



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5165		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	NAP Alignment and Strengthening National Reporting Processes		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5142 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$135,000
Co-financing:	\$230,000	Total Project Cost:	\$365,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	Yes. Letter dated 29 Aug 2012.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	
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
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes.
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes, LD Enabling Activity.

Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	LD-4
	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, with NAP.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. Sustainability is being addressed within the institutional framework.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Yes. Refer to para 12 of document.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. Refer to para 15 - 16 of document.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Refer to para 17 of document.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, <10%.
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, appropriate for EA.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes, appropriate for EA.

	bringing to the project in line with its role?*	
Agency Responses	19. 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	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	28 Sep 2012 UA: Yes. Program manager recommends the project for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	September 28, 2012
	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.**