



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

GEF ID:	9285		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Community-based sustainable land and forest management in Afghanistan		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-1 Program 2; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$10,495,873
Co-financing:	\$54,254,000	Total Project Cost:	\$64,749,873
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Tim Vaessen

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>08/20/2015 The project is aligned with BD-4 Program 9, LD-1 Program 2, CC-2 Program 4 and SFM 1, 2 and 3. It may be useful to consider if the FASF could be simplified by reducing the number of SFM objectives.</p> <p>09/29/2015 FASF revised. Cleared.</p> <p>09/29/2015</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The project 5610 Reducing GHG Emissions Through Community Forests and Sustainable Biomass in Afghanistan was recently submitted for CEO Endorsement. Although geographically distinct, please explain how these two projects are complementary and develop synergy.</p> <p>10/28/2015 Additional information added. Cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>08/20/2015 The proposal is consistent with the details of the Initial National Communication to UNFCCC. The project is in line with ongoing GOA initiatives detailed. Deforestation and land degradation rates are reported in 3rd party sources as being very high.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>08/20/2015 The drivers of environmental degradation are clearly described as a country emerging from a prolonged difficult period.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>08/20/2015 Incremental reasoning is adequately described with the strengthening of institutional capacities and local communities skills through extension and improved planning. Please explain the links between institutional</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>level planning and local community involvement and how this fits with existing land tenure, use and rights. How does it strengthen existing processes.</p> <p>09/29/2015 Additional information on community based approaches provided in PIF text. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>08/20/2015 Component 2 what status will HCVs be afforded and how will these be maintained in the future. It would be preferable not to restrict woodlot design to a single species at this stage but use the PPG phase to refine this; additionally natural regeneration methods are preferred. How will the project address potential impacts on livelihoods for example pistachio harvest.</p> <p>Component 3 overgrazing due to the oversized national herd in relation to the fodder supply is noted in the PIF, is there any risk that increasing fodder supply will provide a perverse incentive for farmers to increase herd size, and if so has this been addressed. Water and 'other activities of local communities' are noted as a driver of degrade in Uruzgan, Ghazni and Bamyam, what is proposed to address these drivers.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		09/29/2015 PIF text has been amended to address these issues. Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	08/20/2015 Please address the following Data Issues: ERROR in PIF The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance ERROR in PIF The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from PF's total cofinance  09/29/2015 Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	08/20/2015 The funding requests are within the STAR allocation remaining as at 08/20/2015.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>08/20/2015 Not at this stage. Please address the issues raised above.</p> <p>09/29/2015 Not at this stage. Please see issue above.</p> <p>10/28/2015 The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 20, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 29, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 28, 2015	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		