



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5607		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	Support for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$220,000
Co-financing:	\$245,000	Total Project Cost:	\$465,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Esther Mwangi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Pakistan has ratified the CBD and is eligible for GEF BD funding.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	The OFP has endorsed the project. It was endorsed on Sept. 18 2013 by M. Siddiq.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes, UNEP's comparative advantage on the EAs are recognized.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	Yes. The project will be managed remotely from Nairobi with close supervision.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a. EA is financed by FA set aside.
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes. The budget for the project (\$220,000) is within the benchmark for NBSAP enabling activities.
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes. It is well aligned with BD 5.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes. Please see above.
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, NBSAP is a key national strategic document on biodiversity.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>While the project has good information about arrangements for sustainability, and on the type of capacities to be built through the project. However, it is unclear "how" capacities will be developed through this project (see comment below for further clarification). Please clarify further.</p> <p>1/27/14</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project components and activities are well in line with the GEF guideline and CBD requirements. This proposal identifies some of the gaps in the previous NBSAP (gender, biodiversity mainstreaming, etc.), however, it is unclear how this project will ensure that those areas are better included this time. The proposal only note assurance that they will be. Please clarify how (i.e. method and/or tool) to ensure that these elements will be adequately reflected through the revision.</p> <p>Particularly, please further clarify how biodiversity mainstreaming will be realized (page 24). It is not clear "how" integration of biodiversity in key sectoral plans is going to happen. Please clarify.</p> <p>1/27/14</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the clarifications.</p>
11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>General information has been provided, however lacks country specific context. Please provide further relevant information.</p> <p>1/27/14</p>	

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Yes.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>General information has been provided, however lacks country specific context. Please further clarify how the indigenous peoples or marginalized groups and NGOs would relate to the activity in Pakistan.</p> <p>1/27/14</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the information.</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes. Clear attention has been paid to previous GEF projects as well as the work done by other relevant groups, such as WWF-Pakistan. However, other than the CHM, none of the websites listed in the table work. Please update the table.</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>The NBSAP revision project will be housed under the Climate Change Division, which is also the national focal point in implementing the CBD. While the key element of the revision includes mainstreaming biodiversity in key sectors, it is not clear how the institutional arrangement of the project will involve other key sectors. Please clarify.</p> <p>1/27/14</p> <p>Yes.</p>
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	<p>We note that while this is a 2.5 year project, the project staff are only being hired for 72 weeks. Please clarify the amount of time they will be spending on the project.</p> <p>1/27/14</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. It is aligned with the norm.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, it is in line with the benchmark budget.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes, the government has identified \$245,000 of in-kind cofinancing.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	We note that there is no cofinancing from UNEP.
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	No, please address the comments provided above and resubmit the revised proposal. 1/27/14 Yes. The revisions greatly improved the document.
Review Date (s)	First review**	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

**** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**