

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

10312

Countries

Afghanistan

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6406

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS: Modification requested. CCA-1 in Table A is aligned with 2018-2022 GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF, and thus sufficient. However, the proposal seems to also cover CCA-2 (mainstream CCA and resilience for systemic impact).

Recommended action: Please consider including CCA-2 in the Table A.

Agency Response Comment is addressed in the revised PIF and CCA 2 is included in Table A

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS&FI 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS&FI: The components are sufficiently clear for this stage of project development. However, further justification is required particularly for the project components which appear to be repetition of the other past/ongoing projects. Please refer to the comments in the coordination section of this review.

Also, a total cost (including PPG and fees) indicated is approximately \$9.75 million, which might waste \$0.25 million.

Recommended action: Please consider utilizing the full \$10 million or substantially reduce the cost so that the remaining can be meaningfully utilized in the future project.

Agency Response

Well noted. The comment is addressed and the revised total budget, inclusive of PPG and fees, is \$10 million

SK: 04/15/2020

The revised signed endorsement letter for 10 million is attached to this revised PIF.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.02.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

08.21.2020:

Government in-kind co-financing of \$25M is based on several initiatives either under implementation or under preparation, and the amount reflects the total amount of these initiatives. GEF co-financing guidelines defines in-kind co-financing as "Contributions in the form of goods or services other than money, including but not limited to salaries and wages, office space, and utilities". Please provide justification to this or revise the amount to reflect the share of costs that can be considered "in-kind".

06.15.2020:

If the co-financing from MAIL and ADB is recurrent expenditure, then please update Investment Mobilized column in Table C to 'Recurrent expenditures'. Currently these are indicated as 'Investment mobilized'.

05.14.2020:

Corresponding co-finance is adequately mapped in Table A. However, it is not clear on what has been addressed on the earlier comment on 'Investment Mobilized'.

YS&FS 04.17.2020:

According to the explanation co-finance from MAIL and ADB seem to be recurrent expenditure, rather than investment mobilized. Also, Table A indicates that CCA-2 is mapped to \$233,333 from the GEF with no associated co-finance, while Table B Component 1 is mapped to the same \$233,333 from the GEF with \$1 million co-finance. If these are the same \$233,333, two co-finance need to match.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS 03.24.2020: While total co-finance amount is increased to a sufficient, that from MAIL indicated in the table (\$25 mil.) does not seem to match that indicated in the description (\$3.5 mil.).

Recommended action: Please provide an explanation to the above.

YS&FI: While there is no required minimum level of co-finance for the LDCF, the level of co-finance is low (\$10.5 million) for a grant of this size (Community-based sustainable land and forest management in Afghanistan GEFID: 9285 project has a similar grant size with co-finance of over \$50 million, including >\$38 million from MAIL). Particularly, investment mobilized is considerably small (\$1 million). Ninety percent of the proposed co-finance is "in-kind", which does not really serve the country by leveraging additional resources. Also, \$9.5 million of the co-finance is not "investment mobilized" as it is in-kind.

Recommended action: We request that the proposal increase the volume of co-finance, particularly for the mobilized investment. Also, please adjust the categorization of the co-finance.

Agency Response

SK: 09/17/2020

The co-finance section has been revised. MAIL-UNDP Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development-All (CBARD-ALL) has been added - which will provide 10 million as co-finance in the area of climate resilience livelihoods. This 10 million is without operations cost. The government co-finance is decreased from 10 million to 4 million, as operational costs (salaries and wages) have now been excluded. The total overall co-finance is therefore reduced from 32 million to 20 million. For more details please see the co-finance section of the revised PIF.

SK: 07/09/2020

The co-financing from MAIL and ADB has been categorized as recurrent expenditures.

SK: 05/28/2020

Co-finance from MAIL and ADB is recurrent expenditure and not investment mobilized.

SK:05/05/2020

As suggested - the figures have been revised in the PIF.

SK: 04/15/2020

The co-finance amount has been revised upwards to \$32 million and the categorization adjusted and the description is also corrected.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS&FI: Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS: Yes.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS: Yes. PPG has been requested and is within the allowable cap at \$150k.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

06.15.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

05.14.2020:

Most of the earlier points have been adequately addressed. However, Since this is a PIF stage, please delete the figures in columns for CEO Endorsement stage /MTR /TE. These should be provided at the respective stages. Most of the figures have been cleared in the latest update; however, there seems to be still some left; for example, rows 106, 119 and 139.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI 04.17.2020:

CCA Results Framework is developed and attached. However:

- Since this is a PIF stage, please delete the figures in columns for CEO Endorsement stage /MTR /TE. These should be provided at the respective stages.
- Core Indicator 3: 44 in total seems to be ambitious number. Please provide how this number was counted.
- Core Indicator 4: 672 men and 168 women; please reconsider for a better balance or provide clear justification for the proposed balance.
- GEFTF indicators seem to be still visible (e.g., Indicators 3 and 4) in the PIF.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF. CCA Results Framework (CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information) does not seem to be attached to the current PIF.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI: Please remove the indicators entered in the Core Indicator Table and provide the excel document with the GEF-7 CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information instead, which can be accessed at:

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-adaptation-results-framework-gef-7>

Agency Response

SK: 05/28/2020

All figures in columns for CEO Endorsement stage /MTR /TE (including for rows 106, 119 and 139) have been deleted. These will be provided at the respective stages.

SK: 05/05/2020

The figures in CCA Results Framework/Core Indicator (under column headings - CEO Endorsement stage /MTR /TE) is deleted. These figures will be provided during the respective stages.

Core Indicator 3: 44 is not ambitious. This is because the project will support mainstreaming of climate resilience into both policies and development plans. The project will be implemented in 4 provinces, and in each province - 10 Community Development Plans will be revised with climate resilience mainstreamed into these plans. At the national level, the project intends to mainstream climate resilience in four policies/plans (Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, Designated National Authority for Clean Development Mechanism (DNA) Projects in Afghanistan, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions for Afghanistan (NAMA), National Adaptation Plan for Afghanistan (NAPA). These four documents are due for revision. Overall, the total number of policies/plans mainstreamed is $40+4=44$.

Core Indicator 4: the figures have been changed (504 men and 336 women). The ratio is 60:40%.

GEFTF indicators (Indicators 3 and 4) have been removed in the PIF.

SK: 04/15/2020

The table is removed and Climate Change Adaptation Results Framework is filled out and is attached to the revised PIF. The results framework was inadvertently left out in the previous submission.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.17.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI: No. A Rio Marker rating of "1" is provided. All LDCF projects must have a Rio Marker of "2".

Agency Response

SK: 04/15/2020

Relevant sections in Item G of the PIF and Taxonomy sheet are filled, and the latter is attached. The taxonomy sheet was inadvertently left out in the previous submission.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage. However, during PPG, it is requested to refer to STAP primer on ToC (<http://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>) to elaborate further on this point by the CEO Endorsement stage. Preferably this should be summarized in a diagram (or table etc.) so that GEFSEC can see an overall picture and logical structure at the glance.

YS: Further elaboration requested. PIF does not clearly mention adaptation problems the proposed project will address. On the other hand, PIF does mention various root causes and barriers; however, a clear linkage between proposed activities or how the proposed activities are expected to address the root causes and contribute in overcoming the barriers are not explicitly delineated. As such, the theory of change discussed in the PIF seems remain weak.

Recommended action: Please elaborate further on the above points.

Agency Response

Some paras on main adaptation problems and how this project will address them have been included in the respective section. Additionally, all identified barriers have been linked to the project components, which will address these.

SK:04/15/2020

The comments requesting reference to STAP primer on TOC and further elaboration of the same during CEO endorsement stage is duly noted.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.17.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF. For example, ADB initiative in Table C. It is stated in Table C that 'ADB will provide co-finance from its projects being implemented in relevant target areas in Afghanistan'. As such, this seems to be one of the baseline projects; however, detail is not provided.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s). Also, refer to previous request to make PIF easier to identify the different sub-sections of text. Further, please also make it easier to locate the updates made by Agency (e.g., by highlighting the changes) to make sure these will not be overlooked.

YS&FI: Further elaboration requested. Please clearly discuss baseline initiatives. Are the sources of co-finance shown in Table C associated with baseline initiatives? If so, please describe.

Recommended action: Please clearly state which of the baseline projects/activity are associated with co-finance. Also, please include an overview of what has already been supported by the baseline/co-financing projects, which gaps remain, and how the efforts that will be financed under the current project are contributing to closing these gaps.

Agency Response

The baseline projects associated with the co-finance mentioned in Table C are elaborated in the revised PIF

SK: 04/15/2020

Additional information on projects under implementation by MAIL has been summarized to justify the 25m co-financing. Additional information has also been furnished for ADB project, as well as additional information on overall ADB portfolio in Afghanistan has also been provided. The narrative for MAIL co-financing is also provided.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS&FI: Yes. The project seeks to improve the baseline situation provided, by introducing technologies and practices to improve the climate resilience. It is structured around three Components:

Component 1: Capacities of national and sub-national governments and communities are strengthened to address climate change impacts

Component 2: Restoration of degraded land and climate-resilient livelihood interventions

Component 3: Natural forests sustainably managed and new forest areas established by reforestation

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

YS: The proposal seems to be also aligned with CCA-2 (mainstream CCA and resilience for systemic impact). Please refer to the comment for 'Focal area elements'.

Agency Response Comment fully addressed in the revised PIF

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.17.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

YS&FI 03.24.2020: This PIF still lacks clear explanation on additional cost reasoning, particularly for on-going project. For example, GEFID=9285 project states in its project document that it 'offers considerable potential for scaling up. The approaches for participatory, community-based management of rangeland and forest ecosystems can be replicated in areas outside of the project intervention sites.' Thus, the rationale of this intervention is still unclear particularly for Ghazni and Paktia which are also covered under this GEFID=9285 project. For instance, what has been done and what still needs to be done by this intervention.

Recommended action: Please provide further rationale addressing the above point(s).

FI: Needs further discussion. Which specific climate threats are communities in the proposed provinces (Samangan, Ghazni, Kunar and Paktia) vulnerable to? How might these be exacerbated by climate change? How will the project be addressing these needs? This needs to be presented from a climate change adaptation perspective and not only from a forest management or poverty perspective. Also, the PIF lacks clear explanation to and demarcation between additional cost reasoning for LDCF and co-finance.

Recommended action: Please further elaborate on the above.

Agency Response

SK: 04/15/2020

More specific information on the provinces covered by the project have been added, including local climate change related threats, and the vulnerabilities of the communities in each of the projects will be gathered during project document elaboration as such data is not available for each province in Afghanistan. Not having proper data is a big problem in Afghanistan. However, the data will be collected during the PPG phase.

Additional information on FAO project ID 9285 has been furnished and the complementarities between FAO and the proposed project have been elaborated. Additional paras (in blue font) have been provided to justify the additional/incremental cost.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

06.15.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

05.14.2020 /04.17.2020: Please refer to earlier comment(s) in Section I (Core Indicator).

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF. For example, CCA Results Framework (CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information) does not seem to be attached to the current PIF.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI: Update requested. Core indicators need to be provided. Please note that to justify the use of the full \$10M, agency is encouraged to reflect this also in the Core Indicator(s); for example, by a large number of beneficiaries.

Recommended action: Please address the above points.

Agency Response

SK: 05/28/2020

Earlier comment under Section 1 has been addressed

SK: 05/05/2020

The comment on Section 1 under Core Indicator has been addressed

SK: 04/15/2020

CCA Results Framework (CCA Core Indicators and Meta-Information) is attached now. It was inadvertently left out in the previous submission.

SK:

This comment is fully addressed in the revised PIF by inserting the climate change adaptation results in the form and mentioning them in the PIF

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

YS&FI: Not clear. The sustainability of restoration activities is not explicitly stated. Further, policies and strategies at the national level should be also considered and emphasized for revision since sustainability and replication should not be contained within the local level. Also, the strategy for the scale-up of activities is not clear.

Recommended action: Please consider and elaborate on the above.

Agency Response The relevant national strategies and plans that the proposed project will aim to influence for revision and updates, where needed, have been included as well as issues regarding national level strategies, sustainability of restoration interventions and scale-up.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS: Yes. The PIF includes geo-reference for the indicating the project's four target provinces: Samangan, Ghazni, Kunar and Paktia.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.12.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

10.02.2020:

Additional information is provided; however, it is not yet clear how the stakeholder consultations took place in developing this proposal (ie., during the project identification phase). The proposal states that both 'Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' and 'CSOs' have participated in consultations during the project identification phase, but lacks descriptions.

08.21.2020:

Please provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with civil society organizations and indigenous peoples. Please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (Nov 2017) requires that that at PIF stage 'Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...'

YS: The PIF clearly indicates a range of stakeholders and their potential role during the project. However, it does not clearly mention where and how the Agency has consulted with the listed stakeholders.

Recommended action: Please clarify where and how the Agency has consulted with the stakeholders.

Agency Response

SK: 10/09/2020

Additional narrative has been provided to clarify stakeholder engagement process during the preparation of PIF - including both at the national and local levels. During the PPG phase, a more detail stakeholder engagement process will be deployed and included in the final project document.

SK: 09/17/2020

The description on stakeholder consultation is provided in the relevant section of the PIF. Stakeholder consultation is an important aspect of the project and will be continued during the PPG Phase

Respective para included in the PIF.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS: Yes. The PIF adequately articulates gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS: Yes. PIF states that no private actors are willing to invest in the target area, but considering the highly vulnerable and poor rural communities and security issues mentioned for the targeted areas in the PIF, this is acceptable.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.12.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

10.02.2020:

Please further elaborate in detail on potential impacts and associated risks due to COVID-19 (particularly on potential impacts both during PPG and project implementation as 'Socio economic impacts, as well as delays/impacts' is too broad). Also discuss potential opportunities (if any) due to COVID-19.

06.15.2020:

Given the current and foreseen situation, please consider including COVID-19 pandemic, if appropriate, as a potential risk to the proposed project.

Agency Response

SK: 10/09/2020

Potential impacts and associated risks and potential opportunities due to COVID-19 is further elaborated in the revised PIF. The risk table has been revised to clarify risks and mitigation measures during both design and implementation. Potential opportunities due to COVID 19 has also been added to the narrative. A more detail assessment of the impacts and risks posed by COVID-19 will be conducted early on during the PPG phase and presented as part of the project implementation strategy.

SK: 09/17/2020

Additional information on COVID-19 mitigation measures has been added in the relevant section of the PIF.

SK: 07/09/2020

As suggested, COVID-19 risk has been added to the risk table.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.17.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF. For example, that for GEFID 4227.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS&FI:

Update requested:

Please provide the following information:

1) A similar community-based sustainable land and forest management project (GEFID 9285) was approved recently. Difference in the geographical location (same province, but different community) was provided as a justification of the current proposal to GEFID9285 project. However, good practices and lessons learnt etc. from the GEF projects are expected to replicate and scaled beyond project intervention area, unless further justification was provided. 2) Coordination with GEFID 4227 project (Building Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in Afghanistan) is required. 3) Explanation on co-financed projects/activities seem to be lacking. 4) Explanation on how the baseline projects/activities are helping in designing this proposal (e.g., how this proposal is building on the baseline projects/activities; how lessons learned and findings from the baseline projects/activities are reflected in the proposal; how the proposal ensures that there are no overlaps in activities).

Recommended action:

1) Please refrain from using difference in geographical location as a rationale of this proposal. It is important to mention about the location, but normally not as a project rationale. On the other hand the current proposal mentions that there are 'thematic' difference. Please elaborate further from this aspect. 2) Please add coordination plan with GEFID 4227 project (Building Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in Afghanistan). 3) Please provide explanation on co-financed projects/activities. 4) Please provide further explanation on how the baseline projects/activities are helping in designing this proposal. In particular, an overview of what has already been supported, which gaps remain, and how the efforts that will be financed under the current project are contributing to closing these gaps and coordinating with these baseline/activities.

Agency Response

SK: 04/15/2020

Changes have been made in the relevant sections –(i) baseline scenario and (ii) coordination - of the revised PIF

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04.17.2020:

Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

YS 03.24.2020: It is unclear where/how previous comment(s) are addressed in the PIF. For example, MIA and NIP seem to be listed in the PF without sufficient explanation.

Recommended action: Please address the above point(s).

YS: Further elaboration requested. Various national strategies etc. are listed. However, 1) alignment with the proposed project is not delineated. 2) some appear to be irrelevant to the proposed PIF (e.g., MIA and NIP).

Recommended action: 1) delineate the alignment with the proposed project. 2) list only the relevant strategies etc.

Agency Response

SK: 04/15/2020

Section fully revised and expanded. The alignment of the project with national priorities and strategies has been delineated/clarified. Additional details on alignment with international conventions – including UNFCCC, Sendia framework and SDGs have been provided in the revised PIF.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.02.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed for the PIF stage.

08.21.2020:

Please consider the followings as “lack of knowledge” at the local level is mentioned as a key barrier:

1. It would be good to mention plans to develop a “communication strategy/plan” that targets, especially, the local communities as well as the local governments that will benefit and/or be impacted by the project; and organizes consistent information dissemination across the most appropriate local channels.
2. It would be good to mention the various “training” efforts that will be undertaken by the project (as part of Component 1 and 2) and how these efforts will be connected to the activities listed under the Knowledge Management Approach of the project.
3. It would be good to mention how the proposed information management system (Component 3) will be connected to the activities under the Knowledge Management Approach of the project. People need to be trained on how to access and use it. Its existence and value need to be advertised; so that people are aware. Thus, there needs to be a “promotion” of this tool.

Also, in comparison to the FAO project, a stand-alone component on KM and M&E is missing from this project. It seems that this project could use a separate component that focuses on learning and knowledge exchange/dissemination, especially at the local community level, in line with its KM Approach. Please consider this possibility or provide sufficient justification to this.

YS 03.24.2020: Cleared. However, Agency is requested to consider and elaborate on knowledge management during PPG, particularly on how lessons learnt from this project can be accumulated, shared and disseminated beyond the target provinces, at the national level and even globally.

YS: Additional information requested. While the PIF sufficiently delineates how the project will share lessons learned, how the project will learn from other relevant projects and initiatives are not stated. Also, user-friendliness is not elaborated in the PIF. Please also discuss how communities will access and benefit from the knowledge-sharing activities, and how the knowledge-sharing actions will be sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.

Recommended action: Please consider and elaborate on the above points.

Agency Response

SK: 09/17/2020

As suggested, a separate outcome (Outcome 4) on Knowledge Management and M&E has been added - which is a cross-cutting outcome that collates knowledge management, communication and capacity building efforts under the 3 other outcomes of the project. In addition, the new outcome also addresses monitoring and evaluation aspects of the project.

The Learning and Knowledge Sharing information has been expanded and completed.

SK: 04/15/2020

SK: U4/15/2020

The reviewer's comment on the need for consideration for further elaboration during PPG is noted and will be addressed.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

YS&FI 03.24.2020: Cleared. Earlier comment(s) are appropriately addressed.

FI: No. OFP's Endorsement Letter is missing.

Agency Response Attached is the approved revised endorsement letter for \$10 Million from NEPA

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10.12.2020: Cleared. Sufficient for the PIF stage.

10.02.2020:

Not yet. Please refer to the review item (stakeholders and risks) and resubmit for consideration.

08.21.2020:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items (co-financing, stakeholders and knowledge management) and resubmit for consideration.

06.15.2020:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items (co-financing and risks) and resubmit for consideration.

YS&FI 05.14.2020: Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

YS&FI 04.17.2020:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

In addition, please provide Environmental and Social Safeguard screening information.

YS&FI 03.24.2020: Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

YS&FI 03.12.2020: Not yet. Earlier GEFSEC comments seem yet to be addressed and reflected in the PIF.

YS&FI: Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

08.21.2020:

It is requested to elaborate further, particularly on the following items by the CEO ER.

- Clear coordination and synergies with relevant projects and entities, particularly with GEFID: 9285.
- Clear Theory of Change (cf. <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>)
- Clear reflection on COVID

YS&FI 03.24.2020: Please make it easier to identify the different sub-sections of text, particularly those of section 1a in the online review. Further, please also make it easier to locate the updates made by Agency (e.g., by highlighting the changes).

Please make it easier to identify the different sub-sections of text, particularly those of section 1a in the online review.

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| First Review | 10/6/2019 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/12/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/24/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/17/2020 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/14/2020 | |

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

CONTEXT

This project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer) and CCA-2 (mainstreaming adaptation). The rural communities of Afghanistan are affected by and remain vulnerable to the risk of climate change exacerbated droughts – that are becoming more frequent and severe. This has resulted in losses suffered by farmers through reduced crop yields as well as to pastoralists through livestock deaths from insufficient supplies of water, forage on pastures and supplementary fodder. Floods and other extreme weather events cause damages to economic assets as well as homes and community buildings.

COMPONENTS and RESULTS

The proposed project aims to enhance the resilience of local communities to climate change through improved alternative livelihood and land-use options. The driving objective of the proposed project is to diversify livelihoods and sources of income as the main adaptation strategy. Water and land management practices are geared towards supporting this objective. It has three components that will result in adaptation benefits to 80,000 direct beneficiaries, of which 40,000 is women (Core Indicator 1), 800 hectares of land under climate resilient management (Core Indicator 2), contribute to 44 policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience (Core Indicator 3), and 840 people trained, of which more than 330 are female (Core Indicator 4).

Component 1: Capacities of national and sub-national governments and communities are strengthened to address climate change impacts.

Component 2: Restoration of degraded land and climate-resilient livelihood interventions.

Component 3: Natural forests sustainably managed and new forest areas established by reforestation

POLICY IMPACTS

The project will support the integration of climate change considerations into local level planning. The provincial climate-smart natural resource management plans will provide the framework for integration of forest management and rangeland management in the Community Development Councils to institutionalize community-based conservation and sustainable use of resources. In addition to this, valley level conservation and adaptation plans will be further prepared.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP & GENDER

Through support to climate-resilient livelihoods and diversified income-generating opportunities, participating communities will have access to greater financial means from their increased income. Coupled with awareness-raising and training on integrating climate change into local-level actions, these

activities will promote a sustainable cycle whereby households with improved income are able to use their returns to further invest in their livelihoods. The introduction of innovative electronic ledger wallet and mobile application-based payments for products and services – agricultural and non-agricultural – will provide practically applicable mechanisms for overcoming currently widely existing hurdles for business development and effectively remove transaction costs. This is expected to remain sustainable long after completion of the project implementation period, as continued improvements in livelihoods and income will lead to re-investment and thus continue gains.

The project will support the integration of climate change considerations into local level planning. This will ensure sustainability of restoration activities and other adaptation measures and support scaling up. Moreover, livelihood activities conducted within the project sites can be easily replicated with minimal input costs by neighboring (non-participating) communities. This is likely to lead to scaling up of project activities outside of the project areas.

The lessons learned, and best practices generated through this project and other initiatives will be collated and communicated through platforms such as Istanbul Process and other regional knowledge-sharing opportunities. Not only will this promote replication of project activities in other countries within the region, but it may also catalyze further investments for scaling up project activities at the national level. Lessons learned will provide detailed documentation of benefits of diversified community livelihoods to build climate resilience, with a focus on successes of empowering women and youth in participating in livelihood activities.

The proposed project will be designed to ensure women's involvement through women's social associations/shuras as far as possible during PPG preparation and implementation. The project will particularly focus on engaging women in planning and implementation to make sure their priorities are considered. The Directorate of Women's Affairs and Community Development Councils, Farmer Cooperation, Forest Management Committees and Rangeland Management Committees will be actively engaged and consulted for planning project interventions. More importantly, women will be engaged in building capacity, access to information, set targets for women's involvement in activities, focus on gender differences in capabilities to cope with climate change adaptation project and to ensure that risk assessments are informed by gender analysis and any other aspects of gender equality and women empowerment to maximize effectiveness of gender involvement.

It is aligned with country priorities and will coordinate with relevant baseline initiatives on the ground. The project will deliver additional adaptation benefits within \$32 million of proposed co-financing, of which the \$1 million amount is investment mobilized.