



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

GEF ID:	5202		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Strengthening the resilience of rural livelihood options for Afghan communities in Panjshir, Balkh, Uruzgan and Herat Provinces to manage climate change-induced disaster risks		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5098 (UNDP)
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-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$9,000,000
Co-financing:	\$103,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$112,100,000
PIF Approval:	January 10, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	March 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	

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 is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	Yes. No change.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement stating the date of July 27, 2013 and signed by the Operational Focal Point is included.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, the UNDP has the comparative advantage to support this project as its substantial engagement in Afghanistan, notably through the National Area-Based Development Program, has addressed development issues in different areas and sectors, including	Yes. UNDP has the comparative advantage.

*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)
		water supply and disaster management.	
	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 Afghanistan country program is the largest UNDP operation in the world, delivering close to US\$753 million in assistance in 2011.	Yes.
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?	n/a	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested under this project is available for Afghanistan under the principle of equitable funding. This will be Afghanistan's second project under LDCF.	Yes.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, Components 1 and 2 are well-aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1, and CCA-2: reducing vulnerability, and increasing the adaptive capacity.	Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	Yes.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	Yes, the project is aligned with NAPA priorities as water, forestry, and agriculture were identified as the	Yes. The project is aligned with NAPA priorities.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	priority sectors, and droughts and floods among its most severe climatic hazards.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>The capacities developed, particularly for improving livelihoods, indicate sustainability. However, further clarifications on the sustainability of the rehabilitation of the 2,000 ha of degraded rangelands.</p> <p>Recommended action: by CEO endorsement, please elaborate further on the sustainability of project outcomes.</p>	Yes. To ensure sustainability of the project outcomes, ownership of the project by government structures is an integral part of project development and implementation. In addition, communities in priority project sites have been consulted and will actively be engaged in project implementation via a "learning-by-doing" approach in unison with traditional capacity building. As for rangeland rehabilitation, the project utilizes an incentive-based approach where local communities will receive cash for work based on the survival rate of planted stress resistant species.
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?	Yes. The choice of additional activities and baseline projects are highly mutually complementary.	Yes.
	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?		Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. The activities include incorporating adaptation into Community Development Plans, improving climate change information, feasibility assessment of water use, and investments in water-related infrastructures such as storage	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals, and checkdams, and developing and improving rural livelihoods, e.g. through diversification.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the framework is sound and clear.	Yes.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, it is clear.	Yes.
	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?	Yes, the socio-economic benefits are clear and compelling, including benefits for women and vulnerable farmers. The incorporation of climate change adaptation into community development plans will increase the resilience of communities at risk, and improvements to water infrastructure and rehabilitation of degraded lands is expected to benefit farmers communities significantly. Finally, economic diversification will reduce vulnerability where the current primary activity is climate-sensitive.	Yes, the description is clear and compelling.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, all major stakeholder groups have been identified.	Yes.
	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. Risks, and measures to mitigate them, are clearly identified in the project document.	Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The project is coordinated with the other LDCF-funded, UNEP-implemented project, and a number of national programs, as well as a number	Yes, the project is consistent and properly coordinated with a number of related initiatives in the country.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of regional initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	Yes.
	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?		Yes. The project structure is based on the PIF and incorporates comments provided at PIF stage.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	Yes. The project management cost is within 5% of the LDCF project grant.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	USD\$30.5 is the amount of cofinancing. The cofinancing/baseline consists of UNDP and World Bank grant-based programs.	Total confirmed co-financing is US\$103,000,000 and consists of US\$1M cash from UNDP; US\$70M investment from USAID; and US\$30M cash and US\$2M in-kind co-financing from the national government (Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock).
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. The project document includes the LDCF/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Tracking Tool.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		Yes. The project document includes a detailed budgeted M&E plan.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		Reasonable indicators and targets have been provided.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		Yes. The comments provided by the LDCF/SCCF Council have been addressed.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes.	
	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?		Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 26, 2012	February 28, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	Yes, the proposed activities are fine.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes. Please refer to the LDCF program requirement to facilitate the measurement of portfolio-level results, as per the results-based management policy covering the LDCF.
	4. Other comments	Please ensure, by CEO Endorsement, the selection of appropriate indicators corresponding to the strategic LDCF objectives towards which this project is expected to contribute. The filled out LDCF/SCCF Adaptation Monitoring and Tracking Tool should be submitted at CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 25, 2012
	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.