



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

GEF ID:	9231		
Country/Region:	Pakistan		
Project Title:	Pakistan Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program (Resubmission)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5716 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-1; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,644,521
Co-financing:	\$12,951,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,745,521
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tsehering

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	Yes, the project's alignment with BD1, LD3, SFM1 and 3 are well recognized. Linkage to the relevant Aichi Targets are also recognized.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	No. While information on the NBSAP and GSLEP are provided, no information has been provided on the consistency with the National Action Plans related to UNFCCC and UNCCD. Please provide appropriate information.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	Not sufficient. Drivers are adequately	

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
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	informed, however, institutional and financial sustainability issues are not addressed. In particular, please clarify how the financial sustainability issue will be addressed through the project in order to enable long term engagement at the landscape level. On the upscaling, it is not very clear how this will be done. Please clarify and incorporate these elements in the project framework with concrete outputs and outcomes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>While the importance of snow leopard conservation is well recognized, the project takes an overly species centric approach. Referring and learning from other related GEF projects on snow leopard, including projects in India, Krygystan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan, please review and redesign the project to take an ecosystem based approach with a focus on landscape conservation and sustainable use by having snow leopard and other species as indicator species.</p> <p>The project seeks substantial SFM incentive financing while the forest in the targeted landscape is rather limited. Is it correct to understand</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that the total targeted forest coverage is 8000ha? It seems most of the project activities are focused on activities related to SLM in drylands. Please clarify and review the relevance of the SFM amount.</p> <p>Baseline projects/initiatives are sufficiently explained on BD and LD related issues. The Mountain and Market Project which is financed by the GEF can not be included as baseline. Baseline information related to SFM is very limited. Please clarify and provide necessary information.</p> <p>On table F, the BD coverage is only identified as 20000ha for the protected areas. This should cover the entire landscape (also outside of PAs). Please revise.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>GEBs: No. The GEBs only explains about the biodiversity benefit. Please clarify SFM benefits, including CC, LD, and BD elements.</p> <p>Project Framework: The project framework is sufficiently clear, however as noted above, the proposal should be reviewed and revised to take an ecosystem based approach. Project objective and relevant approach should be reviewed</p>	<p>Please clarify the below issue by CEO endorsement: The carbon figures seem low for a targeted project area of 4 million ha under better planned SFM and SLM management. Please review the figure by using appropriate tools (e.g. FAO Ex-ACT carbon tool) and provide updated figure by CEO endorsement.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and revised substantially. Component 3 relates to sustainable community development. Considering substantial local benefits, this component should be largely financed through cofinance. In particular, while recognizing the relationship and importance of vaccination, this initiative should be largely financed by cofinance. Please review and reduce the GEF amount for this component.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Gender - while substantial information has been provided, please make sure to note that gender analysis will be conducted during PPG, and gender responsive project framework will be developed by CEO endorsement. IPs - Considering involvement of indigenous peoples, please make sure to develop a relevant indigenous peoples plan by CEO endorsement.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes, BD, LD, and SFM are all within the STAR allocation.	
	• The focal area allocation?	refer above.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or	n/a	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>No, please refer above comments. Please revise the PIF accordingly and resubmit.</p> <p>15 Sept 2015 Yes, the PIF has been revised and adequately responds to earlier comments. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p> <p>27 April 2016 Germany has provided important comments during the review of April 2016 Intersessional Work Program, including issues on cofinance, multi-stakeholder approach, alternative economic activity, information system, linkage with NBSAP and RBSAP, and STAP review. Adequate response and revision to the PIF have been made by UNDP and the country proponents. The PM recommends the revised PIF for CEO clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 15, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 27, 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?		
	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		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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	Please make sure that the project address the STAP comments during project preparation, and reflected in the project document at CEO endorsement.	
	• GEF Council	Please further address the Germany council member's comments during project preparation, and reflect in the project document by CEO endorsement.	
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.