



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4380 | | |
| Country/Region: | Pakistan | | |
| Project Title: | 5 th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Pakistan | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4514 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Multi Focal Area |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; BD-2; CCM-2; CCM-5; CCM-3; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana; IW-1; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$3,055,555 |
| Co-financing: | \$3,565,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$6,620,555 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | March 01, 2011 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Danielius Pivoriunas | Agency Contact Person: | Doley Tshering |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | Pakistan is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | 2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | N/A | |
| | 3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes, endorsed. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | UNDP has been responsible for implementing the SGP in Pakistan for the past 17 years, and has helped develop an efficient and effective approach for the SGP with partners at the national level. The implementation approach proposed for this FSP directly builds on the many years of experience working with UNDP to implement the SGP. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | 5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | Yes. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | 6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | No information provided. Please also provide on proposed implementation arrangements. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/02/2011 | |
| Resource Availability | 7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | Yes, available. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | LH 09-27-10: Yes for CC, about 17% of the total CC allocation. YW - Yes for BD. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access? | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | N/A | |
| Project Consistency | 8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework? | LH 09-27-10: The CC part of the project refers to the focal area objectives CC-1, CC-2, and CC-5. The technologies listed as CC1: solar, fuel efficient stoves, and increased bio-composting cannot be considered innovative but are proven and available. These are better aligned with CC3. Note that the low carbon housing and EE material listed under CC-2 could be considered innovative if other necessary elements were present. (Other necessary elements include establishment of mechanisms for technology transfer, the purchase of technology licenses, or identification of the technology source. CC-5 is a very suitable choice especially if coupled with reduced pressure for firewood created by project efforts currently listed under CC-1. YW - alignment with the BD1 and BD2 RBM are recognized, however, the linkage with BD2 is rather weak considering the BD strategy is focused on | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>mainstreaming in policy/legislation and market system. Please further elaborate the linkage and revise the project activities as necessary. Since it is multifocal project please consider including objectives of capacity development where appropriate. 10/01/2010</p> <p>CC/LH: Jan 31 2011. The correct climate change objectives are now listed, however, adding the rows of CD to Table A due to a comment in question 9 have ending up creating a new problem. See question 9. Also, in paragraph 2, CCM-1&2 is the old text and needs to be revised for endorsement.</p> <p>BD/IZ: Feb 03, 2011: The alignment with the BD 2 was strengthened. Further details should be provided on IW projects to be funded during project endorsement phase. Cleared. 02/09/2011 Changes provided in revised PIF. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p> | <p>LH 09-27-10: see comment 8. YW - refer the same above. Capacity development priorities should be identified in table A. 10/01/2010 LH Jan 31 2011: The capacity development rows in Table A should now include some of the items that were originally included in the other rows so that the funding in the other rows should be reduced. Also see Project Financing section (Questions 27-30) Please provide this information at the endorsement stage. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?</p> | <p>LH 09-27-10: According to an official country press release dated July 28, 2010, (pid.gov.pk) the Ministry of the Environment is developing a National Climate Change Policy and National Adaptation and Mitigation Action Plan. It would be useful to see those documents</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>to see if this proposal is consistent.</p> <p>YW - Linkage with the NBSAP and other key strategy and plan are missing. Please provide further information. 10/01/2010</p> <p>LH: Jan 31 2011. Section A.2 was added to address this comment. The response to comments by GEF SEC document for 10 acknowledges that the announcement was a press release to say the activities were underway. This information (about the NAMA and NCCP). Please provide this information during endorsement stage. BD/IZ: Feb 03,2011: The link to the Pakistan NBSAP was clarified. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p> | <p>No information is provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 LH/CC: Jan 31 2011. Language in para 31 and 33 describes networking and training. for sustainability of project outcomes. What happens when the stoves or solar energy projects stop working? How will the developed capacities contribute to ongoing maintenance and replacement of these devices or technologies? Please add text to the full project document to clearly articulate answers to these questions during endorsement stage. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <p>CC and BD: No. The project describes the baseline situation in Pakistan in general. Please describe the baseline project for which incremental GEF funding is sought. 10/01/2010 CC: Jan 31 2011. New paragraphs were added that describe the baseline scenario for CC. However, we are interested in the baseline project. The PIF indicates several million in co-financing. One way of looking at the baseline project is to</p> | |

Project Design

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>describe what will be done, or is being done, with this funding that the GEF funding will incrementally building upon. The list of existing GEF projects is a good reference to ensure there is no duplication, however, these should not be used as the base project. Paragraph 25 gives a hint as to what the base project might be. It sounds as co-financing could be used to do some gathering up lessons learned, etc, and then the GEF funding could incrementally make that effort stronger and include deployment and demonstration activities at additional sites. If this is what the co-financing is going to be used for, then modify the PIF accordingly. Additional clarification is requested. 02/02/2011</p> <p>BD/IZ: Feb 03, 2011: In line with the CC comments above the PIF needs to describe the baseline project, not only elaborate on baseline scenario. The description of existing/completed GEF BD FA projects in Pakistan are confusing since they cannot be considered as baseline project(s). Details provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| <p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <p>Additional information is requested to provide relevance of provided information in para 4 and 6. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>Please refer above comment on the linkage with BD2 and revise the outcome as necessary. Yes somewhat, however, it is not clear what framework is proposed for project implementation. Rules of different stakeholders have to be identified. 10/01/2010 CC/LH: Jan 31 2011. With the addition of rows to table A, the project framework is not clear to CC. Unless all the CD funds are coming out of biodiversity (and</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>perhaps they should--more about this in questions 28 and 29), then there is less funding for items already described. How the additional rows in Table A relate to Table B is unclear. Component 3 in Table B indicates that some of the approaches are to produce BD outcomes, however, all the funding listed for this component are CC funds. If BD outputs are the intent, then BD funds should be used.</p> <p>BD/IZ: Feb 03, 2011: The same applies to BD, the project framework is not clear. Resources allocation adjusted, clarification is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p> | <p>YW - please describe the baseline project to determine complementarity and appropriateness. 10/01/2010</p> <p>CC/LH: Jan 31 2011, as indicated in question 12, please better describe the baseline project here not the baseline scenario.</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>CC No. The CC-linked global environmental benefits are stated as estimates (for example--100,000 tons avoided; 10,000 tons avoided) without clearly showing or citing how these have been derived. 10/01/2010 CC: Jan 31 2011. The explanation is clear. Thank you. Cleared 02/02/2011</p> | |
| | <p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> | <p>No information is provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 CC/LH: Jan 31 2011. In terms of cost effectiveness (paragraphs 34-35), from Table A we can calculate from CC5 that \$163/ha is needed (817037/5000ha). For BD, 30,000 ha are being improved, and at \$163/ha that sums to \$4,902,222, which is over twice what is being asked for BD, and BD is also helping 12 other</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>communities etc for the amount of funding being asked for there. How come the cost of the land activities for CC is so much higher than it is for BD?</p> <p>Carbon sequestration is 317037/506,400= \$0.62/tCO₂e. The costs of the stoves seem relatively high per tCO₂e. It would more clearly demonstrate cost-effectiveness of alternatives to look at the many existing related GEF projects mentioned in this revision, and show how the cost per CO₂e in this project compares to their costs. Please provide additional details during endorsement stage.</p> <p>Information is provided. Cleared 02/10/2011</p> | |
| | <p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</p> | <p>Sufficient information provided at this point but it would be important to identify gender disaggregated project indicators before CEO endorsement based on appropriate assessment. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | <p>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</p> | <p>Yes fully considered, however rules of different stakeholders in project execution should be provided. 10/01/2010 Information is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>20. 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)</p> | <p>Yes. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | <p>21. Is the provided documentation consistent?</p> | <p>Yes, consistent. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | <p>22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?</p> | <p>Further clarification is requested. See para 19. 10/01/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | 23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Yes, consistent. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | 24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | No info provided. Please provide 10/01/2010 Information is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011 | |
| | 25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | |
| Project Financing | 27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate? | Yes, appropriate. However, details on how visibility of GEF investments will be ensured during project should be provided. 10/01/2010 CC: Jan 31 2011, Please also consider that project management costs should be shared appropriately between BD and CC, and not borne just by CC. Budget revised to distribute costs equally per focal area. Cleared 02/10/2011 | |
| | 28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle? | Yes, appropriate. However, monitoring costs seems are excessive, please provide clarification. 10/01/2010 CC/Jan 31 2011. Monitoring costs are excessive for CC because CC is being charged for all M&E costs, including those for BD. The costs should be shared appropriately. Costs are adjusted accordingly. Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/10/2011 | |
| | 29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed. | Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | 30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | For CC, the budget may be low. More detailed information about what solar energy products are included as well as the type of waste system are needed to | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | respond accurately. 10/01/2010 CC: Jan 31 2011. The details listed in the response to GEF SEC attachment need to be included in the revised PIF. Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/10/2011 | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | Not provided. Please provide 10/01/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011 | |
| | 32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | The relevant CC objectives (CC-3) should be included with additional details about the technologies. Please describe the baseline project for which incremental GEF funding is sought. Also, references or details should be provided on how the expected GEBs have been estimated. Additional information is requested. 10/01/2010 Details provided. Cleared. 02/10/2011 | |
| | 35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | |
| | 37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | October 01, 2010 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | February 10, 2011 | |
| | 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.