

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

Review PIF 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

9/27/2020

Review completed by PM

10/26/2020

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS IS A PRELIMINARY REVIEW DUE TO MISSING INFORMATION IN THE PORTAL. The sections 1 d, e, f, g are missing.
Please check and complete the portal entries.

- Table A: As the project includes restoration activities and on resilience, please consider alignment with LD-1-3 objective on restoration and LD-1-4 on competing land use and resilience as appropriate.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

The missing sections of the PIF document have been put into the GEF portal

Table A has been revised to indicate that the project is aligned with both LD 1-1 and LD 1-3

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

- The project objective is identical with the project's title. While this is not wrong, it is unusual and will lead to repetition when the project cover note is formulated for GEF Council. Please revise the objective as appropriate. The title must remain as referred to in the OFP endorsement letter. Please add "in" Northern Punjab accordingly.

- The project should be a mix of TA and INV, especially component 2 should be dominated by INV, please clarify.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

- The wording of the title has been corrected to match the OFP endorsement letter.
- The wording of the project objective has been revised to the following: “To conserve and restore critically important rangelands and livestock production systems and strengthen the resilience and sustainability of rangeland-dependent livelihoods in vulnerable dryland regions of northern Pakistan.”
- Component 2 is now categorized as INV.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

The level of co-financing is too low, especially in view of the ambitious targets for restoration and SLM. How can this realistically be achieved with a low co-finance? The government may wish to consider a higher co-financing by the 1 billion tree initiative and/or to explore co-financing opportunities that arise out of COVID-19 support measures and stimulus packages.

10/20/2020: Addressed as per agency response below. However, please also address the following:

- The description field below Table C provides information on the amounts and source for investment mobilized. Please also describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures for the entered amounts.

10/23/2020: Addressed, but only in the review sheet. Please enter the explanation in the portal in the description section under Table C.

10/26/2020: Addressed. Explanation has been entered in the portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to comment made on 10/20/2020

We have considered "recurrent expenditure" of the government to be year to year "normal" expenses such as salaries etc. that has been budgeted and spent over for a long time through its national budgeting process. The two government projects listed are considered investment mobilized as they are special government initiatives funded from Federal and Provincial governments as well as donors, and do not fall within "normal" working budget of the government. The estimated cofinance currently only accounts for anticipated funds for these programmes over the lifetime of the GEF project from federal government and provincial government sources. These will be further verified and detailed during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

· Co-financing for the project has been increased by an additional USD 8.0 million. Additional co-financing through Covid-19 programs cannot yet be confirmed, but such co-financing will be pursued during the PPG phase. Addressed under Table C

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Clarification requested.

- As above mentioned, with the current level of co-financing, the targets appear too ambitious, especially the SLM target.

- Please clarify whether the restoration is all under sub-indicator 3.3., which is shrublands and native grassland. Further, the restoration activities and measures need to be further elaborated in the PIF. Please confirm that native grass or shrublands will not be converted.

10/20/2020: Above points were addressed. However, an additional inconsistency has been found that needs to be addressed:

- Please use sub-indicator 6.1. (currently 6.2) for the targets in carbon sequestration, as the carbon benefits are created in the context of AFOLU.

10/23/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Response to comment made on 10/20/2020

This has been corrected and data entered for sub-indicator 6.1 and removed from 6.2

Agency Response

- SLM Target: The indicator “533,069 ha managed under new Provincial (1) and district (3) sustainable land and resource management plans that include concepts of land degradation neutrality” under Component 1 has been revised to “New Provincial (1) and district (3) sustainable land and resource management plans include concepts of land degradation neutrality”. In addition, the indicator “At least 6 community rangeland and livestock management plans that mainstream land degradation neutrality principles” has been revised to “6 community rangeland and livestock management plans covering 3,000 ha mainstream land degradation neutrality principles”. These changes have been made to reflect the fact that the primary focus of the on-the-ground management planning will be in the six target communities, and therefore these communities represent a more accurate estimate of the area in which effective management plans will contribute to SLM outcomes
- Type of Restoration: The restoration activities will include both shrublands and native grassland (sub-indicator 3.3) and forest and forest land (sub-indicator 3.2); with approximately 70% of the restoration taking place on shrublands and native grassland and 30% on forest and forest land. The PIF (Table F and Annex B) has been updated to reflect this.
- Details on Restoration Activities: Additional text has been added under Output 2.2 that further elaborates the restoration activities, partners, etc.
- Native vs. non-Native: The PIF has been revised (under Core Indicators and in Output 2.2) to clarify that no native grass or shrubland areas will be converted, and that all grasses/shrubs planted by the project will be native species.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

Indigenous peoples may be missing, please check.

10/20/2020: Addressed as per agency response below.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

FAO has confirmed that there are no indigenous peoples within the project intervention area.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

Due to missing information as mentioned above, the description is not fully coherent in terms of a consistent rationale for the project and how all elements fall into place to address the root causes and barriers and how this links to the national LDN agenda. While many elements have been described, what should be improved is the linkage with the rationale and theory of Change for the project.

Please consider to consult the LDN checklist (in UNCCD and GEF websites) to designing the project in a more coherent way in view of LDN implementation.

10/20/2020: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

Regarding the first point, additional text has been added to more clearly show the linkages between threats, roots causes and barriers on the one hand and the project rationale and Theory of Change on the other hand, as follows:

- Additional contextual information on existing planning, institutional frameworks, and information / data related to land degradation and sustainable land and resource use in Pakistan has been added to the Barriers section
- Text has been added to the Alternative Scenario to clarify that the key policy and planning initiatives supported by the project, including the provincial rangeland management policy (Output 1.1.1), provincial and district sustainable land and resource management plans (Output 1.1.3), and community-level rangeland and livestock management plans, will all include 1) provisions focused on restricting the conversion of rangelands to other uses (e.g. housing, agricultural, forest areas, roads, mines, oil and gas exploration areas), and 2) the adoption of integrated approaches to sustainable food production that link land and water resource conservation, food security, climate resilience, and the sustainable livelihoods of farmers and pastoralists.
- Text has been added to Output 3.1.1 to clarify that the project's awareness raising strategy will include outreach and education for local communities and livestock herders on the impacts of their activities on the rangeland, and the ecological and economic importance of preserving ecosystem services.
- In addition, the project is aligned with and supports the achievement of a number of Pakistan's national LDN targets, and additional details on this alignment have been added in a table in the section on Consistency with National Priorities

Regarding the second point

- Additional text has been added to the PIF regarding support for measuring LDN targets (under Output 1.1.4) and regarding alignment with SDGs (in the Consistency with National Priorities section).
- In addition, the proposed project is aligned with numerous elements of the LDN Checklist, including most notably the following:

A. Features that are fundamental to LDN

Include a monitoring system consistent with national LDN targets and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets, particularly SDG 15.3 and its indicator 15.3.1 on LDN;

B. Features that deliver multiple benefits

Promote land use decisions based on an assessment approach which takes into account, inter alia:

✓ land potential, land condition, resilience;

✓ social, cultural and economic factors and their impacts, including consideration of vulnerable groups and gender;

- ✓ participation of relevant stakeholders representing key land uses and land governance systems in the intervention area/landscape;
- ✓ both short and long term sustainability.
- Identify land-based pathways for improving livelihoods, sustainable food systems and/or inclusive as well as sustainable value chains for current and future generations.

C. Features that promote responsible and inclusive governance

- Define mechanisms for ensuring gender-responsive engagement of key stakeholders in project design and implementation;
- Ensure strong gender equality, inclusiveness, accountability and transparency in land use decisions and planning;

D. Features that promote the scale out and up of what works

- Employ science based and local and indigenous knowledge as well as best practices including sustainable land management that contributes to land-based climate change adaptation and mitigation;

E. Features that enhance (sub)national ownership and capacities

- Identify and employ capacity development mechanisms such as public awareness, education and capacity-building campaigns that are aligned with enduring domestic procedures, tailored to the specific needs and social behaviors of both women and men, and existing national strategies and programmes;

F. Features that leverage innovative finance (especially private sector)

- Foster activities that incentivise income generation and job creation for the communities in the project intervention areas;

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

The baseline scenario is missing, only baseline projects have been described.

For the scenario, please describe on what the proposed project will build upon. Please also include COVID-19 considerations (risks and opportunities). Consult the GEF guidance: : <https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>.

For the baseline projects, please add the Restoration Initiative (TRI) project that FAO is implementing under this program and elaborate on potential linkages.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

- Baseline Scenario: Significant additional text has been added to the Baseline Scenario and Baseline Projects.
- Covid-19: Analysis of Covid-19 risks is included in the risk section of the PIF. Regarding opportunities, Output 2.2.6 describes some ideas on how the project will support initiatives to enable local communities to mitigate Covid impacts and build back better in response to Covid impacts, and additional text has been added under the baseline to explain how the project will build on / collaborate with various government and donor-funded programs that are addressing the Covid 19 pandemic.
- TRI project: Text describing the TRI child project in Pakistan and linkages between the two projects has been added to the PIF.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

Because of the missing baseline scenario, the alternative scenario 'hangs a bit in the air'. Please address this in line with comments above.

The theory of change should be concisely and briefly explained so that the main thrust of the project is clear to the reader without looking at the ToC graphic. The uploaded ToC is appreciated, however, it is presented more like a project logframe, which does not fully make the pathways and sequences for change clear, this can be therefore done here in the text.

Since Theory of Change is referred to as Annex D, please rename the uploaded document as "Annex D: Theory of Change". Please use "public" category so that STAP reviewers can have access to the document.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

- Alternative Scenario: As noted under the Baseline above, additional text has been added to the Alternative Scenario in the PIF to show the linkages between the baseline and alternative scenario.
- Theory of Change: A paragraph explaining / summarizing the ToC has been added at the beginning of the Alternative Scenario section of the PIF. The TOC diagramme has been uploaded in document section of the project.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Information missing in the portal.

10/20/2020: Missing information has been provided and considered adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response This has been added.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Information missing in the portal.

10/20/2020: Missing information has been provided and considered adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response This has been uploaded.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Information missing in the portal.

Please also include adaptation benefits since Rio Marker "1" is selected for Climate Change Adaptation.

10/20/2020: Missing information has been provided and considered adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response

Adaptation benefits are also included.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Information missing in the portal.

10/20/2020: Missing information has been provided and considered adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response Uploaded on the portal.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

- Please elaborate briefly on how the key stakeholders have been engaged at this point.
- In the table, it is unusual that the Implementing Agency lists itself as a stakeholder. Please remove.
- Tribal councils are mentioned in the risk section. Please clarify if they are a stakeholder in the project.
- Is there more concrete information on private sector stakeholders available at this stage?

10/20/2020: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

- Stakeholder Engagement during PIF preparation: Additional text on stakeholder engagement has been added in the Stakeholders section of the PIF.

- IA as stakeholder: Reference to FAO has been removed from the stakeholder table
- Tribal Councils: The reference to tribal councils has been removed, and replaced with reference to local Panchats (groups of elders with responsibility at the village level to approve local programs/activities)
- Private Sector Stakeholders: There is no additional information available at this time on private sector stakeholders for the project, but the stakeholder analysis and engagement plan conducted during the PPG phase will include a full assessment of the potential role of private sectors partners in the project.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

The gender information has a good level of detail, however, the section is difficult to read as it refers to Pashtun and Balochi women and it is not clear how this links to the project areas (3 districts, where are the different groups located?). The section should also make reference to the beneficiaries and explain why 80,000 men and only 20,000 women will benefit, and what, exactly, the project will do to improve that. What are the project specific opportunities in this regard?

Gender mainstreaming is later mentioned as a risk, please build this into this section in the assessment of the importance and need to promote gender equality.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

However, the project proponents are reminded to provide a more detailed gender analysis at CEO endorsement stage, which is required as part of our Policy that states: " At or prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies provide: (a) Gender Analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment that identifies and describes any gender differences, gender differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to address Gender Gaps and promote the Empowerment of Women that may be relevant to the proposed activity".

Cleared

Agency Response

Responses to comments made on 10/20/2020:

We confirm that gender analysis will be undertaken at PPG phase and presented with the CEO endorsement package.

Agency Response

- Tribal Groups: Reference to specific tribal groups has been removed as it is better not to generalize too much about any given group.
- Beneficiaries: The core indicator targets have been revised to make reference to 20,000 overall beneficiaries, of which 10,000 will be women and 10,000 will be men, and additional details on the project's contributions to the core indicator have been added.
- Gender Mainstreaming: Text has been added to the PIF on this issue

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

The linkages to the private sector are described in general terms. In the outputs, private sector engagement it only occurs in output 2.2.5. Please elaborate as appropriate at this stage and/or outline how the private sector opportunities will be pursued during PPG.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

Additional text has been added describing private sector engagement under Output 2.2.6 and in the section on private sector engagement. Further details on private sector engagement will be developed during the PPG phase.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Clarification requested.

The Risk "Improvement of rangeland status and livestock health incentivizes communities to increase number of livestock – thereby leading to more land degradation in future" needs to be reformulated. As presented here and also elsewhere in the PIF, the reader gains the impression that a successful project implementation may lead to this negative effect and therefore may be not well-designed. It is suggested to discuss this as a potential trade-off, but to make clear that it doesn't constitute a risk to achieving the project objective as such.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

The risk noted above has been removed from the risk table.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

- On the mentioning of FAO providing execution support: As the agency is well aware of, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate as per GEF policy and guidelines. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis, based on country requests (and per example template as posted on the GEF website). We strongly encourage the project proponents to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for project execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses or encourages any alternative execution arrangement.

- On other projects to coordinate with: Please include the GEF-6 FAO TRI child project.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

10/26/2020: After careful consideration, the linkage to the Restoration Initiative (TRI) project that FAO is implementing is not considered relevant / practical in the context of this proposed project. The agency is requested to remove the paragraph describing the TRI child project.

10/26/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to comment made on 10/26/2020: TRI project has been removed from coordination section of the PIF, as requested.

Agency Response

· Text regarding the institutional arrangements has been revised per the comment above.
Coordination with TRI has been added in the PIF

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

As this is a LD focal area funded project, it should foremost support the UNCCD agenda, be fully and clearly aligned with the UNCCD NAP and national LDN targets. This needs to be in the front of the description in this section. It should also be clear in as much the project will contribute to national LDN targets.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

The project's alignment with the UNCCD NAP and national LDN targets has been moved to the top of this section, and additional details on this have been added.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Not fully.

- It is not necessary to mention how the FAO agency staff is funded. "GEF fees" may lead to misunderstandings.

- Please elaborate on the strategic value that the the knowledge created in this project will have and who can benefit from it in the context of UNCCD implementation, rangeland management, restoration, gender, etc.

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response

- Regarding the first point, mention of GEF fees has been removed.
- Additional text elaborating the project's knowledge management approach has been added to the PIF document.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Clarification requested.

While a certificate is uploaded that shows the overall risk category as "low" - there is no information in this certificate other than the overall risk. Is this intended in this way or are pages missing?

10/20/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Preliminary environmental and social safeguards assessment at PIF stage is now uploaded.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/01/2020: No. Please complete portal entries and address preliminary comments made on the available information submitted.

10/20/2020: No. Two remaining issues to be addressed on core indicators and co-financing (see comments under I.3 and I.6).

10/23/2020: No. One issue remaining on co-financing.

10/26/2020: Program Manager has one additional comment in box on coordination, please address. Afterwards, CEO clearance can be recommended.

10/26/2020: Yes. Program Manager recommends project for CEO clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2020:

Project proponents are reminded to provide a more detailed gender analysis at CEO endorsement stage, which is required as part of our Policy that states: “ At or prior to CEO Endorsement/ Approval, Agencies provide: (a) Gender Analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment that identifies and describes any gender

differences, gender differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to address Gender Gaps and promote the Empowerment of Women that may be relevant to the proposed activity”.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/1/2020	10/20/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2020	10/23/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/23/2020	10/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/26/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/26/2020	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The FAO/GEF project GEF ID 10693 “Combating land degradation through integrated and sustainable range and livestock management to promote resilient livelihoods in Northern Punjab” in Pakistan 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 3,000 ha of grass and shrublands with native species and bring

28,000 ha of rangelands under sustainable management, which will result in carbon sequestration of 157,000 t of CO₂e. About 20,000 local men and women will directly benefit from the project activities.