



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5017		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Developing Core Capacity for Decentralized MEA Implementation and Natural Resources Management in Afghanistan		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-2; CD-3; CD-3; CD-4; CD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$910,000
Co-financing:	\$1,625,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,535,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Monika McDavette, DEWA

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?	Yes. Afghanistan ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on 09/19/2002 the Convention on Climate Change on 09/19/2002; and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in 1995. Cleared June 26, 2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Letter dated 3/10/2012 (Mostapha Zaher). Cleared June 26, 2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP has comparative advantage in the area of capacity development, providing technical and policy support. UNEP has been supporting the Afghan government agencies in capacity development and has provided technical and administrative support to the INC,	

*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)
		the NAPAs, the NBSAP and the NCSA. Cleared June 26, 2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project is consistent with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and with UNEP's Mid-Term Strategy for 2010-2013. UNEPs' office in Afghanistan has a working relationship with the government. However, no indication is given about the number of staff who will be supporting the project. Additional information is requested. June 26,2012. Revision provided on UNEP staff who will be involved in the project. Cleared 9/26/2012	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, Cross-cutting Capacity Development. Cleared June 26. 2012	
	• 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?	It's consistent with Afghanistan's National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) completed in 2006 and what	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the country's core capacity needs are to implement the UNFCCC, the UNCCD and the CBD. Cleared. June 26, 2012	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. They are identified. Cleared June 26, 2012	
	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?	The project is consistent to some degree with the NCSA and its strategy developed in 2006. However, further details on specific actions should be provided. Additional information is requested. June 26, 2012 Clarification provided in the revised PIF. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	It specifies the gaps as identified in the NCSA and how the project will fill most of them through capacity development of agency staff and the creation of an inter-ministerial task force at the central level. However, it is not clear how capacities developed will be sustained. Additional information is requested. June 26, 2012 Revised PIF provided sufficient information. Cleared. 9/26/2012	
	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?	The baseline project is described to some degree; however the information provided is not sufficient to understand the baseline without relevant data. Additional information is requested. June 26,2012. The PIF provided a satisfactory revision. Cleared 9/26/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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>Yes, the incremental reasoning is explained, but no cash co-financing is provided. It's recommended that some cash co-financing be included, particularly from the government. A 1:1 ratio in cash is necessary. Additional information is requested. June 26,2012.</p> <p>Cash co-financing has been increased and it's now slightly below 1:1. The revised PIF indicated that it may increase during project preparation. Cleared 9/26/2012</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>It is sound to some degree. However, the project seems overly ambitious for the amount of funding. It's not clear how certain outputs of the project can be achieved with the relatively discrete amount of resources from the GEF and with no cash co-financing from the government. Four CCCD objectives are included and the outputs seem somewhat unrealistic with the amount of money requested. It is not clear what kind of policies, legal frameworks, etc. will be developed (or is determined necessary through NCSA). Additional information is requested. June 26,2012</p> <p>Explanation provided in the PIF is satisfactory. Cleared 9/26/2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Somewhat appropriate. However additional information should be provided with illustrative data and global environmental benefits (GEB) that the project will bring about. June 26, 2012 Revised PIF provided additional information. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	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/additional benefits?	The socio-economic benefits are not described in detail. Same with the gender dimensions. Please provide relevant data. Additional information is requested. June 26,2012. Revised PIF provided the information requested. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. There are clear roles for CSOs established in the project, including capacity development for NGOs and CBOs. However, a description of the CSO landscape in the country would be useful and of the particular mechanisms that will be used to develop their capacity. More information on these two aspects is requested. June 26,2012. The revised PIF included further clarification. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	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)	Yes. It does. Cleared June 26, 2012	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, it is to some degree. However, additional information/linkages with existing capacity development projects listed in section B.5 should be provided.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Additional information is requested. June 26, 2012. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Not provided. Please provide. June 26, 2012. Provided in the revised PIF. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	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?	Appropriate to some degree. However, as mentioned below, the total cost of the project seems low for the ambitious objectives and outputs that are included. It is recommended that the co-financing be increased substantially or that the objectives be reduced. June 26,2012. The revised PIF includes a higher amount of cash co-financing. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	No. The project seems too ambitious for the amount of funding. All four eligible CCCD objectives are included and the outputs seem somewhat unrealistic with the amount of resources. It's recommended that the objectives be reduced and proper costing is considered. Additional information is requested. June 26,2012.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The revised PIF seems more streamlined and clear. Cleared 9/26/2012	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Cash co-financing should be provided by the government or other partners with a 1:1 ratio. Please provide. It is also hard to understand how with such substantial in-kind co-financing from the government, it's not possible to make most of the changes proposed in the project. Please provide more details. June 26,2012. The revised PIF provided a cash co-financing increase and indicated that other sources of cash co-financing will be identified. HOWEVER, TABLE D HAS NOT BEEN FILLED IN. Please provide. 9/26/2012	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, to some degree. However the total cost of the project and the co-financing from other partners should be reviewed as per comments above. Additional clarification is requested. June 26,2012. Cleared, 9/26/2012	
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Additional information is being requested. June 26, 2012 Yes. However, please note that table D has not been filled D. Please provide Table D details Cleared 9/26/2012	
	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*	June 26, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 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.