

# Land and natural resource degradation neutrality and community vulnerability reduction in selected Miombo and Mopane Ecoregions of Angola (Okavango and Cunene river basin)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10256

**Countries**

Angola

**Project Name**

Land and natural resource degradation neutrality and community vulnerability reduction in selected Miombo and Mopane Ecoregions of Angola (Okavango and Cunene river basin)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

12/11/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/9/2021

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

However, please retain only the IP SFM Drylands "Dryland Landscapes Sustainably managed" alignment for the entire amount (same as in parent PFD).

- please set CCM Rio Marker to 2 as CCM funding is involved.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Noted and revised.

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

However, the PMC co-financing is not fully proportional to the overall co-financing ratio. Please justify and make sure that sufficient co-financing of PMC is available so that no management costs are charged to project components.

03/25/2021: Not fully addressed.

This is not justified since there is 34.5 million of co-financing listed in Table C. Further, the budget includes PMC costs that are charged to the components. Please also explore FAO co-financing to PMCs if the government is not able to increase the amount.

Please revise accordingly.

04/09/2021: Addressed as per agency response below. The issue is still not fully resolved. While a justification for lower PMC co-financing ratio (1 : 4.3 vs 1 : 6.3) can be discussed in the context provided in the response; however, there are still some charges towards project components that need to be covered by PMC first as a basis for accepting a lower PMC co-financing ratio.

For detailed comments of the budget and PMC line items, please see box 5 below.

04/27/2021: Addressed (explanation provided by agency under box 5 below).

Based on the discussions with the agency, explanation of the specific context of the project and the additional justification provided, Program Manager approves (i) the disproportionate ratio of PMC co-finance to overall co-finance (1 : 4.3 vs 1 : 6.3), and (ii) approves the TOR provided for the position of the National Project Coordinator.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/19/2021

addressed below (box5)

03/28/2021

The PMC (government and FAO) amount has been increased as much as realistically possible (exploring all options available). The budget has been revised, ensuring that no PMC is charged to the components. See additional information provided under question 5.

Although the PMC co-financing is not fully proportional to the overall co-financing ratio, the coverage of essential PMC related tasks will be assured throughout the project's implementation. At this point and despite all efforts the project team in consultation with the government was not able to increase the amount. Further consultation will take place with partners during the inception meeting to identify additional (relevant) PMC resources. More detailed information of the current co-financed PMC has been detailed in Table 1 and subsequent co-financing description (see also following response below). All project related management costs are reflected under PMC and not charged to the project components as per GEF policy. The budget has been revised accordingly.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response N/A

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

However, all co-financing is investment mobilized. Please clarify how recurrent expenditures will be covered, especially management costs (see comment above).

03/25/2021: Not fully addressed.

I don't see the response reflected in the Table C, which still has the categories unchanged. The information in the table is also not in line with the co-financing letters, which state that contributions are in kind. For example, the FAO co-financing letter has "in kind" contribution but Table C has "grant".

04/09/2021: Outstanding issues:

- At the time of the review, the revised co-financing letters was not yet uploaded in the documents section in portal. Please provide.
- Co-financing from IFAD should be labeled as a loan from a donor Agency (even if the letter is issued by the Government's implementing unit), as indicated in the letter.

04/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

04/19/2021

Revised letter of co-financing has been uploaded.  
Table C in ProDoc and portal has been updated accordingly

03/28/2021

Table C has been adjusted. The co-financing letters have been amended accordingly and will be re-submitted as soon as signed by government and the FAO Representation of Angola respectively.

The co-financing contributions by the government to cover management costs are in-kind contributions and now itemized in table 1 and subsequent co-financing description.

In summary, the in-kind co-financing will cover: (i) the use of office facilities at Luanda as well as in the two provinces, municipalities and communes for project offices (PMU staff and regional facilitators), meetings and trainings during 5 years: USD 240.000, (ii) contribution to expendables in project offices for 5 years: USD 40.000, (iii) contribution to mobility at field level and the capital during 5 years: USD 170.000, and (iv) staff time of public institutions: directors and authorities, technicians and support staff (drivers, admin) during 5 years: \$ 240.000.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

#### **5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

##### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

Table D is adequate.

However, the budget proposal is not adequate and needs substantial revisions. Please note that the budget cannot be fully assessed at this stage as it is not presented as a GEF budget template, only with FAO cost categories. Please present the budget as per GEF guidelines and also paste into portal in Annex F. In the revision please take the following points (but not limited to these points) into account :

- The budget needs revision in line with FAO not providing execution support services (see also further below).
- Vehicles need justification as to why they are needed and an explanation why the GEF grant instead of co-financing is used. Further, credible co-financing arrangements should in place in order to consider the request.
- The GEF amount going towards field implementation is considered too low. Please make every effort to increase the amounts going towards field implementation. Please do not include any further studies or proposals that are related to only prepare implementation measures (e.g. firm to elaborate proposals for implementation, and other studies preparing or formulating proposals or strategies). This type of studies/proposals should have been covered during the PPG phase by using PPG funds.
- Also note that all costs related to project management must be charged to PMC and co-financed as per GEF guidelines.

03/25/2021: Thank you submitting the budget in a separate Excel table. The reviewer has the following comments:

- PMC costs are still partly charged to project components (National Project coordinator, Admin & accounting officer). Please revise.

- The request for 2 vehicles is considered justified and herewith approved. However, please work with the government to fund the costs for drivers out of co-finance (this would also free up the amount for PMC costs that are currently charged to components). Further, please clarify what is meant by "maintenance vehicle" (\$60,000), which is in addition to the 2 vehicles).

04/09/2021: Not fully addressed.

(i) Miscellaneous general operating expenses usually should be charged to PMC but not to project components. Please utilize co-financing.

(ii) National Project Coordinator is charged to PMC and to the Project Components - please use PMC to cover this (GEF portion and co-financing portion).

(iii) Execution Capacity development Support and ESS monitoring specialist is charged to the project components, M&E and PMC ? if this specialist is for monitoring as he/she seems to be scheduled to work throughout the lifetime of the project (60 months), it has to be charged to M&E.

(iv) IT equipment for decentralized offices and PMU office are charged to the Project Components ? at least the portion correspondent to the PMU office has to be charged to PMC.

(v) Miscellaneous are generally operating expenses, so they should be charged to PMC but not to project components. Please utilize co-financing portion allocated to PMC.

04/27/2021: Addressed.

Program Manager approves the TOR for the National Project Coordinator. The arrangements are considered acceptable on an exceptional basis based on the specific context of the project.

Cleared.

Agency Response

04/19/2021

- (i) Miscellaneous costs were removed from the budget
- (ii) The NPC will contribute to technical deliverables that are beyond PMC related tasks as outlined in the revised TORs. Associated costs are therefore spread over the technical outcomes. Due to nature of PMC co-financing it is unfortunately not possible for the government to co-finance this position. However, the government will substantially support the PMU's operations logistically and technically as detailed in previous response.
- (iii) The costs for this profile were moved under the M&E budget.
- (iv) A proportion of the IT equipment (relevant to PMU) was shifted under PMC as requested.
- (v) Please refer to (i)

03/28/2021

PMC costs have been revised. Please note that the National Project Coordinator will also contribute technically to the project components. The TORs have been strengthened accordingly.

Thank you for the approval of the vehicles. The government has agreed to fully co-finance one driver and 20% of the costs for the second driver. These contributions have been included in the government's PMC co-financing.

The maintenance costs for the vehicles have been reviewed and removed from the budget.

During the negotiation of the guidelines to the PPC, the GEF SEC confirmed that Agencies can use their own templates and cost categories as long as funds flow is clear. GEF specific cost categories such as PMC and M&E costs are included in this template.

The project budget has been amended and funds reallocated to increase investments into field-based operations as per GEF-SEC recommendations.

FAO is now only providing minor, very targeted support functions to the lead executing agency (The Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment, MCTA) at country level that are essential to the smooth and consistent delivery of the program - considering that this is the first GEF project for MCTA with FAO to carry out execution leadership. Services provided will support MCTA in the management of the project including direct support for mitigating financial as well as environment and social risks.

For that purpose and as requested by the government of Angola, FAO will engage a national expert (Execution Capacity Development Support and ESS monitoring specialist, see link to TORs below, and also included in the Annex M: ToRs of the



prodoc) budgeted on PMC and on M&E budget to support and build MCTA's capacity in the following critical areas:

? Ensuring coherence and timely engagement with regional and global learning, monitoring, and reporting efforts as well as the provision of the GCP's technical support services. FAO is well-positioned to ensure that the project optimizes its interactions both regionally and globally. Through this targeted support the project management unit will be in a better position to interface directly with the Regional Exchange Mechanism, ensuring a consistent and reliable bi-directional flow of data and knowledge.

? Managing risks related to environmental and social safeguards (ESS) that were triggered during the design process, and the implementation and monitoring of corresponding risk mitigation plan. The ESS that require additional support are related to conflict resolution and tenure (as part of the integrated land use planning, ESS-1), crop genetic resources (establishment of community seeds banks, ESS 3) as well as climate risks (to be incorporated in the land use planning process). See relevant section in the ProDoc.

? Implementing the fiduciary risk mitigation plan. The fiduciary assessment of execution capacity (conducted by the external audit firm BDO) is currently on-going and it is anticipated that MCTA will require capacity building support in some critical areas (including procurement and sub-contracting capacities).

In view of the tasks, the inputs provided by the implementing agency fee and own co-financing alone are not expected to be sufficient to ensure the desired level of coordination, application of environmental and social safeguards, coherent flow of knowledge and monitoring of agencies performances and contributions.

TORS (Execution Capacity Development Support and ESS monitoring specialist):  
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SR9edDuHwhWnP1VJtjAmoha0IbObHHck/view?usp=sharing>

The Number of cars has been reduced from 3 to 2. The vehicle foreseen in support of the PMU in Luanda was removed and will be covered by co-financing contributions (see itemized co-financing/PMC, Table 1). The two vehicles covered by the project (components) are required to ensure that field interventions can be carried out in efficient and timely manner as logistical support that can be provided by project partners is very limited in the targeted intervention areas. The existing cars of local institutions will support the project as much as possible. However, these vehicles are already assigned to other projects and programmes and are therefore not always available

causing possible delays in the project's field activities. In addition, the geographical focus of the project is very large with difficult terrain, therefore sufficient mobility is needed in each province.

As mentioned, the GEF amount allocated to field implementation has been increased, the budget for international consultants was reduced and non-essential studies were removed from the budget after thorough review by FAO and government counterparts. The budget lines for direct field interventions were increased, including investments in SLM/SFM and corresponding value chains. Budget lines crucial to build the government's capacity, especially with regards to Integrated Landscape Assessment and Land Use Planning were maintained. Note: the fact that all existing 166 territorial management plans in Angola were developed by or with support from external consultants highlights just one area that requires a strong capacity development approach.

All costs related to project management are charged to PMC and co-financed by the government.

#### **Project Preparation Grant**

#### **6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: It is reported in the project document; please also paste into Annex C section of the portal.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The PPG utilization table has been included in Annex C as requested.

**Core indicators**

#### **7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Clarification requested.

Table E indicates no BD related targets / benefits. While the project is not specifically funded by BD STAR, it still comes under the SFM parent program, so please clarify if there any BD related benefits and targets? The prodoc includes work on > 100,000 ha of forests (i.e. Tchipelongo forest), in which conservation measures will take place. Are any BD benefits expected from this (indicator 4.1?). Or is any HCVF forest areas involved (4.4)?

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

The core indicators were amended.

52,000 ha from Tchipelongo Forest (A7) has been shifted under sub-indicator 4.1.

For the same site, the loss of 2,000 ha of HCVF will be prevented (sub-indicator 4.4)

Additional explanation on the targeted HCVF is included in Annex X-4: HCVF Justification (see corresponding link below).

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fsokBcruKK1BqeDszvNb\\_sl-GgFf08Dh/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fsokBcruKK1BqeDszvNb_sl-GgFf08Dh/view?usp=sharing)

### Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

The project document neglects biodiversity aspects of its interventions and biodiversity is not included in the problem description. Even if biodiversity conservation is not the main focus of this project, there should be an assessment and consideration of the problems and some measures to address them within an integrated approach striving for multiple benefits. Please revise.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Relevant aspects on Biodiversity were included in the project document (context description, land degradation section, project strategy description).

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/20/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comments on Biodiversity related approach and targets.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

See above.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

04/09/2021: Please amend formatting issue in Table 4, which goes beyond the margins ? this will create a problem whenever the CEO Endorsement template is converted in pdf format for circulation / posting.

Agency Response

04/19/2021

formatting issues have been fixed

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

Please clarify how co-financing contributes to the GEF project in in what specific way.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Annex A3 includes a description of the co-financing and the contribution to the project interventions. It is further envisaged that the targeted National Development Programmes (PNDs) will be closely aligned with the results of the ILUP and corresponding action plan.

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes. However, please take the following into account and address as appropriate:

- The focus of the project is clearly on private sector engagement which addresses the core drivers of environmental degradation ? crop production, livestock and forestry. Charcoal is listed as a process contributing to land degradation with the extracted biomass used in urban centers. Consideration could be applied to better integrated (livestock/forest) management of charcoal production through certification, better kilns and the access to markets. CMO Global and FSC have models that may be suitable and include support from entities such as GIZ.

- The private sector in its consulting capacity could also be considered ? for the Farmer Business Schools, for advisory services into the value chains (GVC). These types of business development activities, including financial access could be of interest to private sector actors.

- The document references the high cost of living and the expenses from working within Luanda. These costs are driven by the resources sector, mostly oil and gas. Chevron, Exxon, Total, Eni, Petrobras and BP all produce and export oil and gas from Angola. A

concerted effort, through NBS approaches that directly link to the objectives of the sector could be considered to bolster co-finance.

- The Cunene River (and surrounds) is host to a number of productive diamond mines. Consideration could be made to engage the diamond mining sector in the project, as a landscape partner, with the objective of co-finance but also to improve the image and transparency of the sector and welfare of the mining communities.

- Angola's land tenure laws and practices (noted in 56-61) support carbon and PES trading. However local customs may be a barrier (99-105). Carbon could be added to the tenure challenges for the taskforce in output 1.1.2. Carbon benefit activities may include grasslands management to reduce the risk of major fire events, revegetation, forest protection, herd management, soil carbon sequestration. Such activities are listed in the NDC.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

(i) The DSL IP Project will work closely with GEF Project: Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach (GEF ID#5719) implemented by UNDP and MCTA. The UNDP GEF project is currently supporting the government in the development of a policy framework for sustainable charcoal value chains, including possible charcoal certification schemes. The DSL IP Project will further complement UNDP's interventions by introducing innovative demonstrations for greening the charcoal value chains (with focus on sustainable use of tree resources, more efficient wood to charcoal conversion techniques and end use appliances) and by demonstrating viable certification schemes (if necessary with REM support).

(ii) Duly noted, the project will explore these opportunities during the project implementation.

(iii) The project will explore these opportunities during the project implementation with the GCP's support on private sector involvement. An appropriate early step will be to invite representatives to the project inception workshop.

(iv) There are no diamond mines in the targeted intervention area.

(v) This is noted. In view of the existing capacity at government/country level, the opportunity to include carbon benefits and PES trading will be further explored during



project implementation with GCP/REM support, as part of innovative financing model other child projects can benefit from as well.

### **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

While all risks have been considered, including from the COVID-19 pandemic, what is lacking is the assessment of the opportunities in context of Angola's efforts to build back better. Please refer to GEF guidance in this regard, which was sent to all agencies.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

The COVID-19 section has been strengthened accordingly, opportunities will be further explored with government counter parts at project inception.

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

It is noted that the OFP has made an exception request for FAO to provide execution support.

- The justification provided in this case is to ensure a more effective collaboration between the Miombo/Mopane cluster countries under the programmatic approach, and

also to provide an opportunity for a harmonized, well-coordinated and cost-efficient deployment of tailored technical assistance to support child project countries in addressing common land degradation challenges. This is not considered a justification for a GEF policy exception, which explicitly precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agencies and the execution functions undertaken by EAs.

- The proposed arrangement on the procurement of all international expertise for the child project through FAO is not in line with this policy. GEF policy strongly prefers national execution of projects and the utilization of national expertise to provide technical assistance locally. The intended harmonized, well-coordinated and cost-efficient deployment of tailored technical assistance to support child project execution can be achieved by other means than by providing execution support by the Implementing agency.

- FAO as the Lead Agency for the DSL program also implements and executes the associated Global Coordination Project (GCP) for this program. This function is crucial for ensuring coherence among all child projects under the program, and also has a specific budget for providing technical assistance through the GCP. In addition, child projects are expected to allocate funds for engagement in global (and specifically for this IP regional cluster) activities for learning and knowledge sharing.

- Even if situations of low capacity in the country would require specific execution support, we request the GEF Agency to procure a "third-party" to execute as a preferred way forward.

- Finally, written requests by OFPs are only a condition for consideration of the request, and do not automatically lead to GEF's concurrence with the request. In the specific case, the conclusion of the PM is to not approve the request.

- Please re-design the coordination arrangements accordingly.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

The project budget has been amended accordingly. Funds were reallocated to increase investments into field-based operations per GEF-SEC recommendations. FAO is now only providing minor, very targeted support functions to the lead executing agency.

See further details provided in response to point 5.2 above.

### Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

Budget was not presented in a way that separates the M&E budget out.

03/25/2021: Has been included. However, please clarify the difference in amount in Table 12 (\$101,000) and in Table B (\$218,750). Please consider adding a footnote under Table 12 explaining the difference in amounts.

04/09/2021: Corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/28/2021

M&E costs have been reviewed and refined. The amounts in Table B and Table 12 are aligned now.

The M&E budget allocation has been detailed in the project's budget (Annex A2) and additional row has been included in ProDoc's Table B.

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Not fully.

Annexes are all contained in the prodoc. Please also paste relevant annexes into portal in Annex A - F.

03/25/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

04/09/2021: Please amend formatting issue in the project results framework, which goes beyond the margins ? this will create a problem whenever the CEO Endorsement template is converted in pdf format for circulation / posting.

04/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/19/2021

formatting issues have been fixed

All Annexes have been pasted in the corresponding portal sections as requested.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Has been presented as part of the prodoc.

Cleared

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Upstream GEF and STAP comments have been taken into consideration.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Will be responded to after the 4-weeks Council circulation period.

Agency Response Noted.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: No specific comments were made on this project. Upstream comments by STAP during the EOI phase have been taken into consideration.

Therefore, Annex B is not necessary.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Yes.

Upstream UNCCD comments were taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: Has been presented.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
01/20/2021: Has been presented.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response  
**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/20/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

- Please also upload the revised Agency Project Document (prodoc) as a public document so that it can be circulated to Council and shared on the GEF website.

03/25/2021: Prodoc correctly uploaded. Please address outstanding comments made in this review.

04/09/2021: No. Please address outstanding issues and additional comments on formatting issues (Table 4 and results framework margins outside the portal template).

04/27/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	1/20/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/25/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/9/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/21/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This child project in Angola is part of the Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes (DSL IP). The objective of the project is to support a transformational shift towards a sustainable and integrated management of multi-use dryland landscapes of the Miombo and Mopane ecoregions of Angola (Okavango and Cunene river basins) following Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) principles. The project will contribute to achieve Angola's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target, set in 2018 as a national



commitment under the UNCCD. The national LDN Target has been since mainstreamed into the country's climate change and national development policies and frameworks.

The project objective is fully in line with the programmatic approach of the DSL IP. will be delivered through three components. Component 1 focuses on the strengthening of the enabling environment and frameworks for LDN and the management of landscapes. Component 2 will help Angola develop an integrated land-use planning (ILUP) for two selected landscapes and support the implementation of priority actions embedded in the plan, which will have a long-term sustainability goal. The landscapes constitute sub-basins of the Okavango and Cunene river basins and are located in Cuando Cubango and Cunene provinces. The development and implementation of the ILUPs will engage all relevant stakeholders and propose solutions that reconcile land-use goals under various sectors. Also, under the second Component, the project will focus on the development of sustainable value chains based on dryland products. The realization of specific SLM/SFM goals within multi-use landscapes will count on specialized rural advisory services conveyed by FAO, including the strengthening of land-users' capacity for SLM/SFM through Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Forest-Farm Facility (FFF) models both being signature support programs of FAO. The project will equally strengthen support the organization of Community Seed Banks (CSB) and various other actions linked to the sustainability of dryland value chains and local livelihoods. Component 3 will focus on strengthening national and landscape level assessment and monitoring for LDN, while facilitating national stakeholders' participation in regional and global level initiatives under the DSL IP, which will improve Angola's access to best practices and other capacity development resources for LDN. Among them are the Regional Exchange Mechanism (REM), which involves 6 other countries in southern African that form part of the DSL IP's Miombo Cluster to jointly address common management challenges.

Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) to be generated by the project include the achievement of the following targets: 633,278 ha under sustainable management, including 107,722 hectares of forests covered by ILUPs, with at least 16,825 ha under direct improved management through the adoption suitable sustainable forest management (SFM) techniques. As for other land uses, ILUPs will cover at least 525,556 ha, of which croplands account for 217,056 ha, rangelands 141,200 ha, and 167,300 ha of mixed land uses. Furthermore, an improved and integrated management of land, soil, water and forests resources will generate GEBs through recognized AFOLU methodologies, resulting in the mitigation of 1,047,911 tCO<sub>2</sub>e emissions over a 20-year period. 5,000 people (45% Women) are expected to benefit directly from the project's activities within the two selected landscapes in southern Angola. Gender mainstreaming will be addressed by the project as a cross-cutting issue, including with respect to the access to land, natural resources, income and capacity development opportunities.

The project design duly addresses the Covid-19 pandemic in a various ways, assessing and mitigating the risks and mainstreaming Covid-19 issues into the project

interventions. Green recovery options and their potential have been explored in line with GEF guidance and in the the country by following the recommendations of the UN Framework for the Immediate Socio-economic Response to Covid-19.