



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

GEF ID:	4839		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Establishing integrated models for protected areas and their co-management in Afghanistan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5038 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,441,819
Co-financing:	\$40,038,000	Total Project Cost:	\$46,479,819
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Letter dated 02/26/2012, signed by OFF.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12 Mar 2012 YW/UA: Yes. UNDP is well positioned to implement this project based on their experience in supporting PA system projects. UNDP is also providing \$3m in cofinancing.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Project will be supported by UNDP's country office.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	12 Mar 2012 YW/UA: Yes. The entire GEF-5 allocation for BD and LD is being requested.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1, LD-3	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	15 March YW: Yes, it is in line with key national policies and strategies.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	15 March, YW: Yes, institutional and individual capacity building at the national and local levels are integral to the project design.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>12 Mar 2012</p> <p>UA: Not fully. In section B1 of the PIF, a long description of the general baseline situation is followed by a very short mentioning of the actual baseline project. The PIF provides details about the funding of the baseline project and a long-term solution, but does not concisely state what problems the baseline project seeks to address. Please consider shortening the general situation description and elaborate on the baseline project.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>12 Mar 2012 UA: To be improved: the description of the GEBs for BD is in rather general terms in the text whereas the LD benefits are deccribed in detail in a table format. This gives the reader the impression that LD benefits are the dominant benefits arising from the project. Please harmonise the description of the GEBs.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Has been addressed. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>12 Mar 2012</p> <p>UA: Not fully. a) It is generally fine that this multifocal area project has clearly a BD focus. Still, in the project framewrok, SLM activities should not be reduced to an annex of the BD focused components. Please consider separating the SLM component as a separate component or sub-outcome to clearly account for the LD involvement into this project.</p> <p>b) The project framework would benefit from numbering the components, outcomes, and outputs for easy reference.</p> <p>YW: 1. We recognize the project initiative timely and important to set up a PA management system and institutions in Afghanistan.</p> <p>2. The project approach in addressing both BD and SLM issues in an integrated manner is appropriate particularly considering the national and local context. The project will establish a national system of PAs to conserve biodiversity and at the same time mitigate land degradation pressures on</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the habitats in and around the PAs.</p> <p>3. We find the project rather ambitious, particularly with the coverage of the very large area at the Wakhan Conservation Area. Rather than trying to cover all the reserves within the conservation area, it may be more feasible to first work on a few areas, particularly considering the national and local capacities. Pls consider and clarify/justify as necessary.</p> <p>4. The area coverage requires further clarification. It is understood that the project will focus in the Wakhan Conservation Area (WCA), with a total coverage of 1.145million ha. It is noted that the project will work on SLM in 1.309million ha, which we assume includes the WCA and surrounding corridors/bufferzones outside of the WCA? It also notes in page 4 that the project will work in an area of 1288809ha. Pls explain and clarify the area coverages and their relations.</p> <p>5. While the policy and institutional arrangements for the PAs management are well explained in the PIF, further information would be requested on the policy and institutional setting on the SLM. Moreover, pls clarify ongoing efforts to mainstream environment and biodiversity in agriculture and rangeland management, if any, and how this project will address the SLM related</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>policy issues.</p> <p>6. Baseline projects seem to include past projects. Pls clarify the ongoing and planned baseline activities in relation to the PIF.</p> <p>7. Sustainability issues: as noted also in the risk analysis section, it may be useful to consider the project implementation in a longer term (to 5 years, instead of 4 years?) considering the limited absorptive capacity. Please also refer to the vast coverage area of the project and the possible need to focus considering the capacity. Pls consider and explain as necessary.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been discussed and adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>15 March, YW: Further information required. Please note comments under section 13 and 14.</p> <p>28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/	<p>15 March, YW: Gender issues are adequately addressed. Further information and details are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	15 March, YW: On institutional arrangement, the role of WCS is critical thus pls further clarify what it means by noting WCS as "Executing Agency Partner" and their role for project implementation. 28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been clarified. Cleared.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Adequate. The project would be a rather high risk undertaking.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	15 march, YW: Adequate information provided at this stage. Further details and arrangement should be clarified at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	15 March, YW: Generally adequate. Please further clarify the role of WCS. 28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been addressed under #17. Cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	15 Mar 2012 YW No. The Project Management Cost is slightly higher than 5% of the sub-total grant. Please revise. 28 Mar 2012 UA: Has been revised. Cleared.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	15 March 2012, YW: Yes the project's cofinancing ratio is 1 to 6 and considered appropriate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes, refer above.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	12 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. UNDP contributes \$3 million in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No, please address the issues raised above and resubmit the revised PIF. 28 Mar 2012 YW & UA: Yes. PMs recommend the PIF for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 28, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.