



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

GEF ID:	5660		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	Sustainable Forest Management to Secure Multiple Benefits in High Conservation Value Forests		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4674 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	SFM/REDD+-1; BD-2; CCM-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,338,000
Co-financing:	\$26,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$35,038,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated Dec 17, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	n/a	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes for SFM/REDD+ incentive mechanism.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>06 Jan 2014 UA: Not fully. Please elaborate to which Aichi targets the project contributes and how it is planning to track progress towards those targets.</p> <p>CCM Please describe the distribution of forests in the country, along with deforestation rates in different regions to support the choice of the Western Himalayan region for the project (from climate change mitigation perspective).</p> <p>01/17/2014 UA: NR comments have been addressed in the revised PIF. Cleared.</p> <p>CCM JS Provided explanation is adequate to support the choice of Western Himalayan region for the project .</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.</p> <p>CCM Please describe how the project aligns with Pakistan's National Communication and Low Carbon Development strategy.</p> <p>1/21/2014 CCM JS</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Importance of sustainable forest management as stated in the country's national communication and the National Climate Change Strategy has been provided.	
Project Design	6. 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?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes. CCM By CEO Endorsement Request, a) please identify the gaps (actions and funding) in the baseline REDD+ strategy project b) provide details on the concrete actions the proposed project plans to undertake to fill such gaps, c) steps on how the project will involve forest managers and how it will set up mechanisms to develop reliability of REDD companies.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	06 Jan 2014 CCM: No. In component 1: a) please explain briefly what the ecosystem services valuation would include (for example economic valuation), depending on the extent of valuation, such exercise could be highly costly. b) Please explain the need for full valuation if such method is taken. c) please include identification of high carbon forests to aid selection of target project sites. d) as an output, please include a preliminary (for PIF stage) comparative analysis of the direct benefits stakeholders will obtain from (i) currently ongoing or potential unsustainable practices, and (ii) project proposed	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sustainable practices. Such analysis will help demonstrate that the latter can be sustained beyond project completion.</p> <p>For component 2 and 3:</p> <p>a) please explain what steps the project will take to develop and implement forest management practices that will adequately address the demand for timber and fuel wood, which are cited as the main causes of forest degradation.</p> <p>b) please identify where such demand for timber and fuel wood originate from.</p> <p>c) please provide information on legal status of the forest lands in the project area and the extent of the land that is under illegal possession of feudal lords. In such cases, please explain how the project will implement its intended project activities.</p> <p>e) in order to support sustainability of the project, please include or identify a project outcome and output that will enable project activities to continue after the end of the proposed project.</p> <p>1/21/2013 CCM JS Clarifications and explanations provided are sufficient.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement Request, please ensure that ecosystem services valuation done for carbon is aligned with REDD+ methodologies and that potential markets are determined. GEFSec expects and looks forward to the detailed analysis of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>direct benefits to stakeholders as a support for project sustainability. Similarly details on and monitoring scheme for practical demonstration of participatory and integrated approaches on SFM is also expected by CEO Endorsement. GEFSec appreciates the agency's understanding of the complexities in land tenureship/ownership in the country and looks forward to the results from PPG studies on the topic.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>CCM By CEO endorsement request stage please quantify the deforestation and degradation threat to the existing forests at the project sites and quantify the amount of carbon the project will be protecting. As currently presented, the method of CO2e emissions avoided assumes that the entire project area is under threat. Please follow one of the existing standard and comprehensive methodologies for estimations of carbon benefits.</p>	
	<p>9. 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?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes. Refer to PIF page 12 for details.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes. UNDP is contributing \$1 million in grant resources.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	06 Jan 2014 UA: Yes. Within thresholds.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>06 Jan 2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests.</p> <p>17 Jan 2014 UA & CCM JS Yes. The agency has provided satisfactory responses to the GEFSec's questions. The PIF is technically cleared and may be included into an upcoming Work Program. Please note the items to be presented at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1) Co-financing arrangements to be confirmed and level of co-financing to be at least as indicated in the PIF.</p> <p>2) By CEO endorsement request stage please quantify the deforestation and degradation threat to the existing forests at the project sites and quantify the amount of carbon the project will be protecting. As currently presented, the method of CO2e emissions avoided</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>assumes that the entire project area is under threat. Please follow one of the existing standard and comprehensive methodologies for estimations of carbon benefits.</p> <p>3) By CEO Endorsement Request, a) please identify the gaps (actions and funding) in the baseline REDD+ strategy project b) provide details on the concrete actions the proposed project plans to undertake to fill such gaps, c) steps on how the project will involve forest managers and how it will set up mechanisms to develop reliability of REDD companies.</p> <p>4) By CEO Endorsement Request, please ensure that ecosystem services valuation done for carbon is aligned with REDD+ methodologies and that potential markets are determined.</p> <p>5) GEFSec expects and looks forward to the detailed analysis of direct benefits to stakeholders as a support for project sustainability. Similarly details on and monitoring scheme for practical demonstration of participatory and integrated approaches on SFM is also expected by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>6) GEFSec appreciates the agency's understanding of the complexities in land tenure/ownership in the country and looks forward to the results from PPG studies on the topic.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 06, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2014	
	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.**