



# Community-based Climate-responsive Livelihoods and Forestry (CCLF)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10312

**Countries**

Afghanistan

**Project Name**

Community-based Climate-responsive Livelihoods and Forestry (CCLF)

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

12/7/2021

**Review completed by PM**

6/7/2024

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

**PIF**  
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.10.2022:

Cleared.

04.28.2022

Please provide indicators under 'OBJECTIVE 3 Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaption'. Currently there seems to be no indicator (target) under objective 3.

04.08.2022

Please reflect the explanation about the budget allocation provided in the review sheet, in the CEOER. Also, CCA-3 is strongly associated with Objective 3 and Outcomes 3.1-3.3 of the Indicators. As such please consider and reflect this change in the Indicator section(s) of the CEOER.

12.14.2021

Entry points associated to the CCA-3 include support to NAP process. The CEOER states ?The CCLF project contributes towards some of the priorities identified in the NAP?. As such please consider including CCA-3 and provide further elaboration on how CCLF is going to support NAP process, or justification to not including CCA-3 despite the above sentence. <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-programming-strategy-adaptation-climate-change-ldcf-and-sccf-and>

**Agency Response**

UNDP 05.09.2022

Indicators have been provided for objective 3 in the LDCF Core Indicators sheet (row 154 to 156)

UNDP, 04.21.2022

We have reviewed the budget allocation provided for CCA-3 as per advice provided. It now reflects allocations made towards Objective 3 and Outcomes 3.1 to 3.3. This change is now

reflected in the indicator sections of the CEO-ER: Table A, and section 7, Consistency with National Priorities of the CEO ER and under p. 17 National Adaptation plan of the ProDoc. The text now reads:

?The CCLF project will demonstrate, disseminate and scale up appropriate adaptation technologies among climate vulnerable communities. It will provide support for technology transfer and build capacities of communities who are otherwise unable to access and adopt these technologies. Outcomes under component 3 which seek to transfer climate resilient management practices for forests and woodlands, in particular, will support the NAP process through integration of technologies in sustainable forest management, including mapping and GIS and building geo-databases to facilitate access to spatially explicit information.

The hands on farmer field schools and demonstration sites will additionally provide an enabling environment for participation of local communities, including women in adopting climate resilient farming, livestock raising and horticultural activities. Furthermore, the project will leverage the CDCs to engage with local government extension and research agencies in the demonstrations and outreach to sustain these interventions over longer periods and to wider audiences.?

04.05.2022: CCA-3 is added to both the CEO-ER and the ProDoc. Kindly note that the budget allocations for CCA-1 and CCA-3 are closely integrated and have been presented together. Further elaboration on how the project will support the NAP process is provided in pg.17 of the ProDoc and pg. 78 of CEOER, as below:

*?The CCLF project will demonstrate, disseminate and scale up appropriate adaptation technologies among climate vulnerable communities. It will provide support for technology transfer and build capacities of communities who are otherwise unable to access and adopt these technologies. The hands-on farmer field schools and demonstration sites will provide an enabling environment for participation of local communities, including women in adopting climate-resilient farming, livestock raising and horticultural activities. Furthermore, the project will leverage the CDCs to engage with local government extension and research agencies in the demonstrations and outreach to sustain these interventions over longer periods and to wider audiences.?*

#### **Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response  
**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.07.2024: cleared

06.03.2024:

Please provide details of the use of PPG resources by using the eligible activities included in Guidelines.

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To-date	Amount Committed
Component A: Technical studies	40,000	11,194	28,806
Component B: ProDoc formulation	70,000	19,589	50,411
Component C: Validation Workshop	20,000	5,597	14,403
Component E: Completion of final documentation	20,000	5,597	14,403
<b>Total</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>41,977</b>	<b>108,023</b>

\*As of 19 April 2022

**Agency Response**

• 06.06.2024

•

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To-date	Amount Committed
71200 International Consultants	73104	72,620	7,638
71300 Local Consultants	46440	23,259	8,134
71600 Travel	11356	655	
74200 Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs	3500	588	
<u>75700 Trainings, workshops</u>	15,600	385	
<b>Total</b>	<b>150000</b>	<b>97,507</b>	<b>15,772</b>

**Core indicators**

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05.10.2022:

Cleared.

04.28.2022

- Please refer to comment in Part 1(1) on CCA-3 indicators (Objective 3).

04.08.2022

- Please reflect the explanation provided in the review sheet also in the CEOER.

- Please refer to the comment in Part 1(1) on CCA-3 indicators.

12.14.2021

There seems to be a significant gender imbalance in Core Indicator 4. Please reconsider or provide justification.

## Agency Response

UNDP - 05.09.2022

Targets in Table E of the CEO-ER remain unchanged. We have updated the targets in the LDCF Core Indicator Sheet for Objective 3 (row 154 to 156)

UNDP, 04.21.2022

GEF Core indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares) is 19,559ha. This figure has not changed as it includes the forested areas to be supported by Outcome 3 of the project.

CCA3: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology: This has been addressed in response to comment 1 of part 1 of the review sheet. This is also reflected in the CEO-ER.

Regarding gender imbalance in the LDCF Core indicator 4 (Number of people trained, male/female), we have included the explanation below in the CEO-ER in the section 6 on global environmental benefits as suggested.

04.05.2022: There is a discrepancy in the number of men and women being trained owing to the limited participation of women in local CDCs, government bodies and the cultural constraints within which women operate in businesses and farm work in some of the proposed sites. This is expected, given the context of Afghanistan. The CCLF project will explore all available opportunities to meaningfully involve women in its activities (as detailed in the Gender Analysis and Action Plan ? Annex 11), The existing targets provided in the core indicators are considered ambitious in these circumstances and have been reviewed and vetted by gender experts.

## Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.08.2022

Cleared.

12.14.2021:

Project Site:

While some explanation is provided on selection/change in the project sites at the provincial level, minimal explanation is provided for the district and village levels. Also, CEOER states that the relevance to the project objective (e.g., forest area etc.) and security concerns were among the primary motivations for the change at the provincial level. Please elaborate further on the project relevance and the security situations for the selected provinces/districts/villages. In addition, in the light of local adaptation, if any local contexts are taken into consideration in the project activity/implementation, please also elaborate on them. Further, please discuss the financial implication from the change in the project sites; project sites have reduced from 4 provinces to 2, but there is no reduction in requested grant.

Incubators:

While market analysis and incubators are important, right incentives for them are also essential in light of sustainability. Please elaborate on the possible incentives for incubators.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Agency Response

**04.05.2022:**

**Project Relevance:**

The relevance of the project for the selected sites, in terms of climate case is elaborated in the Feasibility Study (Annex 13, especially section 3 and 4) which provide site specific details on the biophysical and climatic conditions and how the proposed activities will address these challenges.

**If any local contexts are taken into consideration in the project activity/implementation, please also elaborate on them:**

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (specifically annex B), provides details of the engagements with the communities, including women, which were done as part of the PPG process to assess viability of the activities. These, along with Annex 1 of the Feasibility Study (List of Activities prioritized by the stakeholders) provide details of the local contexts which were, indeed, taken into consideration during planning. Additional details on the local conditions, including site surveys and designs are provided in the annex to the Feasibility Study, particularly the Technical Report on Infrastructure.

**Security situation for the selected sites**

The security situation in Afghanistan was in a state of flux during the final stages of submission of this project. All field visits and site identification were completed before the fall of the previous government. The process through which sites were prioritized is captured in the annex to the Feasibility Study titled Criteria Analysis.

There has been an overall improvement in the security situation in Afghanistan under the new de-facto authorities, allowing UN operations to access parts of the country that was inaccessible in the last 15 years<sup>[1]</sup>. This improvement in security has also been seen in this project's target sites - Badakhshan and Kunar provinces. There have been no security incidents in these two provinces in recent months. However, the security situation in the country is uncertain and could depend on future political changes.

**Financial implications for change in project sites**

The total number of beneficiaries and the total area to be restored and managed for climate change adaptation is the same as in the PIF. Therefore there has been no change in the overall budget for the project. There were two key reasons for reducing the number of provinces for the project to two.

1. Focusing on fewer provinces and on sites which were close by greatly reduces the logistic costs of implementing the project. This is particularly relevant given the security concerns. This was also a major recommendation of the mid-term evaluation of a similar GEF initiative ? the CBARD project.

2. Restoration activities using the watershed approach have substantial gains if treated areas are contiguous. These benefits specifically include better recovery ecosystems and consequent improvement in provisioning and regulatory services from ecosystems.

**Possible Incentives for Incubators:**

Kindly refer to Pg. 66 and 67 of the ProDoc and Pg. 51 of the CEO-ER where this has been elaborated. The text now reads as follows:

*?The project will set up "incubators" to facilitate private sector participation and help communities diversify livelihoods and income generation. Entrepreneurs will be identified from within the community and will receive mentorship, provision of start-up capital/materials and linkages with credit and other financial services. The focus of these interventions will be on post-harvest, storage and packaging technologies which will increase resilience to climate change related disasters by reducing post-harvest losses while increasing incomes and food security among farming and pastoral communities. Incentives for incubators include provision of equipment and consumables for the initial (one year) period, linkages with financial services including access to loans and start-up capital through nationally recognized banking and micro-finance institutions and access to cold storage facilities that are proposed in the two provincial headquarters. Mentors who support the livelihoods will be provided small financial incentives by way of consultation fees and DSA.?*

---



---

[1] UN meeting coverage, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2021/sc14706.doc.htm>

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.28.2022

Cleared.

04.08.2022 /12.14.2021:

Please refer to comment in the Focal area elements section.

Agency Response

UNDP, 04.21.2022.

We have elaborated on the Focal area elements section as suggested.

04.05.2022: Further elaboration has been provided under response to Part 1 (7) above.

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.28.2022:

Cleared

04.08.2022

Rio Marker for climate change mitigation should be 1 if there is a target (currently it is indicated as 0).

12.14.2021:

The CEOER states that the project will also contribute to climate change mitigation. If GHGs reduction is expected from the project, please elaborate.

## Agency Response

UNDP, 04.21.2022

The Rio Marker is set at 2 as the project is predominantly aimed at climate change adaptation. The mitigation aspect of the project is limited to just 1,048,171 tCO<sub>2</sub> tCO<sub>2</sub>e based on the Ex-ACT tool. Please see section 6, global environmental benefits of the CEO-ER. Text repeated here:

?We estimate that the project will result in a sequestration of about 1,048,171 tCO<sub>2</sub> equivalent over a 20-year return period, based on the FAO Ex-ACT tool. This will be done by:

? Converting 2,350ha of degraded land to plantations and other tree crops

? Bringing 1,500 ha of cropland (mainly wheat) under irrigation and climate smart agricultural practices

? Restoring 15,109 ha of degraded lands to grasslands and

? Sustainably managing 600 ha of forest lands and improving them from moderately degraded to a low degradation state.

04.05.2022: We have used the FAO EX-ACT tool to estimate the GHG benefits of this project and estimate that the total tCO<sub>2</sub> equivalent will be 1,048,171 over a 20-year period. Kindly note, however, that the project is in an arid region, hence the GHG benefits are modest. This text has been added to the CEO-ER on Pg.49.

The Ex-ACT tool was parameterized as follows:

LUC: 2,350 ha of degraded land to be re-planted with plantations and other perennial tree crops.

Cropland: 1,500 ha of crops (mainly wheat) to be brought under irrigation and climate smart agricultural practices.

Grasslands: 15,109 ha of degraded lands to be restored to grasslands.

Management: 600 ha of forest lands will be better managed and moved from a moderately degraded to a low degradation state.

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

## Agency Response

### Project Map and Coordinates

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.08.2022

Cleared.

12.14.2021:

A map is there; however, letters are small/blurred and unable to read.

#### Agency Response

04.05.2022: High and low resolution version of the maps have been provided. Additionally, please use this link below:

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/18-U\\_y3289i8f7NHdtDq-cGKzR7c5bL8?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/18-U_y3289i8f7NHdtDq-cGKzR7c5bL8?usp=sharing)

#### Child Project

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

#### Agency Response

##### Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04.08.2022

Cleared.

12.14.2021:

Stakeholder engagement plan is adequate and elaborated; however, CEOER seems to lack stakeholder engagement during the PPG.

Agency Response 04.05.2022: The relevant section of the CEO-ER has been updated with a summary of the stakeholder engagement that were held. Text follows:

Stakeholders who were consulted during the PPG phase included civil society organizations ? particularly the CDCs, but also NGOs, local communities, including groups which are indigenous to these regions, and private sector entities including farmers and livestock owners, federations and traders.

Meetings held with provincial government agencies and NGOs followed by site visits where communities and their representatives in the CDCs, traditional and religious leaders were met. A combination of focused group meetings and on-site discussions were held, including separate discussions with women groups which were facilitated by the gender expert. Joint assessments of water infrastructure and discussions on climate resilient crops, livestock and

horticultural practices as well as livelihood diversification were held. Community members involved in trade and off-farm activities participated in these discussions.

A validation workshop was also held in the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL) before the fall of previous government. It was attended by representatives from MAIL and other ministers and this exercise provided an opportunity for consultations between the project design team and key stakeholders in the government. During the validation workshop the project objective, outcomes, outputs and activities were presented, including project logical framework, stakeholder analysis and engagement, implementation arrangements and Monitoring and evaluation, as well as selection of potential implementing partners.

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.07.2024: cleared

06.03.2024:

Please ensure that Gender Action Plan is monitored and reported on.

#### Agency Response

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request (via email)

06.03.2024:

**Please ensure that Gender Action Plan is monitored and reported on.?**

#### Agency Response

This is well noted. Given the current context in Afghanistan, gender equality considerations will be an important aspect of project implementation on the ground. A comprehensive gender analysis was conducted, identifying significant gender differences, gaps, and opportunities linked to the project/program objectives and activities. The analysis revealed disparities in access to resources, participation in decision-making, and economic opportunities, and highlighted opportunities for women's empowerment. Given the current context in Afghanistan, gender equality considerations are a critical aspect of project implementation. The project includes gender-responsive activities - such as capacity-building initiatives for women, establishment of gender-inclusive committees, and initiatives to increase women's access to economic resources. Gender-sensitive indicators have been integrated to monitor progress, including metrics on women's participation and access to resources. UNDP Country Office in Afghanistan has a strong reporting and monitoring unit through which the project will ensure due diligence and monitor and report on progress as per the Gender Action Plan. UNDP will also report progress of the Gender Action Plan through the annual PIR.

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.07.2024: cleared

05.14.2024

A letter of support signed by the official OFP is required. What has been submitted has no signature.

04.28.2022

The OFP of Afghanistan has recently changed to Dr. Zainul Abedin Abid.

Please consider obtaining a letter from this OFP.

<https://www.thegef.org/who-we-are/focal-points>

04.08.2022

Please provide an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP(s) of the participant country(ies) indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by a GEF Agency. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform.

12.14.2021:

The CEOER proposes Direct Implementation by UNDP; however, no explanation is provided on what efforts have been put during PPG to look for alternative options. Also, request for such IA/EA arrangement request needs to come from the OFP.

### Agency Response

06.06.2024

The signed OFP request letter is uploaded on the portal. The letter was also communicated directly by the OFP to GEF Secretariat.

UNDP ? 05.09.2022

UNDP is not in a position to obtain the OFP request letter since UNDP cannot engage directly with the de facto authority as per current UN Transitional Engagement Framework (UNTEF) and UNDP's country strategy ? Area Based Approach to Development Emergency Initiatives (ABADEI). In this context, the new OFP as noted above has been informed to communicate directly to GEF Secretariat with a request letter for extension of CEO endorsement deadline.

UNDP, 04.21.2022

The post 15 August 2021 power shift in Afghanistan has resulted in severe political and social-economic instability in a climate of heightened uncertainty. Core government functions and essential service provision have collapsed. Following the power shift, UNDP has undertaken a programme review to align its country strategy with the United Nations Transitional Engagement Framework. The new UNDP country strategy known as ?the Area-Based Approach to Development Emergency Initiatives (ABADEI)? has been designed as a response to the ongoing crisis in Afghanistan upon a call of the UN Executive Committee Working Group for Afghanistan. Under this strategy, UNDP will maximize the use of the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). The execution of ABADEI will be undertaken through the direct contracting of third-party implementers. Third-party implementers include non-governmental organizations, local community groups, private vendors, and vetted money service providers. UNDP will use the flexibilities of its fast-track procurement to make use of the existing contracts. For example, Long Term Agreements (LTAs) used by all the UN agencies will be used under the agreed ?mutual recognition? principle of the UN development system. In line with the ABADEI strategy, UNDP Afghanistan proposes to implement this GEF project in question through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM).

However, due to the changed circumstances in Afghanistan, UNDP is not in a position to secure the request letter from OFP (De-Facto Authority) for the IA/EA arrangements for this project.

UNDP Afghanistan will implement this project under Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) as per the United Nations approved Transitional Engagement Framework (TEF) for Afghanistan, which clearly states that UN agencies funds and programmes will continue to engage the de-facto authorities at the national and sub national levels to enable carrying out of their activities under the UNTEF principles of engagement. The UN will carry out its activities through but not limited to non-government implementing partners including the Community Development Councils (CDCs) and other community-based organizations, national and international non-government organizations, faith-based organizations and private sector, in compliance with applicable international sanctions regimes.

Since 15 August 2021, UNDP has undertaken programme review to align with the broader framework of the 'UN Continuation of Activities' in the country. UNDP is, therefore, adopting an integrated yet decentralized approach to programming known as 'the Area-Based Approach to Development Emergency Initiatives (ABADEI)'. The ABADEI Strategy has been designed as a response to the ongoing crisis in Afghanistan upon a call of the UN Executive Committee Working Group for Afghanistan. It offers an integrated yet decentralized approach to programming for community resilience. It proposes an innovative, inclusive and highly flexible approach, that puts people first, targets the most vulnerable and meets specific local needs. It will prioritize support under four key pillars: (1): Provision of essential services, (2): Community livelihoods and local economic activities, (3): Protection of farm-based livelihoods from natural disasters, and (4): Community resilience and social cohesion.

Under the DIM modality, all the procurement activities and payments to vendors will be conducted by UNDP, addressing the risk of money laundering and financing of terrorism. UNDP procurement and vendor selection processes are open and competitive. UNDP has zero tolerance against vendors that engage in proscribed practices: corruption, fraud, coercion, collusion, unethical practice and obstruction. During evaluation processes, all UNDP vendors are checked against the UN Vendor Sanction List. UNDP may use some national and international NGOs to carry out some activities of the project such as implementation of livelihood activities and civil works.

04.05.2022: To ensure that the project interventions are implemented in a gender- and culturally-sensitive manner, UNDP will implement the recommendations put forward in the project's gender analysis. It will closely involve Civil Society, NGOs, women cooperatives and traditional authority structures to ensure gender and cultural sensitivity of project interventions.

During the PPG phase the option for NGO execution was also considered, given the presence of some well-established NGOs in Afghanistan who continue to operate in Afghanistan. However, considering the risks during implementation, including security of project assets and personnel, direct implementation by UNDP was determined to be the best way forward.

The OFP request for change of IA/EA arrangement could not be secured at the time of submission as the OFP belongs to the previous government, which is no more in place. We have been informed that the new de facto authority has submitted a request to GEFSEC to update the OFP info.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**Benefits**



Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.10.2024: Cleared.

06.07.2024:

Agency is charging US\$ 402,000 for the administrative services they provide to execute the project. Following the recent guidance, we are accepting Agencies to carry out executing functions at zero cost. Therefore, if Agency wants to execute this project, the charge for the administrative services should be removed and instead, some of the managerial activities / positions / experts charged to the project components must be charged to PMC.

**ANNEX E: Project Budget Table**

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD eq.)				Sub-Total	Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	Project Management Costs	Total (USD eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency/IFU)
		Component 1: Capacity of Community Development Councils, Inc. - NGOs and ...	Component 2: Restoration of degraded forest and climate-resilient livelihood ...	Component 3: Natural forests sustainably managed and new forest areas established	Component 4: Knowledge management					
Equipment	1. Activity 3.1.3: Process workstation and computer with appropriate hardware and networking infrastructure for Guadalupe installations. Calculation: unit cost @ \$500 X 2 (workstations with hardware) @ Y1.3: 300000 Sub-total = 30,000 2. Activity 3.2: GPS and survey equipment for field surveys Total = 35,000			25,000.00		35,000.00		35,000.00	UNEP	
Equipment	1. Activity 4.1.1: Setting up data collection and communication systems for monitoring and reporting systems in district and provincial levels and training focal points in their use. Calculation: unit cost @ 2000 X 2 (training with data plus) [Y1.4: 5000] Sub-total = 5,000 Total = 5,000			1,000.00		5,000.00		5,000.00	UNEP	
Sub-contract to executing partner	Services to Project Costs cover administrative services provided by UNEP to the project, including human resources, procurement, finance, travel, and other project-related administrative functions. Direct project costs will be determined based on the UNEP Universal Price List or actual service costs, subject to GEF rules on DPCs. These amounts are utilizations and will be detailed during the annual project planning process and included in yearly budgets. DPC costs are for operational expenses per transaction. Y1 \$6,200, Y2 \$6,200, Y3 \$6,200, Y4 \$6,200, Y5 \$6,200 The total cost is 291,400 from LDCF					-	291,400.00	291,400.00	UNEP	
Sub-contract to executing partner	Services to Project Costs cover administrative services provided by UNEP to the project, including human resources, procurement, finance, travel, and other project-related administrative functions. Direct project costs will be determined based on the UNEP Universal Price List or actual service costs, subject to GEF rules on DPCs. These amounts are utilizations and will be detailed during the annual project planning process and included in yearly budgets. DPC costs are for operational expenses per transaction. Y1 \$8,500 Y2 \$8,500, Y3 \$8,500 Y4 \$8,500 Y5 \$8,500 The total cost is 329,400 from LDCF					-	329,400.00	329,400.00	UNEP	

06.03.2024:

The budget table in Portal is not readable as figures are sharing two columns, or it is not possible to see who the executing entity receiving the funds is (see below at the left-hand side). Additionally, budget line "Contractual services" Company? (see below at the right-hand side) bundles a series of contracts amounting US\$ 6,311,200, but it is not possible to understand what the total cost of each contract is, neither what is the amount being paid.

Please resubmit the budget table itemizing the different costs (changes also must be done in ProDoc).

**ANNEX E: Project Budget Table**

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD/yr)				Sub-Total	Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	Project Management Costs	Total (USD/yr)	Responsible Entity (excluding any receiving funds from the GEF Agency)
		Component 1: Capacities of Community Development Councils, local NGOs and communities at a strengthened to address climate change impacts.	Component 2: Restoration of degraded land and climate-resilient livelihood interventions.	Component 3: Natural forest managed and new forest areas established by reforestation.	Component 4: Knowledge management.					
Equipment	i. Activity 3.1.3: Procure workstation and computers with appropriate hardware and networking infrastructure for Desktop installations. Calculation: unit cost @ 15000 X 2 workstations with hardware (Yr: 30000) Subtotal = 30000 ii. Activity 3.2: GPS and survey equipment for field surveys Total = 30000			30000.00	30000.00			30000.00		
Equipment	i. Activity 2.1: Setting up data collection and communication systems for monitoring and reporting systems at district and provincial levels and the			5000.00	5000.00			5000.00		

Contractual services-Company	Description	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	Total
	i. Activity 2.1.1: Identification and stocking of drought tolerant and disease resistant varieties of small fruit crops. Calculation: unit cost @ 10000 X 2 (grammes) X 4 (years) (Yr: 1: 80000; Yr: 2: 200000; Yr: 3: 20000; Yr: 4: 20000; Yr: 5: 100000) Subtotal = 80000 ii. Activity 2.1.1: Identification and stocking of drought tolerant, pest and disease resistant and early maturing varieties of crops, vegetables and fruit for on-farm. Calculation: unit cost @ 10000 X 2 (grammes) X 4 (years) (Yr: 1: 80000; Yr: 2: 200000; Yr: 3: 20000; Yr: 4: 20000; Yr: 5: 100000) Subtotal = 80000 iii. Activity 2.1.3: Workforce of Justice and Peace for horticultural plantation, agro-forestry, woodlots and range and species. Calculation: unit cost @ 10000 X 2 (human resources)	4,311,200.00										6,311,200.00
												6,311,200.00

12.14.2021:

Annex B: Response to Council member comment is not included.

**Agency Response**

10.06.2024: The GEF budget table was updated. DPC is removed from PMC and some managerial/expert positions have been charged to PMC instead.

06.06.2024 The Budget table is re-uploaded. The Contractual services ? Company of total US\$ 6,311,200 presents the itemized costs.

04.05.2022: Responses to Council comments have been provided below separately and included in Annex B of CEO ER.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### Agency Response

#### Germany Comments

Germany welcomes this project, which aims to enhance the resilience of local communities to climate change through improved alternative livelihood and land-use options and, hence, increase resilience by diversifying livelihoods and sources of income. Germany appreciates the application of gender-sensitive approaches and the objective to create gender-empowering alternative livelihoods. Synergies with and co-financing through several on-going projects have also been identified. Furthermore, Germany appreciates the consistency with national strategies such as the NAPA priorities and the contribution to the NAP process.

### Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

Topic	Council Comments	Agency Response
-------	------------------	-----------------

<p><b>COVID-19 strategy:</b></p>	<p>Germany appreciates that COVID-19 is addressed in its risk section as well as project design. Still, Germany emphasizes the need for a strategy that is supposed to be prepared during the PPG phase, especially as it is expected that COVID 19 strongly worsens the food situation in poor and disaster-stricken countries such as Afghanistan. Long-term counter-measures might therefore need to be considered for output 2.3</p>	<p>We acknowledge the risk of COVID-19 and have added the following text to Pg. 40 of the ProDoc and Pg. 36 of the CEO-ER. This text supplements the text provided on the section on risks, specifically pg. 53 in the ProDoc and pg. 76 in the CEO-ER. Text follows:  This output will specifically strengthen and enhance interactions between local producers, local supply chains and local markets, as a long term strategy for self-sufficiency, in line with the COVID-19 response strategy. Specific ways in which this component will support long term measure to counter the impacts of the pandemic are: 1) Stabilising local agricultural and livestock production through climate resilient technologies, water infrastructure and climate smart agricultural practices; 2) Developing and enhancing on and off-farm activities for reduced post-harvest losses, improved storage of produce and value addition and processing through local small scale industries; 3) Strengthening of producer federations and cooperatives which will enhance their bargaining power and ensure better prices through improve efficiency; 4) Linkages with local markets and traders, including facilities for cold storage and packaging; and 5) Enhanced access to local financial services.</p>
<p><b>NAP Process</b></p>	<p>Germany welcomes the project's contribution to the NAP process and encourages close alignment with the Open NAP initiative.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. We have added a specific line to confirm that the project will align with this initiative on Pg. 18 of the ProDoc and Pg. 79 of the CEO-ER:  The project will continue to support the alignment of Afghanistan with the Open NAP initiative to facilitate collaboration with a wider range of experts and organisations to strengthen the formulation of the adaptation plans.</p>

## Cooperation with other projects:

Germany welcomes the strong links and co-financing with other UN projects. However, Germany recommends that greater consideration be given to similar projects in the area such as the German-funded "Forest Landscape Restoration Project" and the Swiss-funded "Sustainable Livelihood and Social Development (SLSD)", which both work in Paktia Province, among others. The results of the World-bank Project "Afghanistan: Capacity Development for Natural Resource Management, Managing Afghanistan's Rangelands and Forest Resources: An Assessment of Institutional and Technical Capacity Constraints" can be of importance for CCLF's component 1.

Thank you for your suggestions.

We have already referred to some of the projects listed above. Namely:

1. Forest Landscape Restoration Project: Pg. 47 of the CEO-ER and Pg. 11 of ProDoc. Elaborated further on Pg. 93 in the Feasibility Study.
  2. We have indeed referred to and cited the World Bank report on "Managing Afghanistan's Rangelands and Forest Resources". Kindly see: pages 12, 13, and 23 in the ProDoc, pages 17, 18 and 22 in the CEO-ER and pages 12 and 23 in the Feasibility Study.
- The Sustainable Livelihood and Development project has now been added to the list of projects reviewed and referred. However, the project is not implemented in the same provinces as the CCLF and therefore is not a suitable source of co-finance. We have clearly referred to the potential for cross learning as described below. A summary is presented on pg. 94 of the Feasibility Study and the project is listed on pg. 31 in the CEO-ER and pg. 46 in the ProDoc. Copy of the text presented in the Feasibility Study is below:

### ***The Sustainable Livelihood and Development (SLSD) project***

The SLSD project, funded by the Swiss Cooperation Office (SDC) is the third phase of an initiative started in 2013. The project is implemented in coordination with MAIL, Afghanistan National Nursery Grower Organization and international NGOs. The project aims to improve the livelihood and resilience of resource-poor and smallholder farmers in the provinces of Paktia and Khost. It proposes to do this through improvement of agricultural production, natural resource management, market linkages and through strengthening agricultural service delivery. The targeted groups and the project objectives are closely related to component 2 of the CCLF project. The result areas of the project are also closely aligned with the CCLF project. These include: planning and implementing natural resource management, building community based NRM institutions, horticultural productivity improvements, water management and local institutions for irrigation management, improved crop varieties, support to extension services and linkages with private sector for marketing and processing of local produce.

**Relevance:** The SLSD project can provide unique opportunities for cross learning and scaling up of successful strategies by the CCLF

		<p>project. Given the overlap in the implementation phases, the CCLF project will utilize available opportunities to engage with the SLSD team during workshop and knowledge sharing events, and to collaborate with its partners, particularly in MAIL, in replication of successes from the earlier phases of the SLSD project.</p>
<p><b>Project strategy:</b></p>	<p>Germany welcomes that CCLF wants to support the implementation of the National Natural Resource Management Strategy (2017-2021) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL) that calls for community-based management of the natural resources in Afghanistan through science-based interventions. However, few reference is made to this strategy and its related "Operational Manual (OM) for Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)". The strategy and the manual offer scientifically proven and feasible approaches for the outputs 2.1. and 3.3 of the CCLF project.</p>	<p>The National Natural Resource Management Strategy is referred to in the following locations:  CEO-ER: Pages 19, 20 and 21.  ProDoc: Pages 14, 15 and page 22 with a summary on its relevance to the project strategy.  Feasibility Study: Pages 13, 14, 15, 22 and 46, with a short note on pg. 22.  Thank you for suggesting the reference to the operational manual. "Operational Manual (OM) for Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)" Indeed the manual provides a framework for implementing projects such as the CCLF. References are now made to the manual on the following pages:  CEO-ER: Pages 19, 25 and 34.  ProDoc: Pages 14, 22, 35, 37 and 41.</p>

## Project Areas:

Germany appreciates the selection of the project areas. However, the before-mentioned NRM-strategy calls for different provinces for the prioritization sequence for implementation of reforestation and agro-forestry projects (p. 55 of the strategy). Moreover, the selected provinces of the CCLF have very different stages of the degraded environment. The mountainous province of Kunar still has some of the few closed forest stands in the country, whereas flat and dry Samangan is heavily influenced by wind erosion and other disasters. These facts might call for different, locally adapted implementation approaches, especially for components 2 and 3.

Kindly note that the new project sites are in the provinces of Badakhshan and Kunar. Both these regions are mountainous and have a few villages with forest areas. We have provided a comprehensive description of the sites in the Feasibility Study (Pg. 32 to 43) and also detailed maps of the same

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/18-U\\_y3289i8f7NHdtDq-cGIKzR7c5bL8?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/18-U_y3289i8f7NHdtDq-cGIKzR7c5bL8?usp=sharing) .

The implementation approaches for the sites do consider the local conditions as advised. We have discussed these at length both with local communities and with the provincial and national governments.

<p><b>Forest restoration:</b></p>	<p>The budget for forest management and reforestation is substantially lower than for restoration ? this is in line with the overall rationale. However, reforestation is costly and does not really appear in the outcome/output description. Germany suggests to clarify the role reforestation will play. Furthermore, it appears that the indicators regarding restored or reforested areas do not contain values as of yet. Germany asks for those values to be added.</p>	<p>The reviewers correctly point out that restoration is expensive and requires substantial outlay. The outlay provided for afforestation and forest restoration is about 500,000. This does not include the budget for setting up institutional structures, training and mobilization. Allocations made under Component 2 that will support and supplement the afforestation and forest restoration activities are about 2,886,000. This includes activities such as soil and water conservation and protective measures undertaken for restored areas. These will directly support the restoration work in the forest areas. Additionally, rangeland restoration, nursery raising and plantations in buffer areas will reduce the pressure from the forest.</p> <p>The indicators for reforested areas are, as per the results framework - 240 ha for mid-term and 600 ha for the end of the project (Pg. 71 ProDoc).</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06.10.2024:

This CEOER is recommended for technical clearance.

06.07.2024 /05.14.2024 /05.10.2022 /04.28.2022 /04.08.2022 /12.14.2021:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the change).

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/14/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/8/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/28/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/10/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/14/2024</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**