



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5664		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Building Resilience of Communities Living Around the Northern Pistachio Belt (NPB) and Eastern Forest Complex (EFC) of Afghanistan through an EbA approach.		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$6,900,000
Co-financing:	\$7,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes. Afghanistan is a Least Developed Country and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes. A Letter of Endorsement from the OFP dated 11 December, 2013 is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	Yes.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>12/30/13 FI: Further information is requested. The document states that the project is aligned with the LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (enhancing adaptive capacity), and CCA-3 (technology transfer/adoption for adaptation). While alignment with CCA-1 and CCA-2 is clear, the technology transfer/adoption aspects are not obvious.</p> <p>Recommended action (12/30/13): Please clarify how CCA-3 is relevant. If it is not, please remove it as a project objective.</p> <p>Update, FI, 2/14/14: Yes, adequate explanation has been provided, i.e., the project will enhance the enabling environment to support adaptation-related technology transfer.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, it is in line with (i) Afghanistan's NAPA, which identifies community-based watershed management as a priority adaptation measure, (ii) the National Priority Programme 1 (National Water and Natural Resource Development), (iii) Afghanistan's National Development Strategy (Pillar 8 is 'Agriculture &amp; Development') and (iv) Afghanistan's Millennium Development Goals, as it will reduce deforestation and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		poverty.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>Yes. Both project areas are highly vulnerable to a range of existing pressures (population and livestock, weak institutional measures, poor soil management) that are contributing to watershed and forest degradation. These are expected to worsen with climate change, which could result in increased drought as well as heavier rainfall incidents that will exacerbate soil erosion.</p> <p>The LDCF project will bring climate resilience measures to 3 baseline projects: (i) USAID-funded 'Irrigation &amp; Watershed Management Project', (ii) JICA-funded 'Programme for Improvement of Irrigation Systems in Kabul, Bamyán and Kapisa Provinces', and (iii) the 'National Solidarity Program', funded by the World Bank and other donors and international funds.</p> <p>The former two baseline projects focus on watershed management, water supply and irrigation measures, whereas the third project focuses on effective institutions for local governance.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	12/30/13, FI: Minor changes are requested. While the project has heavy emphasis on capacity building/institutional strengthening, vulnerability assessment, and policy revision, with less on investment measures, this seems acceptable in the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Afghanistan context, where the knowledge base and capacity for adaptation urgently need to be built. However, the project also appears to include on-the-ground adaptation measures in establishing multi-benefit forests and in supporting alternative livelihoods. These activities have currently been folded into "TA".</p> <p>Recommended action (12/30/13, FI): We would very much appreciate it if any INV (investment components) could be separated out from the enabling activity and technical assistance actions. This will assist us in estimating the proportion of LDCF funding supporting on-the-ground adaptation actions. As stated earlier, it is understood that in Afghanistan's case this may be a lower proportion than is generally expected for LDCF investment components.</p> <p>Update, FI, 2/14/14: Yes, the requested change has been made and all components of Table B are clear and sound, with the investment component accounting for 55 percent of the total grant request.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Adaptation benefits are discussed in general terms -- or in the case of Annex II, in terms of "expected benefits".</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please provide information yielded from studies supported by PPG about specific climate-resilient measures that will be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		used in the project so that the measures are distinct from those that would be used in business-as-usual watershed management or forest management projects. In other words, please provide details of how climate models or outputs of other climate research support the decision to use specific crop and tree species, adjustments to infrastructure, etc., in view of long-term (including projected future) climatic suitability.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes for PIF stage. The project will be undertaken using a participatory approach and will actively involve local communities in the design, planning and implementation of proposed project activities.  By CEO Endorsement: Please provide detailed information on measures taken to involve civil society organizations and community members. Please also discuss ethnic minorities -- whether they pose a relevant issue for the selected project sites, and (if so) how their inclusion and participation will be ensured.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>12/30/13, FI: Further information is requested. Although a fairly comprehensive list of potential risks and mitigation measures has been supplied, what seems to be missing -- given the project's heavy emphasis on capacity building and policy strengthening -- is long-term sustainability of capacities created, widespread use and uptake of the knowledge and research outputs that will be generated, and sustained policy change in water resources and forestry sectors (to include consideration of climate risk).</p> <p>Recommended action (12/30/13, FI): Please also address relevant capacity/knowledge/policy risks in terms of sustainability of project efforts in this regard.</p> <p>Update, FI, 2/14/14: Yes, the additional potential risks have been included, with possible mitigation measures, in the risk matrix.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. The project will coordinate with various watershed management and forestry initiatives in the country (e.g., 'Kunduz Integrated Water Initiative', 'Panj;Amu River Basin Programme', MADERA forestry sector work), with ongoing research, and with another UNEP LDCF adaptation project, 'Building Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Afghanistan'.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please also ensure coordination with the recently Council-Approved UNDP LDCF project, 'Strengthening the resilience of rural livelihood options to manage climate change-induced disaster risks' which includes Balkh province as a project site (as does the currently-proposed project).</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Innovativeness: More information is requested. Recommended action: Please provide further information on the use of innovation in designing this project.</p> <p>Update, FI, 2/14/14: Yes; EbA is innovative in the context of Afghanistan. The project will use locally-relevant measures that provide adaptation-related as well as multiple other benefits such as carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation, alternative livelihoods and poverty reduction.</p> <p>Sustainability: If managed appropriately over the long-term, the project has high potential for sustainability as it emphasizes capacity building, policy adjustment, knowledge creation, and community empowerment -- all of which are essential ingredients for sustainable outcomes. The likelihood of achieving sustainability is high based on GEF and UNEP experience, but country circumstances may pose challenges.</p> <p>Scale-up: The capacity and efficacy of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		local institutions and governance may differ widely in different parts of the country. Aside from these potential barriers to scale-up, the EbA approach to building resilience to climate change may definitely be applied to other vulnerable ecosystems and communities in the country (adjusted as necessary to suit local circumstances).	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes. \$7 M will be provided in co-financing.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes. The project management costs stand at 4.6% of the total requested LDCF grant amount.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from	Yes, PPG is requested and is within the norm.	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Clearance is pending response to Items 4, 7, 11 and 13.  Update, FI, 2/14/14: Yes; all concerns have been addressed.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please consider Items 8, 10 and 12.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*	December 30, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 14, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**