

Strengthening climate resilience of communities in Angola through community-based adaptation action

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11545
Countries
Angola
Project Name
Strengthening climate resilience of communities in Angola through community-based adaptation action
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
9/15/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Jason Spensley
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
FSP

PIF
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 16, 2025:

Output 1.1.2: We appreciate the value of this outcome. Please clarify how private sector and local civil society actors will be involved in the capacity building program. For example, to help ensure

financial sustainability of the project, please clarify how inclusive financial service providers will be a focus and actively engaged.

Outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3: We appreciate the focus on microfinance as a strategy. Why is the engagement with microfinance limited to matching grants? Please design a more financially sustainable approach. How will the farmers and MSMEs be able to gain access to capital and just terms to gain the inputs their need to transition to more climate resilient practices? How will grants be provided after the project is completed? Please consider opportunities to partner with microfinance institution's for them to open lines of credit at below market terms due to derisking and/pr technical assistance support by the project?

Agency Response

24 October 2025

1. Output 1.1.2 has been revised and explicitly integrates mechanisms for private sector and civil society participation. Revised text clarifies that financial service providers, agribusinesses, and SMEs will co-develop and deliver training on business planning and value chain management. It also introduces partnerships with microfinance networks linked to FADA (Agriculture Development Fund), KixiCr?dito and the National Institute for Support to Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (INAPEM)?s BSP Network, and collaboration with NGOs like Action for Rural Development and Environment (ADRA Angola) and CODESPA to extend outreach, mentoring, and sustainability of the program.

2. Outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3: INAPEM has played a key role in developing micro-finance systems, in collaboration with FAO and other donors. Details of this baseline have been added to Section A.3. In addition, the description of Output 3.1.3 has been expanded to reflect this information and incorporate incremental support into the project strategy. Finally, corresponding changes have been made to the activities described in the Workplan.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and

critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 16, 2025:

Yes

Agency Response

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 16, 2025:

Please define how the project clearly identifies targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s).

Agency Response

24 October 2025

Relevant section in the project document has been revised to show which Kunming targets the project will contribute to and how.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 16, 2025:

We acknowledge the inclusion of the ESS supporting documents and would like to provide the following comments and requests for further action: Angola is home to Indigenous Peoples and local communities (IPLCs). In line with GEF's Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS), the project should assess their presence and situation to determine whether they are present in the implementation area and/or may be affected by project activities. For clarity, the GEF's ESS are aligned with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and ILO Convention 169, which affirm that Indigenous Peoples have the right to self-identify.

Accordingly, we request the following actions:

? Revise the Project Document (PD) and reassess the ESS to explicitly identify the measures the implementing agency will adopt in cases where Indigenous Peoples and local communities are present in, or potentially affected by, the project area and activities. This includes the application of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) and the assurance of meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities throughout both project design and implementation.

? Update the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) to describe how Indigenous Peoples and local communities will be consulted and meaningfully included.

? Reflect these changes in the PD's Key Risks section and ESS summary, ensuring coherence across project documentation.

Agency Response

24 October 2025

The project document, including Key Risks and ESS sections, and SEP have been revised in line with the comments. Thanks.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 16, 2025:

Please ask agency to identify and name, in the stakeholder engagement plan (annex j in the prodoc), the specific CBOs/associations, women and youth groups as well as CSOs and NGO that the project plans to engage in project implementation, including their specific and different roles and responsibilities related to project components and outputs.

Agency Response

24 October 2025

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been revised accordingly, thanks.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 19, 2025:

1) Please include co-financing from the Agency.

2) Please provide the evidence of cofinancing for both ministry of environment and ministry of agriculture.

Agency Response

24 October 2025

Co-financing has been reviewed and we have provided the co-financing letter from the Government of Angola.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 27, 2025:

Cleared

September 19, 2025:

Please include a map

Agency Response

24 October 2025

We have included the map.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 3, 2025:

Cleared, pending review by OP.

September 19, 2025:

1) Please provide more information, including a financial breakdown, of the 5 contracts proposed, each which have a value ranging from \$300,000 to \$1,350,000.

2) A National Project Coordinator and 4 Provincial Coordinators are being charged to both project components and PMC. Please provide detailed TORs for these positions in the Prodoc. Also, as it looks as a position linked to the management unit, please provide the TORs of the Field level FSS implementation assistant (\$280,000). When resubmitted, we will review the budget table again and provide comments if appropriate.

Agency Response

24 October 2025

1. Additional information on the contracts proposed has been provided.

2. We have also included expanded ToRs of key PMU positions in Annex L.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 19, 2025:

Several comments need to be addressed. Please respond to all comments in this review sheet and indicate where the corresponding specific revisions are made in the CER.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/18/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/7/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/3/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		