



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4754		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management Programme to Combat Desertification in Pakistan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4593 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-2; LD-2; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,791,000
Co-financing:	\$22,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$25,991,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Letter dated 11-24-2011, signed by Mohammad Javed Malik.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. UNDP has extensive experience in providing assistance to Pakistan and was the IA in the first phase of this project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Linked with UNDP Pakistan's Country Programme Action Plan and UNDP has an established and fully staffed Country Office.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

Resource Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. 100% of Pakistans LD STAR will be used.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Refer to comment above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Well aligned with LDFA framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12-05-2011 UA: LD-2, LD-3	
	9. 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?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Through institutionalizing training programmes and decision -support systems.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. The baseline consists of five programmes / projects. The proposed project also builds on the SLM Pilot Phase project funded by GEF.	

Project Design			
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied. Agreed global environmental benefits will be delivered.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. By CEO endorsement stage, please provide further details on how the community financed local SLM funds will operate.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. However, please make sure that the establishment of baselines will be taken care of during the design phase - even without PPG funding - and also incorporates requirements of the LDFA tracking tool.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Adequate at PIF stage. Please provide further information on the mentioned gender inclusion strategy at CEO endorsement stage.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Adequate at PIF stage. Please outline the involvement of CSOs in more detail at CEO endorsement stage.	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	12-05-2011 UA: Yes, adequate.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. The project is well co-ordinated with ongoing initiatives, in particular with GEF initiatives in the country and region.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes, indicative at 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. Considered appropriate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	12-05-2011 UA: Indicative co-financing is solid and mostly grant resources.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. UNDP contributes \$1.5 million in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		

	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12-05-2011 UA: Yes. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance for WP inclusion.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	12-05-2011 UA: Please refer to comments in the review sheet for items to consider at CEO endorsement stage.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 05, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.