



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

Review PIF 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**

3/22/2024

**Review completed by PM**

3/25/2024

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**

**1. General Project Information / Eligibility**

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

I believe other FAO projects have specified a region. The GEFSec project manager will connect FAO focal points to the GEF Portal team to help FAO find the location of the regions selection function.

**25 March 2024:**

Please indicate the region as "Africa"

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

No region selection option in the portal.

**2. Project Summary**

**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 results?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Partially. Please see the set of comments for question 3 below.

## Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

Thanks. Comments addressed - please see below.

### **3 Indicative Project Overview**

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**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?**

## Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

A) The direct focus on climate change adaptation and resilience needs to be strengthened. As one way to do so:

(i) Please deepen articulation of the current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards in the country. Do these vary among regions of the country? This is important in order to ensure focus improving adaptive capacity of the target populations to the specific climate risks and vulnerabilities, through the outcomes and outputs.

(ii) Also, please more explicitly clarify how tenure will be improved by this project.

B) For example:

(i) Component 1: How will this component cope with and/or alleviate the major limitation described in the PIF of the understaffing and limited expertise in the public sector at the subnational levels?

(ii) Output 1.1.1: Please provide further information on the nature and objectives of the National Climate and Environment Observatory that is proposed to be created with support of this project. The support from this project to this observatory seems to be relatively limited in relation to the task of creating, operating, and maintaining a national observatory. What is the sustainable financing strategy for the ongoing maintenance, management, and operations of the National Climate and Environment Observatory. A global tendency is for observatories of this nature to be created, but to then not be fully operational due to insufficient financial and technical resources for their operations and maintenance. Please either ensure a robust ongoing sustainable financial plan is in place for maintenance and operations on an ongoing basis, or remove this output.

(iii) Output 1.1.1: Beyond simply establishing the observatory, how will climate and environment information be communicated in a clear, timely and usable manner for national decision makers, as well as local populations? In considering this, please factor in the lack of electricity in rural areas, and in some cases in provincial capitals. Please either ensure a robust dissemination mechanism in a way that the information will be used by the target populations. Please ensure these aspects will be robust or reformulate or remove this proposed output.

(iv) Component 2: Please provide more explicit explanation and focus of this component to address the current and anticipated impacts (e.g. crop failure) of specific climate hazards (e.g. reduced rainfall and increased temperatures). The outcomes and outputs in this component are currently only partially focused as cost-effective solutions to the specified climate impacts and vulnerability challenges of the local populations. Please make these links more directly to the climate problem, and adjust the outcomes and outputs accordingly as needed.

(v) Output 2.1.1: Please directly focus this output on climate adaptation and resilience. Text in earlier sections of the PIF touch on the potential climate mitigation and biodiversity value of this output, but more direct linkage and focus on climate change adaptation and resilience impact is needed for LDCF support.

(vi) Output 2.1.2: Please more directly focus and articulate how CBNRM establishment and management will result in people's adaptation and resilience to the current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards.

(vii) Output 2.1.2: Please ensure a strategy for the financial sustainability of managing CBNRMs in the medium and long term, after this project ends.

(viii) Component 3: Similar to comments above, please strengthen the focus of this component, and its outcome and outputs on addressing the climate change problem, but helping the target population to transition to more climate resilient livelihood practices.

(ix) Outcome 3.1: How will the practices to be promoted be selected directly based on their expected climate change adaptation and resilience impact to the livelihoods of the target population? What criteria will be used, and how will this impact be monitored?

(ix) Outcome 3.2: For example, is the focus of this outcome to provide necessary capital at accessible terms to help farmers and MSMEs transition to more climate resilient practices and business activities?

(x) Outcome 3.2: Please clarify how the micro loans will be provided to producers with support of this project. Will partnerships be formed with any existing microfinance institutions (MFIs) and/or producer cooperatives? Please consider opportunities for the project to provide an interest rate buy down or guarantee to MFIs for them to provide lines of credit to producers at relatively accessible terms. Please also consider provision of

technical assistance to MFIs on developing their climate resilience lending products, as well as improving their lending systems so as to make loans more efficient and accessible to their clients.

## Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

A.

i) The climate rationale has been refined to emphasize and clarify the current climate situation and how the project will increase climate resilience and adaptive capacity of the targeted communities. Proposed outcomes and outputs have also been revised.

ii) This is addressed through output 2.1.1 "Establishment of community-based natural resources management areas supported". The current policy framework allows for registration of communal land, giving communities long-term rights to land and forest resources. There is a process that needs to be followed and requires communities to structure themselves into associations, to create community-based natural resources management areas (CBNRM) and apply for long-term concessions. At the moment, there is limited awareness (and capacity) in rural areas from both local authorities and communities on CBNRM opportunities.

Land tenure security is fundamental to unlocking investments in and adoption of climate-resilient and sustainable land management practices, hence the proposed project's focus on this issue.

B)

(i) Component 1 has been revised and includes Output 1.1.2 Comprehensive capacity building program for central and provincial governments, municipal authorities, communities and NGOs to support integrated participatory land use planning, climate change adaptation and NRM (incl. decision-support tools for planning, implementation and monitoring), ensuring equitable participation of men, women and youth.

(ii) and (iii) the observatory output has been eliminated. Component 2 will include aspects related to improving communities' access to climate information - to be further refined during PPG.

(iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) component 2 and its outputs has been revised to focus on climate change adaptation and resilience.

(viii) Component 3 has also been revised to focus on addressing the climate change problem .

(ix) Practices to be promoted will be selected in a participatory manner with communities, and TAPE (Tool for Agroecological Performance Evaluation) is one of the tools that could be used and will be considered during PPG. TAPE criteria includes all key aspects of resilience and sustainability in agrifood systems, and provides a good framework for monitoring impact. Past FAO-GEF projects in Angola have used SHARP tool (Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience) which will also be considered.

(ix) and (x) outputs related to improving access to finance and engagement with financial institutions have been revised - strengthened, expanded.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

As per GEF guidance, gender needs to be integrated in the project description, components and outputs. Please integrate gender perspectives, in particular, in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3., 1.1.4., 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and outcome 3.1. Please ensure to capture and disseminate good practice and lessons learned from a gender perspective in Outcome 4.1. and gender-specific results are considered and reported on under M&E.

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

Outputs revised to integrate gender perspectives.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

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

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

A grant for co-finance is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please revise accordingly, so grant is classified as ?recurrent expenditures?.

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

Co-financing classification revised.

#### **4 Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

###### **4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

A) Please see and address the comments above on more explicitly articulating the climate problem that will be addressed by this project, and why the proposed interventions are cost effective ways of doing so for the target population.

B) Please see and address the comment above on how specifically this project will address or alleviate the land tenure challenge, as well as how this project will address the barrier to access to capital for small scale farmers and entrepreneurs to transition to more climate resilience practices.

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

A) Please see responses above. The description of the climate problem and barriers to adaptation and resilience has been thoroughly revised;

B) Please see responses above. Revisions made to clarify the land tenure challenge and how the project will address it. Outputs related to access to capital have been revised/introduced.

#### **4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) 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?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

A) Partially. Please articulate why the approach will drive to greater climate adaptation and resilience than other possible approaches.

B) Partially. Please address the full set of comments.

C) Not really. Please expand on this, referencing specific projects and initiatives, and the learning gained.

D) Please expand on the role of microfinance actors and cooperatives, and stakeholder consultations with them.

#### Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

A) A description of the proposed approach, why it was considered to be most appropriate has now been provided.

B) Comments addressed.

C) Lessons learned from specific projects included.



D) Subsection expanding on the role of finance (including micro-finance) actors and cooperatives has been introduced. Comprehensive mapping and consultations with these stakeholders will be undertaken during PPG.

## **5 B. Project Description**

### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

A) Partially. Please include key assumptions in the ToC.

B) Not fully.

Agency's Comments

A) ToC revised and assumptions included.

B) Revised.

### **5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

### **5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

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

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

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

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

Given the large area of land managed for climate resilience (250,000,000 hectares), the number of direct beneficiaries seems very low (100,000). This is one person directly benefiting per 2,500 hectares, which seems frankly strange. We also note there will be twice as many people trained as directly benefiting, which seems off.

Agency's Comments Core indicators have been revised. 250,000,000 hectares was an error - supposed to be 250,000 hectares.

**5.5 NCI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

## Agency's Comments

### 5.6 RISKS

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**
- 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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

## Secretariat's Comments

### 29 April 2024:

Cleared.

### 25 March 2024:

We note some other projects in Angola have had major implementation delays. Please consider this risk and how this risk will be mitigated.

With regards to the component on micro lending and MSME development, please consider and identify ways to mitigate the risk of inability to identify partners with sufficient capacity to carry out these activities.

## Agency's Comments

### 25 April 2024

Indeed implementation delays have been an issue. This risk and proposed mitigation measures now reflected in the risk table.

Risk associated with micro-lending and MSME development considered as well.

### 5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) **Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) **Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) **Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared, based on responses above and revisions in the PIF.

**25 March 2024:**

A) Please note and address the comments above on financial sustainability of the project interventions.

B) Please note and address the comments above on how the project will address land tenure challenges, and how this will improve the climate adaptation and resilience of the target population.

Agency's Comments

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

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

Although this project is seeking resources from the LDCF, please note the comment from the CBD Secretariat in the stakeholders comments section.

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

A brief description of how the project contributed to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework targets is now included.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 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's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments



#### **Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

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

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Cleared.

**25 March 2024:**

Given the focus on biodiversity and biodiversity co-benefits in the narrative, why is BD not indicated as Rio Marker 1?

Agency's Comments

25 April 2024

BD marker revised to 1.

#### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

**25 March 2024:**

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

## **9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

**29 April 2024:**

Yes, pending any further comments from PPO/operations.

**25 March 2024:**

Not yet. Several comments need to be fully addressed.

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/25/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/29/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		