



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9331		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Pakistan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5734 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 3; LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$80,000	Project Grant:	\$2,659,726
Co-financing:	\$3,025,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,684,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	The proposed project is aligned with the GEF-6 strategic objectives approved for the GEF SGP, particularly with the following: (a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation and (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology and (c) Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits. In addition, the proposed project is aligned with BD-4 Program 9, CCM-2 Program 3 and LD-2 Program 3. The project is also	The PIF has been further revised to reflect the following: 1) The SGP executing partners will receive 90% of the overall GEF allocation earmarked for Climate Change to directly implement energy efficiency actions through small grants to be approved in accordance with SGP procedures. Given SGP's demand-driven approach it is not possible to determine with accuracy at this stage how many

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>consistent with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and in particular: Targets 5, 7 and 18.</p> <p>However, "The CCM proposed activities, to strengthen and expand business models for small scale energy efficient cook-stoves and house-hold renewable systems, proposed to use about \$1.5 million of CCM funding. Alternatively, this could be an MSP on its own, with a substantial executing agency partner, an action plan for engaging communities and the private sector, and attracting about \$6-\$10 million of co-financing. Therefore, please give a stronger rationale in the SGP PIF for how the proposed \$1.5 million could be effectively implemented as compared to a stand-alone MSP. The PIF needs a much stronger justification for why UNDP SGP is the right partner to implement this".</p> <p>Please revise and send justification.</p> <p>12/14/2015</p> <p>The revised PIF addresses the comments to some extent. However, please explain further the following:</p>	<p>projects the National Steering Committee will approve.</p> <p>2) There will be no duplication between the PPG and the implementation phase. The PPG consists of a broad scoping exercise that will help identify the viability and prospects of adoption of the technologies and prototypes developed and tested during OP-5 in specific contexts and potential locations/communities where no prior SGP experience exists. This exploration under the PPG will involve obtaining feedback from communities and will cater to their specific requirements on a region-by-region basis.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1 on the other hand will enable SGP to understand the experience and effects of SGP EE interventions on an ongoing basis as a necessary input for possible further technological improvements, upscaling requirements and policy change.</p> <p>3) The market assessment work is done at different levels: market assessment of individual EE technologies is carried out by the SGP Secretariat and National Steering Committee members with support from SGP champion individual subject specialists on voluntary basis.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>1) How much will be invested in the actual energy efficiency projects? That is, how much will the executing partners will receive to implement the actions?</p> <p>-</p> <p>2) We want to make sure that there's no duplication in terms of preparation actions. For example: How does the following component for analysis and planning, which could best be described as project development, differ from what the PPG will do? .</p> <p>2.1.1 Detailed analysis of successful grant project portfolios and lines of work from previous phases (e.g. fuel efficient stoves, efficient kilns and energy efficient housing) to identify lessons learned/best practice, market opportunities, and feasibility, and upscaling requirements</p> <p>3) If the money goes out as grants to the CSOs and CBOs, who does the market assessment? Who undertakes the upscaling and national level actions?</p> <p>4) How can a number of \$50,000 (or less) grants will achieve the impact of upscaling? This seems like a major effort to be attained beyond the individual small grants.</p>	<p>Market assessments required by CSOs/CBOs grant proposals with market-based components will be the responsibility of the project proponent at the proposal submission stage and refined upon review by the SGP Secretariat and NSC.</p> <p>The upscaling and national level actions are primarily the responsibility of the Ministry of Climate Change, SGP Secretariat and the NSC. A recent example of this is the upscaling initiative carried out by the MoCC's recommendation to the Punjab government to adopt the SGP's energy efficient brick kilns model.</p> <p>4) Based on earlier SGP experience in Pakistan and elsewhere, there is evidence that individual small grants lead to demonstrable impact generating interest at various levels for upscaling to take place. This is illustrated by the impact created under OP-5 where three provincial governments and other entities showed interest in upscaling SGP introduced products and technologies (EE housing, brick kilns and cook-stoves) for which technical manuals were developed and distributed to the interested parties by SGP.</p> <p>5) In addition to the risk analysis that</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>5) Experience with other cook-stove projects has indicated that in many cases, when they are given out to the communities for free, after a few years, the cook-stoves are abandoned and neglected. How will the project address this risk?</p> <p>01/13/2016</p> <p>Explanations provided.</p> <p>Cleared 02/02/2016</p>	<p>will be conducted under the PPG, SGP believes that the risk to the adoption and sustainability of the cook-stoves is negligible on the following grounds:</p> <p>(i) The introduction of nonperishable, portable, detachable and flexible metallic stoves which are more resilient and convenient as compared with the traditional mudstoves;</p> <p>(ii) Because of vanishing forest cover, the fuel-wood cost in Pakistan ranges between USD 4-7 per 10 KG which is very high and thus an ordinary house has a strong incentive to take care of its fuel-efficient stove.</p>
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>To some extent. The proposed project is consistent with the "Vision 2030" elaborated by the Pakistan Planning Commission in 2007, the National Climate Change Policy (NCCP) in 2012, and the Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Review (CPEIR) finalized by the Ministry of Climate Change (MCC) in 2015.</p> <p>What's the consistency of the project with the NAP and NBSAP?</p> <p>Please review 12/09/2015</p> <p>Provided.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared 01/13/2016	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Cleared 12/09/2015	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	To some extent. FA approaches - While the LD and CCM components/approaches look relevant, there is not much info on the BD approach. The STAR allocation is limited (\$177000) but we still want to see relevant approach and benefits on BD. The site descriptions are also very general and require further information on the baseline. Please review. 12/09/2015 Provided. Cleared 01/13/2016	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	To some extent. A couple of the project outcomes	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	<p>bundle more than 2 or 3 outcomes, making it difficult to understand what the real outcome is. For instance outcome 1.3 reads : "Multistakeholder partnerships develop and implement strategic projects to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems to a tipping point through engagement of potential financial partners, policy makers and their national/subnational advisors and institutions, as well as the private sector." Perhaps this can be divided in two clear outcomes. The other 1.3 (which should be numbered 2.3) reads: "Multistakeholder partnerships develop and implement strategic projects in the Indus Delta and elsewhere to bring adoption of specific successful SGP-supported technologies, practices or systems – particularly in regard to energy efficient stoves, kilns and housing - to a tipping point through engagement of potential financial partners, policy makers and their national/subnational advisors and institutions, as well as the private sector." Perhaps this can be divided in two clear outcomes.</p> <p>Regarding GEBs: Table F is empty so it's not clear what the project's impact will be. The text in the PIF is also a</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>bit general and vague. Please work on clarifying what the BD, LD, CCM benefits are</p> <p>Please review</p> <p>12/09/2015</p> <p>Explanation provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>01/13/2016</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>To some extent.</p> <p>There is no mention of gender nor IPs in the project framework. Considering SGP's strong relevance and focus on these elements, it would be expected that relevant approaches are integrated in the outcome/output of the project framework. The text in the relevant sections is also weak. A detail gender analysis should be provided during PPG, to produce a solid plan/approach on how women in particular could be an active partner on all levels of project implementation and monitoring. Relevant IPs also need to be identified and build on their traditional knowledge, particularly for natural resources and land management.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Please review. 12/09/2015 Provided. Cleared 01/13/2016	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	Yes. A total (inclusive of fees) of \$2,912,400 from Pakistan's STAR allocation as follows: \$194,160 from BD \$1,747,440 from CC \$970,800 from LD Cleared 12/09/2015	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	N/A	
	<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	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not at this stage. Please address the points above. 12/10/2015	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Not at this stage. Please address the points above. 01/13/2016 The PIF is being recommended	
Review Date	Review	December 08, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 13, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 05, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		