

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR LDCF/SCCF PROJECTS¹

(For both FSPs and MSPs)

Type of Fund: Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)

Country/Region: Afghanistan

Project Title: Afghanistan: Building Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in Afghanistan.

GEFSEC Project ID: **4227**

GEF Agency Project ID:

GEF Agency: UNEP

Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation:\$4,900,000 Co-financing:\$16,000,000 Total Project Cost:\$20,900,000

PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:

Program Manager: Deborah Hines

GEF Agency Contact Person: Ermira Fida

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Afganistan is listed as LDC and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The operational focal point endorsement letter, dated 11 February 2010, is included with the PIF.	
	3. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	UNEP has a comparative advantage for the capacity building, assessment, and knowledge management components. However, its comparative advantage for component 3 is not well documented. Further the PIF does not address UNEP's capacity in the water sector or its comparative advantage for national water subsector projects.	

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

		<p>Recommendation: The comparative advantage of UNEP should be reviewed and made clear, with specific attention given to its role in the water sector and specifically for component 3.</p> <p>UNEP would need to work closely with partners in country in the execution of water practices activities. These partnerships should be clearly detailed in the project document.</p> <p>Revised document comments 7/9/2010- The resubmitted document clearly lays out the role and comparative advantage of UNEP in implementing this project. It builds on UNEPS work in the water sector and is aligned with its approach to climate change globally (assessments; capacity building and ecosystem based adaptation). As well UNEP has a strong country presence in Afghanistan.</p>	
Resource Availability	4. Is the proposed LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available in the LDCF/SCCF fund?	Yes	
Project Design	5. Will the project deliver tangible adaptation benefits?	Not clear.	

		<p>Component 1 does not address the fact that this part of the country is a desert area...droughts are to be expected. Climate forecasts will forecast dry conditions.</p> <p>Capacity development needs to address water subsector issues related to institutions, national assistance to localities, irrigation T/A investments, and aquifer investigations/management measures.</p> <p>Component 2 and 3 address adaptation planning so local farmers will better understand climate hazards. The value of this action is not clearly demonstrated for this desert area of the country.</p> <p>The adaptation benefits relate to increased capacity to assess, monitor and predict water related climate risks, and to ensure that these risks are integrated into relevant policies and programmes could be useful but it is not clear that the project will address this gap, or if it can given the current situation in Afghanistan. In addition, the on the ground water and agriculture practices should generate benefits related to reduced vulnerability through the adoption of appropriate technologies. However, the distinction between the "development issue" and the "adaptation issue" is not well defined.</p> <p>Lessons should be disseminated and fed back into other adaptation efforts.</p> <p>Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The project clearly lays out the baseline and the adaptation component/benefits. It clearly defines the adaptation issue to be addressed</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>and how the action will support development in Afghanistan.</p> <p>The full project document will still need to present a clear picture of the agro-ecological zones in which the project is working to ensure that the targeted areas are appropriate for the proposed adaptation measures.</p>	
	<p>6. Is the adaptation benefit measurable?</p>		<p>The delivery of tangible adaptation benefits by the project is not fully clear from the PIF. In addition, it is unclear who will benefit from component 3. Please provide greater clarity on the tangible adaptation benefits, especially in relation to project components 1 and 3. Even though at the PIF stage, the expected outputs can be more clearly explained and stated in the project framework. (For example, as an output - "capacity for interpretation of CC to water related risks" is not clear and not at the correct results level.)</p> <p>Recommendation: Clearly spell out the expected outputs of the project. As framed in the PIF, the outputs should be stated as measurable outputs, and the description of the components should contain sufficient information to understand what outputs will be generated and how they will contribute to the component objective.</p> <p>Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The proposed outputs are better defined and clearly support the project objectives. Concrete measurable indicators should be included in the final project document. This is important as many of the outputs are process oriented, for example capacity to assess, monitor and predict climate change</p>

	<p>7. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p>	<p>Under component 3 of the project, it is not clear what adaptation measures will be implemented in relation to ongoing agriculture activities. In the document list of ongoing activities, the World Bank and ADB water sector projects are not listed nor is GEF IW project in the Sistan Basin of the country through UNDP.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please be clear as to which activities are currently under implementation in the country and how the project proposed to work with specific ongoing initiatives, and how adaptation actions would be integrated into the water sector. Specify who will provide the required technical expertise.</p> <p>Include clear argumentation on how this component will help the targeted farmer groups to adopt agricultural practices that are resilient to climate change, e.g. what climate resilient practices and measures they will be informed about.</p> <p>Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The proposed project now states that it will build upon ongoing activities which in fact do not fully consider climate change impacts. The project will play a coordination role and ensure that lessons and good practices are appropriately included in other projects.</p>	<p>risks.</p>
	<p>8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is consistent with NAPA priorities.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>The coordination mechanisms are not clearly identified in the PIF. The PIF identifies possible linkages with FAO, DFID and with other ongoing projects. However two of the FAO projects end in 2010. However, clear</p>	

		<p>coordination mechanisms are not presented.</p> <p>Recommendations: The PIF should identify mechanisms for coordination, even if at the PIF stage it can not provide the specific details of partnerships or concrete linkages.</p> <p>Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The PIF includes an updated review of relevant ongoing activities. A further stock taking exercise will take place during the PPG to set up a clear baseline of ongoing activities and coordination mechanisms. These findings should be included in the final document.</p>	
	10. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	The project is likely to be cost-effective as it will build upon ongoing related project results. However the cost effectiveness analysis must be fully developed in the final project document.	
	11. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		
	12. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		
	13. Does the project take into account potential major risks and include sufficient risk mitigation measures?		
Justification for GEF Grant	14. Is the value-added of LDCF/SCCF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through additional cost reasoning?	<p>No. The value-added of the LDCF resources to the project could be demonstrated more clearly by providing clearer additional cost reasoning. The additional cost must be clearly linked to the adaptation measures of the project.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please clarify and enhance the argument on the value-added of the LDCF involvement, especially in component 3 where the ratio of LDCF to funding is 1:5.</p>	

		Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The justification for an adaptatio component and for LDFC funding has been explained throughout the document. In component 3 the funding will go towards buidling reliance into development intereventions, not explicit support to the development activities.	
	15.How would the proposed project outcomes and adaptation benefits be affected if LDCF/SCCF does not invest?		
	16.Is the LDCF/SCCF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	Yes, the funding level of the project management budget is appropriate and this cost is shared between the LDCF and cofinancing at a pro-rata basis in relation to the total cost contribution.	
	17.Is the LDCF/SCCF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		
	18.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	Yes	
	19.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		
	20.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendations at	21. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	No not yet. The PIF will be considered for CEO clearance following a revision based on the comments provided in sections 3,6,7, 9	

PIF		and 14. Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The PIF should be submitted for CEO recommended clearance.	
	22. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	The design of the project should be reconsidered to address specific adaptation concerns, taking into consideration the underlying root causes of water mismanagement and the need of water/irrigation sector reform in Afghanistan. Revised document comments 7/9/2010. The project logframe should align with the LDCE results framework approved by Council. The selected indicators should be concrete and measurable. Coordination mechanisms and the coordinating role of UNEP should be clearly spelled out. The cost effectiveness analysis should consider the security environment as well as the agro-ecological zones selected for inclusion in the project. Finally the project document should state the criteria for selecting the project sites and analyze needs in relation to local vulnerability to climate change threats.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	23. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		No.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	The proposed activities are appropriate and essential for a well designed project. In particular the climate risk assessment and scoping for institutional arrangements are well thought out.

		However it is not clear if the PPG will be used to produce a project baseline that covers both contextual and results indicators. Both should be completed during project preparation.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget is justified. However the co-financing is low compared to the total requested. UNEP is requested to redo the budget to arrive at a 1:1 LDCF to cofinancing ratio,
	3. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	yes - they are in line with standard international and national rates.
	4. Is the proposed LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available in the LDCF/SCCF?	yes
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	No, while the PPG request is valid and necessary to finalize the project proposal, the cofinancing ratio should be adjusted. Yes, the cofinancing ratio has been adjusted to 1:1.
Other comments		