

Combating land degradation through integrated and sustainable range and livestock management to promote resilient livelihoods in Northern Punjab

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10693

Countries

Pakistan

Project Name

Combating land degradation through integrated and sustainable range and livestock management to promote resilient livelihoods in Northern Punjab

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/1/2021

Review completed by PM

1/14/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Table A is adequate.

Clarification requests:

- Rio Marker "2" for CCM (= primary objective) has been selected for this LD project. While the project generates CC-M benefits, please clarify if "2" is appropriate.
- Please enter expected implementation start / completion dates in Part I.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you for these recommendations.

- Rio Marker 1 has been selected for CCM.
- Implementation start and completion dates have been entered

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

However, please also include the quantitative indicator targets in Table B.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Indicators have been changed for the project's quantitative targets in Table B.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

01/14/2022: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

? Name of co-financier: change ?10 Billion Trees Project? to ?Government of the Punjab - Forestry, Wildlife & Fisheries Department?.

? Type: change ?Grant? to ?Public Investment?

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Changes have been made in the portal and in the updated version of PRODOC.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

01/14/2022: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS on the budget:

i. While there is an indication of the budget being attached to the ProDoc, the file is not attached ? please do so in the resubmission (it has to be the same budget table as in Portal).

ii. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the execution of the project (like project's staff) has to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The position of Project Coordinator should be fully charged to PMC (as there are enough co-financing resources) but has been charged throughout the components and M&E ? regarding the portion charged to M&E (\$18,735), per the M&E budget plan this portion corresponds to supervision visits ? please amend.

iii. Consultants that are not part of the project's staff are meant to be charged to the project's components. However, there is a budget line with no description (Sub-total national consultants) that are charged to M&E and PMC. Please fully charge them to the project's components.

iv. OPIM spot checks is a M&E activity, but it is charged to PMC ? please amend.

Please contact the reviewer email if there are any questions on the budget comments.

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Agency Response

i. The latest version of the budget is uploaded and also re-pasted.

ii. The co-finance committed from the partner, Government of Punjab, are mainly contributions in the form of ongoing projects with similar objectives, in the form of in-kind

contribution. No cash is expected to be received from the Government. The Government co-financing contribution will also be through the project office space to be provided in each project district.

As indicated in the ToR, the Project Coordinator's responsibility will not only be coordination but also providing technical leadership and support for all components. The position will be 100% financed by GEF funds, partly to PMC and partly to the technical components. Salary of the PC will not be paid from the Government funds in cash, even partially.

iii. Project consultant costs have been allocated to their specific outputs.

iv. Audits and spotchecks are usually charged to PMC in other FAO GEF project submissions. Hence, spotchecks are retained under the PMC

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Yes, however, please check Table F. The totals for PPG are missing. Is this something that can be fixed on your end or does it need to be fixed by IT from the GEF backend?

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The total for the PPG is clearly visible in Table F of the GEF portal.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Clarification requests / comments.

- It is unclear why the area of SLM, which is mentioned under the GEBs in 1.6: "553,069 hectares managed under new district-level sustainable land and resource management plans that include concepts of land degradation neutrality, including the following direct on-the-ground SLM interventions" are not included as a target under sub-indicator 4.3? The project document also notes that "thousands of beneficiaries receive support to apply SLM", so it appears that the district level plans combined with the capacity building and the direct on the ground interventions can be reasonably expected to lead towards an increased area of SLM in production systems?

- If a target under 4.3 is entered, please also do so in the project Logframe and Table B for consistency.

- Please enter start year of accounting and duration for sub-indicator 6.1.

01/14/2022: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- The section explaining targets below the core indicator section states that "The figure of 28,000 hectares is based on the area of grasslands", whereas this figure is derived from CI 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored, not 3.3. Please consider adjusting the reference to "based on the area of agricultural land" in alignment with selected indicators or.

- It would improve the consistency of the presented documents if both Table B and Annex A would make explicit references to the Core and sub-Indicators used, such as "CI 3" or "sub-indicator 3.1" even in instances where they are split across different outputs.

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

-The CI target related to the 28,000 ha of grasslands has been placed under CI 3.1 in the worksheet.

-The CI targets have been referenced in Table B and Annex A.

- The 553,069 hectares mentioned in the GEB section 1.6 is an error and has been corrected. It did not appear in other parts of the document. Consistency has been verified throughout the document for the other core indicators and they are cited in the Logframe and Table B.

- The start date and capitalisation of the sub-indicator 6.1 has also been included in the core indicator table in Table F in Part 1 of the project document.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Not fully.

Please note comments under the core indicators. If there is a target entered for 4.3 SLM, please briefly elaborate on the scaling-up strategy of the project.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Core indicator targets are now consistent throughout the document and in key sections (Table B, Logframe, Workplan, Outputs descriptions)

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Not fully.

In this section, the strategy for scaling up remains vague and no concrete pathways and results are presented. This is an issue that also occurs in other sections of the document and should be better addressed. The original Theory of Change approved at PIF stage builds on those upscaling effects through policy adoption and subsequent implementation of land use plans as a precondition for success. The CEO document should build on this in the description of the relevant sections.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Further details and capacities for scaling up and out have been provided and build on the ToC.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Well received with thanks

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

01/14/2022: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

Risk to achieving project objectives and Project Results Framework tables are off the margins ? please adjust - otherwise, once the documents are posted on the web, the parts off the margins will not be shown.

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The tables have been revised and adjusted to fit within the margin.

Well received with thanks.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

01/14/2022: ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

Kindly note that the M&E Budget (\$144, 115) represents 6.6% of the total project amount. As per guidelines ?Observed M&E budgets during GEF6-7 - i.e. 5% of the GEF-financed portion for projects/programs up to USD 5 million?. Please consider revision in light of comments on the budget.

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The M&E budget has been revised and is within 5% of the GEF funds.

Well received with thanks.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Not fully.

- No response to the German Council Member comment at PIF approval has been provided in Annex B.
- Please insert a the project budget table in Annex E. In order to fit into the portal margin, component figures can be provided as a total.
- Comments on the budget: the 74% of the National Coordinator is currently charged to project components. The title of this position and the ToR need to be revised to reflect that. Please revise the ToR - currently the ToR are for "National PPG coordinator".

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Response to the German Council Member has been included and responses provided in Annex B.
- The project budget has been pasted in Annex E of the portal
- The National Project Coordinator position and ToR have been updated and PPG removed from title, thank you.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Has been provided.

Depending on the discussion on sub-indicator 4.3, this may need to be revised.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

However, Project Results Framework tables are off the margins ? please adjust - otherwise, once the documents are posted on the web, the parts off the margins will not be shown.

02/10/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The tables have been revised and adjusted to fit within the margin.

- Please see earlier comments on indicator 4.3, indicator consistency has been achieved.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: PIF stage comments have been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Response to Germany missing.

01/14/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Response to Germany is now included.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: Yes. Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

Well received with thanks.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/20/2021: Has been provided in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/20/2021: Has been provided in Annex D.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/20/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

01/14/2021: No. Please address outstanding comments and additional requests.

02/10/2022: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/14/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/10/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project has the objective to conserve and restore critically important rangelands and livestock production systems and strengthen the resilience and sustainability of rangeland-dependent communities in dryland area. The project will increase the government's capacity to assess and plan for effective rangeland management and assist communities to engage in sustainable livestock management to reduce land degradation. It will strengthen provincial and district policies, institutional capacities, and data resources for decision support, resulting in provincial and district sustainable land and resource management plans to conserve and restored grassland and shrub forest ecosystems and improved livelihoods opportunities based on livestock raising. Broad stakeholder participation in mechanisms for cross-sectoral collaboration and agreements among livestock grazers and landowners on community-level rangeland and livestock management plans is part of the innovative project design. The project will restore 28,000 ha of grass and shrublands with native species and bring 3,000 ha of rangelands under sustainable management, which will result in carbon sequestration of 157,000 tCO₂eq. About 20,000 local people will directly benefit from the project activities.

In response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the project will employ adaptive measures to increase the flexibility of project management. The project will be coordinated with planned and existing Government of Pakistan, FAO, and UN systems programmatic responses to Covid-19, which have been outlined in the CEO endorsement request.