

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

Rwanda ratified the Stockholm Convention in July 2002. Since then, this Convention has been in force in the country. The National Implementation Plan was submitted to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat on May 30, 2007.

During the NIP development, due to lack of statistics and file registers, it was difficult to estimate the quantities of PCBs used in Rwanda, or to identify equipment import dates. In addition to electric equipment sector, PCBs were probably used in hydraulic fluids, lifting machines or special paints imported for various applications.

The initial inventory covered each four provinces of the country and Kigali, the capital. It focused mainly on transformers. This initial inventory made it possible to inspect 986 units out of approximately 1,012 existing in Rwanda. The year of manufacture of the devices inspected goes from 1961 to 2005. One has to note that out of 986 listed units 58 have no date of manufacture, and this equipment may contain PCBs.

The data collected in October 2005 indicated existence of 343 transformers containing PCBs as dielectric fluids. This corresponds to around 154 tons of fluids with PCBs and 353 tons of solid wastes contaminated with PCBs. In addition, two sites were considered as being potentially contaminated by PCBs oils. Also, information collected during the inventory revealed practices which facilitate the spread of PCBs and PCBs contaminated wastes.

The NIP at the time of its development recognized the need to urgently organize a national dialogue between the principal stakeholder parties in PCB management issues. The NIP and PCB section were drawn up to target progressive withdrawal of PCB equipment and safe handling and disposal of PCB materials and wastes. However, the plan is based on expectations of international cooperation since no sufficient resources are available in the country. Among the activities, it was planned to (1) complete PCB inventory through sensitization on POPs related risks, (2) build and strengthen local capacities, (3) ensure environmentally sound PCB management and disposal.

The main identified holder of PCB transformers is ElectroGaz (The National Electricity Company). Currently, the enterprise uses 135 transformers which contain PCBs. Also, 373 disconnected PCB containing transformers are stored at the company's premises. Thus, the company will be involved as the principal project partner and co-financier.

The proposed project strongly aims to strengthen capacity of key stakeholders (government, PCB equipment/oil/waste holders) to address:

- further clarification of PCB equipment inventory and cross-contamination issues;
- set up of national dialogue on the start of implementation of safe PCB management plan (regulatory aspects, awareness raising and cooperation between key stakeholders, training needs in safe PCB equipment handling, PCB equipment labelling);
- collection, storage and disposal of PCB materials through export for final disposal (options for washing of low-contaminated equipment within ElectroGaz will be explored);

The resulting accessible stocks of priority PCBs materials (PCB equipment in poor condition) will be stockpiled and disposed of, thus, risks associated with their global distribution will be removed. Safe PCB handling practices will be established and will contribute to the global benefits as the currently existing PCBs in Rwanda will be managed and disposed in a responsible and sustainable manner.

The project outputs will raise the capacity of various stakeholders for achieving sound management of PCBs throughout their lifecycle. PCB disposal activities are planned to physically remove available stocks from the environment. In cases where it is not feasible due to economic reasons, containment and avoidance of cross-contamination of oils in functional equipment is to be ensured through training, labeling and proper handling of such equipments with the availability of safeguarded storage when equipment is out of order and becomes decommissioned (including capacitors).

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

Since 2002, the Conference of the African Ministers for environment made ecologically rational management of polychlorobiphenyls (PCBs) one of the priorities of the Action plan for environment in The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).

Management of PCBs is identified as a priority in the National Implementation Plan (NIP) of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in Rwanda. The NIP identifies PCBs and PCB equipment management as a priority. Of eight areas of action PCB management was ranked number 4, while action plan *Sensitization, information and training the public about POPs* and *Reinforcement of institutions and regulation* also targeted by the project were ranked 1 and 2, respectively.

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

The project and its activities are in conformity with the GEF Strategic Objective in the POPs focal area.

- SP1. Strengthening Capacities for NIP Development and Implementation through the following indicators: (1) legislative/regulatory framework in place in supported countries for management of POPs, and chemicals in general; (2) strengthened and sustainable administrative capacity, including chemicals management administration within the central government in supported countries; and (3) strengthened and sustainable capacity for enforcement in supported countries.

- SP2. Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation through the following indicators: (1) POPs phased-out from use; (2) POPs destroyed in an environmentally sound manner; (3) reduced exposure to POPs, measured as the number of people living in close proximity to POPs wastes that have been disposed of or contained.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES:

The project will assist the Government of Rwanda to build legislative and technical capacity to safely manage available PCB equipment, oils and materials in mid-term through their collection, packaging and export and in longer term through the enhanced ability and preparedness to manage newly discovered PCB waste streams as they accumulate through time due to efforts aimed at further PCB equipment identification, their labelling and safe handling to avoid cross-contamination spread. The GEF resources will be used to backstop legislation review and update as necessary to initiate the control over PCBs, awareness raising among key stakeholders and PCB equipment holders, trainings for principal PCB equipment holders and repair shops to avoid cross-contamination and improve handling of such equipment. The project will also use the funding to develop and implement a disposal plan in consultations with involved stakeholders to collect, store and export available PCB materials.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The project will establish close ties with the ongoing UNITAR-SAICM project “Updating the National Chemicals Management Profile, Development of a National SAICM Capacity Assessment, and Holding a National SAICM Priority Setting Workshop”.

As the project will be providing national expertise as it develops through in course of its implementation as knowledge to be shared with partner countries in the region, such information will be accessible to all interested stakeholders. It is worthwhile of noting that UNDP has similar programmes in Ghana, Morocco and Mauritius. The project will link through electronic means to such ongoing programmes in order to establish a virtual information exchange tool.

The ‘Consolidated Waste Management Project in Rwanda’ has been established with UNDP technical and financial support. One of the elements covers to set a national waste management action plan. The project will establish close links with this programme.

UNDP will ensure working together with the regional UNEP-UNIDO initiative for PCBs, exchanging information & lessons learned and participating in some of the regional workshops as appropriate.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH [INCREMENTAL REASONING](#) :

Rwanda is a developing country with pressing government’s budget constraints which limits the scope of activities in the area of PCB management, as recognized in the NIP. It is further supported by the fact that no major nationally-driven POPs-related activities have taken place since the NIP was formally adopted and submitted to the Stockholm Secretariat.

Without the project, PCBs would continue to accumulate, existing PCB stockpiles will stay, with materials being cross-contaminated and escaping into the environment due to lack of adequate PCB management system in place, including appropriate legislation. Despite the good intention of PCB holders to manage their waste the current expertise does not exist to manage the PCB stockpiles in adequate and informed manner. Additionally, the country does not possess resources to remove stockpiled PCB equipment and dispose of it in order to minimize existing global risks.

In short, the baseline scenario would entail continuation of the current practices where PCBs are loosely regulated and most probably over the time, be unsustainably disposed of or even re-used.

The GEF resources will be utilized for incremental i) supporting and developing the overall national PCB management, thus breaking the barrier for effectively implemented Convention requirements, and ii) setting up proper PCB management possibilities including logistics for disposal. These management steps entail PCB equipment disconnection, transport, and intermediate storage and disposal steps.

The GEF's support has been seen as a key driving factor behind safe and responsible PCB management in Rwanda and will catalyze a positive response from the public and private sectors to handle the problem effectively. Without this project, there is a great possibility that PCBs will be improperly managed and released into environment.

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:

Risk	Risk rating	Risk mitigation strategy
Counterpart funding will not substantiate due to tight economic conditions	M	As part of the project preparation activities commitment letters will be requested. The project team will work towards securing co-finance resources from various sources.
Fluctuation in exchange rates may stretch the disposal budget	M	By a phased disposal strategy, early success can be reported. This will facilitate securing of further resources in case the currency fluctuations disturb budgetary control.
Safe PCBs management practices will be abandoned by their holders as project is completed	L	The project will work towards integrating PCBs handling issues in the routine working procedures among the major holders and thereby ensure that safe practices will continue to be carried out. Such safe operations will be promoted through adequate legislation.

H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:

The cost effectiveness counted by price of tons POPs eliminated will be a low cost approach in the Rwandan setting. The initial PCB inventory does not indicate a need for establishing technologies for disposing PCBs in country and proposing that would not be cost-effective. In international comparison the Rwandan PCB project would represent a mid-cost per tons PCB eliminated. Higher costs will be accrued due to the geographic, land-locked, situation of Rwanda, which will result in higher transport and transit expenses.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:

UNDP is very well experienced in projects of such design aimed at safe and responsible PCB management. Such experience will be replicated in this programme.

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 (Month, day, year)
Dr. Rose Mukankomeje	GEF OFP	Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)	APRIL 23, 2009

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 (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mr. Yannick Glemarec, UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator, UNDP	<i>Y. Glemarec</i>	May 8, 2009	Dr. Suely Carvalho, Chief, MPU/Chemicals, Principal Technical Advisor	1-212-906.6687	suely.carvalho@undp.org

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.

Biodiversity	Climate Change	International Waters	Land Degradation	POPs*	ODS*	SFM*
BD-SP1-PA Financing	CC-SP1- Building EE	IW-SP1- Coastal Marine Fisheries	LD-SP1- Agriculture	POPs-SP1- Capacity Building	ODS- SP1	SFM-SP1- Financing
BD-SP2- Marine PA	CC-SP2- Industrial EE	IW-SP2- Nutrient Reduction	LD-SP2- Forest	POPs-SP2- Investment		SFM-SP2-PA Networks
BD-SP3-PA Networks	CC-SP3-RE	IW-SP3- Freshwater Basins	LD-SP3- Innovation	POPs-SP3- Demonstration		SFM-SP3- LULUCF
BD-SP4- Policy	CC-SP4- Biomass	IW-SP4- Toxics/Ice				SFM-SP4- Policy
BD-SP5- Markets	CC-SP5- Transport					SFM-SP5- Markets
BD-SP6- Biosafety	CC-SP6- LULUCF					SFM-SP6- Biomass
BD-SP7- Invasive Alien Species (IAS)						SFM-SP7- Forest
BD-SP8- 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).⁵

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 2nd), 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 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

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

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 3rd 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 CO₂ 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.