



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

GEF ID:	6914		
Country/Region:	Afghanistan		
Project Title:	Adapting Afghan Communities to Climate-Induced Disaster Risks		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5398 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$5,600,000
Co-financing:	\$54,721,000	Total Project Cost:	\$60,521,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Claudia Ortiz

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 has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. A letter of endorsement, signed by the OFP and dated July 9, 2014, has been submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	FI, 8/25/14: No. Of the current LDCF ceiling of \$30 million per LDC under the principle of	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>equitable access, \$23.7 million in LDCF funding has already been committed for Afghanistan. The amount currently available to the country in LDCF funding is therefore \$6.3 million, including PPG and fees. (The current request is for \$9 million, excluding PPG and fees.)</p> <p>Update, FI, 9/26/14: Yes. The amount requested has been adjusted so that it is within resources currently available to Afghanistan. However, please see Item 24.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <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>Yes. It is aligned with CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems), CCA-2 (strengthening institutional and technical capacities for effective CCA) and CCA-3 (integrating CCA in relevant policies, plans and associated processes).</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. It is consistent with priority areas of Afghanistan's NAPA: (i) addressing the risks posed by climate change to disaster preparedness efforts and infrastructure, and (ii) building capacity for climate change adaptation. The project will implement activities identified in the country's national and sector plans, and is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		aligned with the country's UNDAF (2015-19), Outcome 1.	
Project Design	6. 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>Yes.</p> <p>Baseline problem: Afghanistan is vulnerable to flooding, landslide and drought, which result in loss of property, livelihood, ecosystems and life. Climate change is expected to exacerbate these risks and the losses associated with them. Ensuring that the vulnerable poor are better able to anticipate and respond to climatic hazards requires resilience at the community level (e.g., improved/diversified livelihoods, EWS) as well as addressing political, socio-economic and institutional barriers.</p> <p>Baseline projects include: (i) 'Response to Devastating Floods & Landslides in Northern Afghanistan' (UNDP), (ii) 'Disaster Preparedness in the Badakhshan Province' (GIZ), (iii) 'Afghanistan Rural Access' (World Bank); and (iv) 'Community-based Rehabilitation and Development' (ADB).</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>FI, 8/25/14:</p> <p>Yes for PIF stage. The project will enhance disaster risk reduction/management capability to boost resilience to current and projected future climate variability and hazards; support community-based early warning systems; implement climate-resilient livelihood improvement actions in selected communities; and strengthen institutional capacity to anticipate and manage climate-related risks at national and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provincial levels through relevant plans, policies and budgetary allocations.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on the specific adaptation actions that will be undertaken, providing a clear rationale how these actions go above and beyond current needs, including those posed by climatic variability and extremes, to the additional risks posed by climate change.</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. Disaster management is Afghanistan has been addressed mostly through relief and response measures that are put in place after the occurrence of the disaster. The LDCF project will provide support to shift this approach to one where ex-ante measures are in place that boost resilience and enable planning agencies and communities to anticipate and prepare for climatic hazards, including the ability to cope with greater variability in their occurrence.</p> <p>This will be done by expanding on existing disaster relief efforts to also address the expected impacts of climate change; improving climate information resources and maps; boosting community engagement in ongoing early warning system baseline work; improve coordination across disaster response agencies with those working on EWS; improve small-scale water infrastructure to improve rural food security; and integrate adaptation within the MRRD Disaster Management Strategy 2014-17.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>FI, 8/24/14: Yes for PIF stage. Several relevant government agencies and ministries have been identified. However, as yet there is no information on which civil society agencies will be engaged, or community groups.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on the CSOs/NGOs that will be involved in project implementation, as well as how community members (including women) will be involved in project design and implementation.</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)	Yes; major risks have been identified (political, organizational conflict, human resource constraints, climatic variability, technical capacity constraints and limited women's engagement in communities). Mitigation measures have been suggested for the risks.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project will coordinate with ongoing adaptation-relevant projects and initiatives in Afghanistan, including UNDP implemented LDCF projects. It will pay particular heed to the country's NAP process, and will also coordinate with activities of national and international NGOs (particularly those	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		working on disaster risk reduction).	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Innovativeness: The project will integrate CCA considerations in DRR efforts, which, for Afghanistan, is innovative. Further, it will help communities to be proactive, as opposed to reactive, in DRR efforts.</p> <p>Sustainability: not adequately addressed.</p> <p>Scale-up: The project will build the capacity of government officials, who can then serve as 'champions' advocating for the scale-up of CCA across other geographic areas or sectors.</p> <p>FI, 8/25/14: Recommended action: Please provide more information on the project's strategy for sustainability.</p> <p>Update, FI, 9/26/14: Yes, the Agency has provided adequate explanation of measures being taken to ensure sustainability of project activities and outcomes. These include the use of indigenous knowledge, an impact assessment strategy, cross-learning between district and provincial councils, leveraging private partners, and capacity-building activities.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	<p>FI, 8/25/14: Not quite. The distribution of co-financing across the proposed components is fine. However, the requested LDCF grant envelope will need to be brought to within \$6.3 million, including PPG and fees (see Item 3, above).</p> <p>Update, FI, 9/26/14: Yes.</p>	
	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. Co-financing is adequate, at \$54,721,000; of this, \$52,000,000 is being provided in grant funding through WB and ADB projects, \$1,000,000 in grant funding through the UNDP, and the remainder in in-kind contributions.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>FI, 8/25/14: Response is pending revised LDCF grant request and PMC amount.</p> <p>Update, FI, 9/26/14: Yes, at 4.6 percent of the revised project grant request.</p>	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line	FI, 8/25/14: Not enough information. This will depend on the revised project cost (please refer to Item 3, above).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Update, FI, 9/26/14: Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>FI, 8/25/14: Not yet. Please address items 3, 13, 16, 18 and 19. Please also specify the Agency fee amount in the 'Project Information' section in Part 1 of the Datasheet.</p> <p>Update, FI 9/26/14: Yes, the proposal is technically cleared. However, the GEF has temporarily suspended the approval of LDCF funds until additional contributions are received. The project will be processed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		for Council review and approval as soon as adequate resources become available.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Item 10.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 25, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 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.**