

Integrated conservation of the Maiombe forest ecosystem in Cabinda Province Angola

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11244

Countries

Angola

Project Name

Integrated conservation of the Maiombe forest ecosystem in Cabinda Province

Angola

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

6/25/2024

Review completed by PM

7/19/2024

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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
July 19, 2024

Yes

Agency Response
CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 1, 2024

Addressed.

Rio Markers

The basic reasoning of the CFB IP is to propose a solution to the twin crisis of biodiversity and climate: CCM and BD are potentially the two principal objective. However, depending on the project reasoning and focus, this rating can be modified. However, we need to know the rationale behind: please provide the explanations about the selected Rio Markers for BD and CCM.

- Based on the current review, the rating for adaptation should be modified. The GEF can contribute to resilience of ecosystems and local populations to face climate change, but several activities and plans are out of GEF eligibility. Please, modify.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

- Explanation provided in portal section Part II. Project Justification. Section. C. Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities. (In the ProDoc this can be found in Annex I, section Rio Markers):

The project interventions were designed to enhance climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation. On this basis, the Rio Marker is rated Principal 2 for both Mitigation and Biodiversity conservation. The justification is provided below:

The overall project targets which directly result in the GEBs are anchored on the Climate Change Mitigation and Biodiversity Conservation. For instance, the targets set for the creation and improved management of 193,000 hectares of terrestrial protected areas (GEF Core Indicator 1) and the implementation of improved practices over 167,000 hectares of landscapes (GEF Core Indicator 4) are crucial for climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation. Protected areas serve as vital carbon sinks. They also safeguard critical habitats, ensuring the survival of diverse species and maintaining ecosystem services hence fostering their protection, conservation and/or preservation. Improved land management practices, such as sustainable agriculture and forestry, enhance soil health, increase carbon sequestration, and reduce emissions from land-use changes. These practices help maintain biodiversity by preserving habitats and promoting ecological balance. Subsequently, the mitigation of 4.86 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (GEF Core Indicator 6) directly addresses climate change by significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This reduction contributes to global efforts to limit temperature rise and its associated impacts on ecosystems and human communities. Additionally, directly benefitting 2,781 people, with 48% being women (GEF Core Indicator 11), ensures that local communities benefit from and support these environmental initiatives. Empowering communities, especially women, fosters social equity and resilience, enabling them to actively participate in and sustain conservation efforts. This inclusive approach not only enhances the effectiveness of climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation but also ensures that the benefits are widely shared and sustainable.

- The climate change adaptation rating on the Rio Markers table has been left blank.

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?
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 1, 2024

Comments on the summary are addressed. See comments below on the result framework. Some activities cannot be financed by the GEF, or not without a clear context and cofinancing.

July 19, 2024

- The summary describes a stand-alone project. No reference is made in the summary about the fact that this project is part of the Congo IP under the CFB IP. Please, correct in the summary and in the full project document. This is a huge problem of conception and mindset to correct.
- The connection with the neighboring countries and the other transboundary initiatives (through the Regional Coordination Project) as well as the consequences in terms of coordination, knowledge management, should be included in the summary.
- Please, explain the definition of "corridors" in the project document (depending on the nature of activities, you should include targets under the Core Indicator 4.5 on OECM).
- Please, define the use of OECM in this project.
- Several aspects are purely adaptation and not eligible per se. Please, correct.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted regarding the summary. Other comments are addressed in the results framework.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

-It was included that the project is part of the Congo IP under CFB IP on the following sections:

Portal section Part II. Project Justification. Summary. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Summary page 24): **This project is part of the Congo Basin Integrated Program (IP) under the GEF-8 Amazon, Congo and Critical Forest Biomes Integrated Program (CFB).**

Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Context page 2 and 3):

This project is part of the Congo Basin Integrated Program (IP) under the GEF-8 Critical Forest Biomes (CFB) IP, to be implemented in Angola, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, and Sao Tome and Principe. The Congo Basin IP objective is: to improve the conservation and effective governance of critical landscapes in the Congo Basin Forest Biome that contribute to sustaining the health of the planet, the flow of vital ecosystem services, supporting green recovery and inclusive sustainable development initiatives. The IP is

expected to enhance the forest conservation agendas at the national and regional levels through a specific focus on critical landscapes and by removing barriers to their conservation effectiveness.

(...)

The Mayombe forest, shared between Angola, the Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Gabon, forms part of the Guineo-Congolian Forest Biome and centre of endemism, and hosts globally important biodiversity, including tracts of intact tropical forest landscapes, and with endangered and iconic species. The Congo Basin tropical rainforest is the second-largest contiguous block of dense tropical rainforest in the world, covering around 2 million km². The Mayombe forest forms the southern-western margin of the Congo Basin tropical rainforest. It covers an area of around 10,000 km² along a narrow stretch parallel to the Atlantic coast, from southwest Gabon to the southwestern tongue of DRC. The process of establishing the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI) commenced in the early 2000s, leading to the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Angola, DRC, Congo and Gabon and a Transboundary Protected Area (TPA) Strategic Plan adopted by all four countries, in 2013.

Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section Incremental cost reasoning. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Incremental Cost reasoning page 11 and 12):

This project will build on previous GEF-funded projects aimed at addressing the abovementioned drivers of the Maiombe forest ecosystems' degradation, focused on the Angolan component. The project will thus support the implementation of key aspects of the Maiombe National integrated management plan, developed through the GEF-funded project 'Expansion and Strengthening of Angola's Protected Area System' (2016-2022). It will also be coordinated with the GEF-funded project 'Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and Human Wildlife Conflict' (ongoing), which strengthens the MNP's capacities to combat wildlife crime. Despite partial support through these projects, the critical ecosystems of the Maiombe forest, are still underfunded, with much more substantial funding and capacity-building support needed to address the abovementioned extinction drivers and threats.

Gaps in the available data on the Maiombe forest ecosystems component of Angola will be addressed through mapping Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). This will inform and influence policy and decision-making for effective governance of the Maiombe landscape in Angola, as well as enhance knowledge sharing amongst the Congo Basin countries for effective governance of the Congo Critical Forests Biome. In particular to increase coordination among the MTI countries, including as a leverage to increase visibility and to mobilize further substantive funding for the conservation and sustainable management of the Maiombe forest ecosystems, throughout the four MTI member countries.

At the transboundary/regional level, the project will support the implementation of the MTI Strategic Plan, adopted by the four member countries in 2013, following a baseline study published and disseminated in 2011, both elaborated through the UNEP-IUCN initiative of support to establishing the MTI, which focused on support for these preliminary activities and transboundary meetings, during 2009-2013. A follow-up FAO MTI Support Project (2013-2015) focused on promoting the sustainable use and management of natural resources, through introducing agriculture and forestry best-practice methodologies, with pilot sites in Angola and regional dissemination of lessons learned.

A participatory assessment realized through this project concluded that the main drivers of the Maiombe ecosystems; degradation are: (a) Unsustainable use of the natural resources; (b) Lack of diversification of livelihood strategies; (c) Weak local governance of the natural resources. This project addresses these drivers in Angola, as well as the regional dissemination of lessons learned.

Cognizant of the fact that the Maiombe ecosystem is underfunded and under-recognized, yet under threat despite being a biodiversity hotspot, the project will collaborate with UNEP through the Congo Integrated Program (IP) by leveraging partnerships with entities involved in the Congo Program such as Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC) and Central Africa Forest Institute (CAFI). The project will also mobilize financing for the Maiombe ecosystems in Angola and in the transboundary context. Notably, through this project, and in conjunction with the Congo IP, multi-stakeholder dialogues among the four countries (Angola, DRC, RoC, and Gabon) will be initiated which will potentially result in the mobilization of funding and influencing high-level decision-makers in the 4 countries to prioritize the governance of the Maiombe ecosystem. This project will also leverage COMIFAC's sustainability mechanism, which serves as a convening agency for Central African countries. By bringing these nations together, COMIFAC provides a strong platform for fostering regional collaboration. This makes it an ideal entry point for establishing a transboundary agency, facilitating coordinated efforts to conserve and sustainably manage shared ecosystems across borders.

In the transboundary context of the MTI this project will focus on: (a) Promoting political buy-in from the 4 countries; (b) Multi-stakeholder dialogues with the goal of enhancing collaboration in the updating and implementation of the MTI Strategic Plan and mobilizing resources; (c) Learning and Knowledge sharing and exchange among the 4 countries.

Despite minimal investments in this landscape, the project will play a critical role in influencing the governance of the Maiombe ecosystem, giving the landscape visibility by generating up-to-date database that justifies its importance and potentially attracting additional financing.

(...) A Business-as-usual approach will thus result in continued degradation and reduction of the area covered by the Maiombe ecosystem.

Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives ? projects. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives, page 20). See section included in Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives, Best practices, lessons learnt from past and ongoing initiatives and projects from other countries in the Congo Basin Integrated Program.

Portal section Part II. Project Justification. B. Child Project Description (changes are highlighted in yellow). (In the ProDoc this can be found in section B. Project Description, page 24).

-The wording in the project summary has been revised to enhance clarity on this point. Specifically, the text has been added about the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI) and its connection with neighboring countries. See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. Summary. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Summary page 20):

(d) Strengthening **the connection**, coordination, learning and exchange at the local, national and regional levels, with emphasis on **strengthening the collaboration with the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI) member countries ? the Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Gabon, for enhancing the joint implementation of the MTI Strategic Plan, as well enhancing coordination and knowledge exchange with the other transboundary initiatives in the Congo Basin, through the Regional Coordination Project of the Congo Basin IP. This is captured under Component Four of the Angola Maiombe project, which focuses on knowledge management and transboundary coordination;**

- Modifications made under Context section (See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale.) - Context. In the ProDoc this can be seen in page 2. It is introduced the Mayombe Forest as a transboundary ecosystem that is shared by four countries, namely, Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, and the Republic of Congo (RoC). As well it was included a map of the region and it was clarify in this context section:

(?)The map of the project **site in Angola, as well as the regional map of the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI), are** provided in **Annex D**.

We want to highlight that in Part II. Project Justification Section A. Project Rationale, it is mentioned that political will and active engagement of the Governments of Gabon, RoC, DRC, and of key stakeholders at all levels is cited as one of the enablers for delivering this project. As well, **component 4 (Knowledge Management and transboundary coordination)**, addresses the reviving of the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative ? (MTI) which is a governance mechanism for the Mayombe Forest, comprising of the 4 member states and other key stakeholders. Notably, **outcome 4.1 is ?Strengthened coordination, learning, and sharing between the GEF-8 Congo Basin Angola Project and initiatives at the Local, National and Regional levels (the Congo Basin with emphasis on the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative - MTI)?** (no changes were made to the original proposal)

3 ? Definition inserted in the Glossary of terms, which is uploaded as an Annex.

4 ? We prefer not to incorporate the OECM concept/approach for this project because no area in the target site has been officially classified as OECM. Instead, our focus will be on enhancing conservation efforts within and around the Maiombe National Park. This approach aims to alleviate pressure on the

park's biodiversity. Additionally, we note that, to date, no area in Angola has been screened or identified as an OECEM.

5 ? Adaptation aspects have been deleted from the Results Framework. See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. B. Child Project Description ? Project Component, AND Portal Section ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK. (In Prodoc these changes can be seen in page 42 and 43). Former Outputs 2.5.1 and 2.5.4 were deleted, and now in the new version there is only Output 2.5.1 which merges former Outputs 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 The term ?resilient value chains? is captured under the new output 2.5.1 to ensure that the interventions can withstand the effects of climate change otherwise, sustainable results will not be realized

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) 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?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) 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 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

It seems that there is a missed opportunity in the analysis to show that the project is part of the Congo IP:

- Please, refer to the levers of transformation of the Congo IP in the sections identifying the problems, the root causes, and the barriers (see references below)
- Please, refer to the general ToC included in the Congo IP PFD.
- Please, complete the identification of best practices and lessons from past projects with lessons from other Congo Countries applicable to the Angolese context (contact the Congo IP Coordinator).

Please find the following elements below as a reminder:

- The five PFD under the CFB IP are regional adjustments of a same Theory of Change in view of contributing to: 1) an expanded protection of primary forests by means of protected areas and OECEMs; 2) an increased understanding and valuing of natural capital, 2) an expanded forest-friendly production, 4) an improved policy coherence and institutional and legal frameworks.

- The CFB IP strategy is based on the following four levers for system transformation: 1) Governance and policies: CFB IP actions are designed to improve inter-sectoral coordination and dialogue to enhance policy coherence on primary forest conservation in pertinent policies and instruments (at local, subnational, national, and regional levels); 2) Multi-stakeholder dialogues: a multilevel inter-sectoral constructive dialogue among key stakeholder is promoted by establishing or strengthening pertinent multi-sectoral local, national, and regional platforms; 3) Innovation and learning: in the areas of protected area management, management of OECMs, community-based forest restoration practices, innovative financing models and tools, use of novel incentives and business models to incentive nature-friendly activities, and new coalitions for change; and 4) Financial leverage: CFB IP interventions will support the use of financing tools to mobilize domestic and international resources to channel long-term funding for urgently needed actions like sustaining protected areas and OECMs, restoration of primary forest cover and the development of forest-friendly endeavors.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Amended and text added. See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. Project Summary. In ProDoc these change can be seen on page 1. Text included:

- This project is part of the Congo Basin Integrated Program (IP) under the GEF-8 Amazon, Congo and Critical Forest Biomes Integrated Program (CFB)
- (d) Strengthening the connection, coordination, learning and exchange at the local, national and regional levels, with emphasis on strengthening the collaboration with the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI) member countries ? the Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Gabon, for enhancing the joint implementation of the MTI Strategic Plan, as well enhancing coordination and knowledge exchange with the other transboundary initiatives in the Congo Basin, through the Regional Coordination Project of the Congo Basin IP). This is captured under Component Four of the Angola Maiombe project, which focuses on knowledge management and transboundary coordination.

Also, see Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section Incremental cost reasoning. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Incremental Cost reasoning page 12 and 13).

As well, in the Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section **Objective and justification of the project**. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section **Objective and justification of the project**.) Included phrase: ?The project, in collaboration with the regional Congo Basin IP project (...)?.

Review as well text included in the Portal section Part II. Project Justification. B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The narrative under Component 4. Knowledge management and transboundary coordination, in Output 4.1.5, was adjusted to describe how the Angola project will

coordinate with the Congo Basin RCP, going further to allocate budgets for Angola's participation in the learning and knowledge sharing events organized by the Congo RCP. See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. C. Child Project Description. As well, in this same section Figure 2 has been added showing how the Angola project Theory of Change integrates to the Congo Basin IP's Theory of Change.

On the portal Part II. Project Justification. Section A. Project Rationale A, a section on **Best practices and lessons learnt from other Congo Basin Countries?** has been added. As well table 4 contains information of past and current projects that could have learned lessons or potential liaise and has been complemented

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

October 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

- In the reasoning, we are clearly not seeing the logical thinking from 1) the baseline situation, 2) the cofinancing opportunities, 3) the justification of the added value of GEF proposed activities. Please, revise these three strategic elements (it would obviously be easier when the cofinancing projects would have correctly been identified and justified with letters of cofinancing).

- The existence of the Mayombe Initiative (MTI) is not enough to justify the role of the GEF: what happened since 2009? Any role from other donors? What partners as UNEP and IUCN did since? What about the role and actions of national and local governments?

- So far, the GEF has not responded to requests expressed by GEF Agencies, especially UNEP, to support the Mayombe Transboundary Initiative, because the baseline situation and the concerned stakeholders did not show the minimum for a GEF investment. To say it a different way, the GEF does not want to be involved in an initiative fully dependent from GEF resources or create expectations that the GEF cannot fulfill. We would like to see these elements clearly expressed in the project - we understand that this project does not reflect the full MTI, but the situation in Angola.

Stakeholder engagement

- We take note and welcome the multiple potential national partners and their possible commitment, as the universities, academia, and research and training centers. However, this intention should be better reflected in the stakeholder engagement and included the budget. Please, clarify.
- ICCF: This is an excellent initiative to associate ICCF and an opportunity to involve the parliament and get awareness on conservation issues (This is a practice to share with the RCP and potential replication by other country projects). Please, follow up.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

- **1.Baseline:** key ongoing and past initiatives have been captured hence strengthening the baseline section. Notably, the table under Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives/projects provided an outline of baseline projects. This table has been complemented and changes can be seen in Portal Section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale. Table 4. In this same section of the portal, it was included the section ?**Best practices, lessons learnt from past and ongoing initiatives and projects from other countries in the Congo Basin Integrated Program?**, that contains **information** shared by UNEP on lessons learnt from the Congo Basin project has been captured under cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives/projects. 2. **Cofinancing opportunities:** The government has indicated that they are committed to providing cofinancing. Delays has been incurred due to internal government processes, but in CI we are still pursuing the letters and aim to include them in the next re-submission. 3. **The incremental cost reasoning section** has been strengthened. See Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section Incremental cost reasoning. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Incremental Cost reasoning page 12 and 13. Specifically, cognizant of the fact that the Maiombe ecosystem is underfunded and under-recognized, yet under threat despite being a biodiversity hotspot. We aim to collaborate with UNEP through the Congo Integrated Program (IP) by leveraging partnerships with entities involved in the Congo Program such as COMIFAC and CAFI. We also seek to use this project as a catalyst to mobilize financing for the Maiombe ecosystem during the implementation phase. Notably, through this project, and in conjunction with the Congo IP, we intend to initiate multi-stakeholder dialogues among the four countries (Angola, DCR, RoC, and Gabon) that will potentially result in the mobilization of funding and influencing high-level decision-makers in the 4 countries to prioritize the governance of the Maiombe ecosystem. Unfortunately, a Business-as-usual approach will result in continued degradation and reduction of the area covered by the Maiombe ecosystem. Despite minimal investments in this landscape, we envision that the Angola project will play a critical role in influencing the governance of the Maiombe ecosystem, giving the landscape visibility by generating an up-to-date database that justifies its importance and potentially attracting additional financing.

In this section of Incremental Cost Reasoning Reference, it has been added in the landscape, and table 3 and 4 also reflects this.

- Please review the annex section, since we included a document with the justification for reviving the MTI. This write-up was developed jointly by CI and UNEP. This annex includes a justification on how this initiative will not only be depending on the GEF

- Please review the annex section on the justification for reviving MTI.

Stakeholder engagement

- The details are outlined in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, including budget information (Annex G). The budget includes specific items to support stakeholder engagement (refer to Footnote 46, Annex G). Highlighted in Page 238-239

- Engaging ICCF: Noted. Comment shared with UNEP. We will follow-up with UNEP during the implementation phase.

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) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) 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?

e) 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?

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

g) 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?

h) 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)?

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

j) 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?

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

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the

intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 30, 2024

Addressed.

October 1, 2024

Thanks for the explanations and changes.

Under the component 2, the following interventions are still not eligible:

- **Disaster Preparedness and Resilience Building** which will involve strengthening/developing and implementing community-based disaster preparedness plans and early warning systems.

- **Business Case for Adaptation and Resilience:** Identify and incubate climate adaptation and resilience business models, supported by market research, stakeholder engagement, and access to finance. Profile and promote commercially viable models to attract investment.

Please, correct.

July 19, 2024

Outcome 2

- Output 2.3.1: About the collaboration with FSC: Please, confirm that the use of GEF resources will not contribute to more timber exploitation in primary forests. Any collaboration with a timber certification system, as FSC, is a sensitive subject: the GEF cannot be associated to an increase of timber exploitation, especially in primary forests. Please, confirm, or remove the work with FSC or find a way to cover it under cofinancing opportunities.

- Output 2.4.3: We welcome activities that will imply more inclusivity in the GEF project approach: the empowerment of Youth and the involvement of partners, as Jane Goodall Institute and its Roots & Shoots program, are highly relevant. We are potentially seeing a good practice in project design that might be applicable to all country projects under the Congo IP. We encourage you to contact the RCP for a closer collaboration. Please, confirm.

- Comment also applicable to the output 2.2.1, the use of FPIC and conservation agreements. Please, confirm.

- Output 2.5.1 (*Community-based disaster preparedness plans and early warning systems to mitigate the impact of natural disasters and climate-related hazards on agricultural production and supply chains reviewed, updated/developed and implemented*): we wonder the use of GEF resources for adaptation issues in such project. As you know, the GEF trust fund does not finance adaptation

and there are other funds managed at the GEF for it (LDCF, SCCF, and AF). However, some activities related ?resilience? may be acceptable and some activities may partially be financed, but not full adaptation plans or early warning systems. Please, confirm.

- We also recommend coordinating with the LDCF projects under development to avoid duplication and improve synergy with this GEF project developed under the Congo IP.
- Cofinancing and/or partnerships would be welcome to support community-based disaster preparedness plans and early warning systems.
- Output 2.5.2 (*Local commodity supply chains assessed*): role of baseline and/or cofinancing. *Justification. Impression each output is starting from scratch, only dependent from GEF resources,*
- Output 2.5.3: same comment.
- Output 2.5.4 (*Business Case for Investment in Adaptation and Resilience developed for the Angola Maiombe Landscape*): see the comment on 2.5.1. This Congo IP is not about adaptation. There are other opportunities, as the LDCF. Please, correct and identify the role of cofinancing?

Component 3

- We welcome the role of the JGI Tchimpounga Chimpanzee Rehabilitation Center, and encourage women's participation in the project. A rapid assessment of lessons and best practices in the country, from past projects, might help. Please, complete.
- Please, clarify the notion of Innovation in the proposed outputs/activities? Any lessons from other projects?

Component 4

- Output 4.1.5 (*Transboundary dialogue for collaborative implementation of the MTI strategic plan between Angola, DRC, the Republic of Congo, and Gabon is re-activated and enhanced*): as said in other items in this review, this output might be acceptable if the countries and potential additional partners contribute. The GEF does not want to be associated alone or involved in the creation of a entity that would be dependent on External resources, and especially GEF resources. Please, clarify.
- Please, clarify the budget devoted to sponsor a representative from Angola?s marginalized and vulnerable groups within the local community, such as women, youth, the elderly, and people with special needs, to participate in the Congo Basin Regional Forum and/or other forums organized by the Critical Forests Integrated Programs?

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

We deleted these 2 outputs.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Component 2:

- **Output 2.3.1:** The role of FSC has been clarified to demonstrate that Timber exploitation will not be promoted. Please in the portal Part II. Project Justification, on the section **Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project, check changes made in table 5**. In a nutshell, in Angola, FSC will formalize forest management by applying the Controlled Forest Management Standard (FSC-STD-30-010 V3) and, within five years, developing a national Forest Stewardship Standard with a chamber-balanced group of Angolan experts.

- **Output 2.4.3:** Noted. Comment shared with UNEP. We will explore further collaboration with UNEP during the implementation phase.

- **Output 2.2.1:** Noted. Comment shared with UNEP. We will explore further collaboration with UNEP during the implementation phase.

- **Output 2.5.1 Deleted**

- We will attend GEF Secretariat recommendation and coordinate with LDCF projects.

- As advised, former Outputs 2.5.1 and 2.5.4 have been deleted hence the project will not undertake interventions related to community-based disaster preparedness plans and early warning systems . See these changes in Portal section Part II. Project Justification. B. Child Project Description ? Project Component, AND, in Portal Section ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

- Outputs 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 have been merged and are now under Output 2.5.1. The new output 2.5.1 is ?Local commodity supply chains assessed, and local gender-responsive and resilient value chains supported, enhancing community capacities whilst partnering with the private sector?.

- Outputs 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 have been merged and are now under Output 2.5.1. The new output 2.5.1 is ?Local commodity supply chains assessed, and local gender-responsive and resilient value chains supported, enhancing community capacities whilst partnering with the private sector?.

- In response to the comment, information has been provided on the relevant past project to demonstrate that this intervention is not starting from scratch. Please see Portal section Part II. Project Justification. A. Project Rationale ? section Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives ? projects. (In the ProDoc this can be found in the section Cooperation with past and ongoing initiatives, page 20). See specific section on *Best practices, lessons learnt from past and ongoing initiatives and projects from other countries in the Congo Basin Integrated Program*. As well, in this section in **table 4**, has been complemented. Specifically, the project titled ?*Building the capacity of the Government of Angola in Countering Wildlife Trafficking in Cabinda Province*?. Lastly, the justification for retaining the new output 2.5.1 is: One of the key barriers impeding investment in Maiombe is the lack of data. Where data is available, it is often outdated. In this project, we aim to support and introduce alternative livelihoods. The value chain assessment will inform the project?s entry points. Furthermore, this assessment will yield valuable information that can be shared with

UNEP and disseminated during multi-stakeholder dialogues, thereby potentially attracting investments. Outputs 2.5.1 and 2.5.4 deleted

Component 3

- In the portal Part II. Project justification, section B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION, in the part *Innovative approaches to unlocking financing*: (point 4) it was included the following paragraph: "Support for establishing a Chimpanzee Sanctuary with the JGI Tchimpounga Chimpanzee Rehabilitation Center. Capacity-building support will be provided for the caretaking of confiscated wildlife, and the establishment of the Chimpanzee Sanctuary, including training of selected relevant provincial staff (e.g., wildlife caretakers and veterinarians), through collaboration with the JGI Tchimpounga Chimpanzee Rehabilitation Center in the Republic of Congo. Specifically, women's participation in this training will be encouraged. This Output will assimilate lessons learned in Angola through the UNSFWS-funded project, "Building the Capacity of the Government of Angola in Countering Wildlife Trafficking in Cabinda Province".

Component 4

Please see this change in the Portal Section Part II. Project Justification. B. Child Project Description. Section *Innovative approaches to unlock financing*, and in *Project Description* in section **B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION**. In the ProDoc these changes can be seen in Section Project Description and Innovative approaches. A justification for reviving the MTI has been uploaded as an annex[AM1] . This write-up was developed jointly by CI and UNEP.

Clarification is provided in section **B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION. Section *Innovative ways of enhancing National and Cross-Border learning***. "In partnership with CI and UNEP through the Congo Basin Regional Coordination Project, the Angola project aims to revive The Maiombe Transfrontier Initiative (MTI) which will be critical in promoting innovation, learning, and knowledge sharing by facilitating cross-border collaboration among Angola, the Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Gabon. The MTI will create a platform for sharing best practices, research, and technological advancements in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. By bringing together diverse stakeholders, including government agencies, local communities, NGOs, and academic institutions, the initiative will foster a collaborative environment where innovative solutions, including financing solutions, can be developed and implemented. Additionally, it will enable the exchange of valuable knowledge and experiences, enhancing the capacity of all involved parties to address environmental challenges more effectively and sustainably. Lastly, it is anticipated that a representative of Angola's marginalized and vulnerable groups, such as women, youth, the elderly, and people with special needs, will be sponsored by UNEP to participate in the Congo Basin Regional Forum and/or forums organized by other Critical Forests Integrated

Programs.? Specifically, the Angola Congo Basin Child project will sponsor representatives from marginalized and vulnerable groups to participate in events organized by the Congo Basin RCP. In the budget, \$ 44,682 has been allocated for the sponsorship under the budget line ?Participation in regional/international meetings and other relevant forums, promotion of the project?. Nevertheless, it is also our expectation that UNEP, through the Congo Program, could also sponsor other selected marginalized groups as needed. Please review new updated budget.

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.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

To be reviewed at the next round, when the baseline, the cofinancing opportunities, and the partnerships would have been revised.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Noted.

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)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- 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

October 30, 2024

Addressed.

October 1, 2024

We take note of the justification given for 67,000 ha under SLM, with no obvious benefits to biodiversity and then not reported under 4.5 on OECMs.

However, if you report under the CI 4.2, meaning areas of landscapes incorporating biodiversity considerations = these areas can be reported to 4.5 on OECM. Please, correct.

July 19, 2024

- The target under CI corresponds to the Maiombe National Park (MNP). Please, confirm.

CI4: The proposed target is 167,000 ha.

- The given description let assume that you should report under the CI 4.3 (SLM) if you propose 67,000 ha under Sustainable Land Management. Please, correct.

- You missed the opportunity to report 4.5 on OECM. Please, identify the targeted areas with better conservation out of protected areas (probably some or all areas under CI 4.2 and 4.3), and provide a target under 4.5.

- CI6: 4.86 Million metric tons of CO₂e: please, justify the assumptions made.

CI11: 2,781 direct beneficiaries of which 48% women

- Please, explain how you will reach 48% women. Provide clear actions. The change of wording in outputs and activities may also be needed. Please, correct.

- In the details, please, clarify how you may reach 1,000 women with the conservation agreements. This perfect parity (50/50) is potentially welcome, but does not seem realistic without further explanation. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Sub-Core indicator 4.5 added:

Sub-core indicator 4.5: Terrestrial OECMs supported

Angola does not have areas that are formally recognized as OECM. Nevertheless, at least 100,000 Ha of terrestrial ecosystems will be certified through the FSC Forest Management Certification while incorporating biodiversity considerations. This is the same area reported under sub-core indicator 4.2

CI1: Confirmed. The area of the MNP (WDPA ID: 555756392) is 193,000 Ha.

CI4: This is correct the project is expected to support sustainable land management of 67,000 ha west of the MNP (outside the MNP), which will be linked with improved management to benefit biodiversity, which will be achieved through capacity-building activities and facilitating the local community members to shift to climate-resilient sustainable livelihoods, including direct engagement in forest ecosystem conservation. The area under Sub-core indicator 4.1. overlaps the area under Sub-core indicator 4.3.

CI 4.5: We prefer not to incorporate the OECM concept/approach for this project because no area in the target site has been officially classified as OECM. Instead, our focus will be on enhancing conservation efforts within and around the Maiombe National Park. This approach aims to alleviate pressure on the park's biodiversity. Additionally, we note that, to date, no area in Angola has been screened or identified as an OECM

CI6: One of the challenges in this target landscape is the lack of data. Therefore, we intend to provide accurate data in the EX-ACT tool during the implementation phase. The tool has been populated with estimated data from online sources, and missing sections have now been completed. Additionally, to clarify, the initial entry of 4.85 Million metric tons of CO₂e was an error. The correct figure is 11.3 Million metric tons of CO₂e , and its justification is provided below:

*?Reduced forest degradation through forest conservation and improved protected area management, through this project, is expected to result in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigation estimated at **11.39 million metric tons of CO₂e**. This is an initial rough estimate from the EX-Act tool and will be recalculated after the Project inception phase, following the data and information base on the Maiombe Forest ecosystem component of Angola updating and mapping (Outcome 2.1), and following the determination of specific activities to be carried out in relation to land-uses, forest management and cropland management, under Components 2 and 3. This initial rough estimate is based on an assumption that the project will reduce the level of the forest degradation from low to very low in an estimated area of 100,000 ha of the full area of the Maiombe NP (193,000 ha).? The change in the figure is reflected in Portal Section Part II. Project Justification. Project Summary and in ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (In the Prodoc this can be seen in Paragraph 2, 119, 164, core indicator table under summary section, Annex B, Annex K). As well*

CI11. Details are provided under the core indicator section and the description of Output 2.2.2 Section **B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION, under the component of Project Components**. In the ProDoc this is in page 38. Overall, the project will benefit directly at least 2,781

(48% women) through learning and knowledge-sharing events, and capacity building for improved livelihood sustainability and resilience and resilient livelihood activities. This number includes at least 2,000 members of the local communities (1,000 men and 1,000 women) that are expected to benefit from Conservation Agreements. Considering that while most of the traditional leaders of the communities are men, the cultivation and production activities are performed mainly by women, a target of 50% of women beneficiaries from the Conservation Agreements is an ambitious but achievable target. Moreover, deliberate action will be taken to secure women's participation in training activities and in the development and implementation of the Conservation Agreements, as described in the GMP for the project. Other measures include:

- ? Setting gender-specific targets, and mandating a certain percentage of resources, training, and opportunities to be allocated to women and girls.
- ? Providing capacity-building programs focused on empowering women with skills, leadership training, and access to financial and technical resources.
- ? Prioritize creating safe spaces for the participation of women and girls, ensuring their voices are heard, and engaging local communities in dialogues that challenge patriarchal norms.
- ? Ensure the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM) is widely disclosed whilst making sure that women feel safe and comfortable to raise grievances.
- ? Collaborating with female leaders, women's groups, and women-led SMEs to enhance outreach and ensure sustained, equitable benefits for women and girls throughout the project's lifecycle.
- ? Design a gender-sensitive knowledge management and communications strategy with a tailored action plan for reaching diverse audiences (including women and girls)
- ? Sponsor women and girls from the local communities to participate in the events organized by the Guinean Forests Integrated program

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
October 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

- Please, clarify sustainability issues in the risk assessment and identify mitigation measures. Without having the full baseline and cofinancing opportunities, the potential continued long-term financial support after project completion does not appear clearly.

- These elements may bring additional changes in the result framework and the budget. Please, adjust.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Mitigation measures for the Financial and Business Model, on the sustainability aspects were amended for better clarification. Risk identification and mitigation measures:

1. 1. Failing to secure continued long-term financial support after project completion, can risk the sustainability of critical Project Outcomes. As a mitigation, the project was designed to promote sustainability. All Outputs are designed to minimize dependency on external financial support. Some Outputs focus on establishing long-term policy and strategic planning frameworks, many Outputs focus on various aspects and levels of capacity building, and some Outputs are specifically aimed at establishing long-term financial sustainability, through enhancing capacities to establish financial sustainability at the local level and establishing conditions to leverage substantive resource mobilization potential for this landscape.

2. Recruiting and training community scouts without securing their long-term employment and remuneration would induce a negative attitude of the communities toward the park. As a mitigation, The implementation of this activity will be conditioned, and the recruitment and training of community forest scouts will be pending securing a permanent source for their long-term funding, in advance.

The project was designed to promote sustainability, per the narration of each output. All outputs are designed to minimize dependency on external aid. Some Outputs focus on establishing long-term policy and strategic planning frameworks, various aspects and levels of capacity building, whereas some specifically aim to establish long-term financial sustainability, through enhancing capacities to establish financial sustainability at the local level, and through establishing conditions to leverage substantive resource mobilization potential for this landscape. There is one project activity whose continuity depends on securing long-term financial support (Recruiting and training of community

forest scouts), however, the mitigation measure for this risk is conditioning the implementation of this activity so that it will be pending securing a permanent source for their long-term funding in advance. Additionally, details about financial sustainability are provided under Innovative Approaches to Unlocking Financing, in section B. Child Project description.

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 RequestNA

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?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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 1, 2024

Addressed

July 19, 2024

- Please, clarify the Reference to KMGBF targets?

Agency Response
CI-GEF 10/14/2024
Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

The project alignment with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework is detailed in the portal in Table 8, in section C. Alignment with GEF 8 Programming strategies and Country/Regional Priorities. In a new paragraph added, it is specifying which of the 23 KMGBF targets the project contributes to and identifying how the specific Project Outcomes contribute to each of the specified global targets.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestAddressed.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

- Please, note and ensure during project implementation, that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the GAP and relevant gender dimension of the project.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 10/14/2024
Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Noted. CI PIR includes a specific section on gender that examines progress, challenges, lessons learned and adaptive management. As well the template used for the TORs for the MTR and TE already include a specific focus on the design, implementation and effectiveness of the GAP.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestAddressed.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestAddressed.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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 Request
October 1, 2024

Addressed.

July 19, 2024

- Please, use an acceptable language for PPG activities (check the projet cycle guidelines). Please, revise.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 10/14/2024
Clearance noted.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Amounts have been updated to reflect expenditures to date, and the category names now align with the general budget categories. Refer to Annex on the budget.

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Professional Services ? Consultant for ProDoc Development	70,698	55,807	14,891
Personnel ? Staff project design	32,592	2,282.79	30,309.21
Travel, Meetings and Workshops	46,710	15,362.03	31,347.97
Total	150,000	73,451.82	76,548.18

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 Request Yes

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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 30, 2024

Addressed.

October 1, 2024

- The average cofinancing of the Congo Forest IP is 1:6.8. At the concept stage, the initial ratio for the Angola project was 1:14.6. At this second submission for CEO endorsement, the ratio is currently 1:0.4. We are far from something in the GEF standards. Please, revise.

- In general, in-kind cofinancing is classified as recurrent expenditures. Please, check and correct or explain the characterization of cofinancing from Jane Goodall Institute.

July 19, 2024

Cofinancing

- The following sources of co-financiers are lacking their letter of co-financing support and amount. Please request agency to remove them from the co-financing table or to comply. Sources included: Government of Angola - Ministry of Environment, Provincial Government of Cabinda, and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
- In-kind is ?recurrent expenditure? normally. Please request the agency to revise investment mobilized for Jane Goodall Institute (JGI) to ?recurrent expenditures? for amount of \$188,177.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

-The Government of Angola, through the Ministry of Environment, has committed \$26M in-kind cofinancing hence, the total co-financing has increased to **\$28,114,775**

All the co-financing tables in the ProDoc updated

Co-financing amount updated in the Budget

Cofinancing letter uploaded

-Apologies for the confusion. Jane Goodall's co-financing is a combination of grant/cash and in-kind co-financing; hence, investment mobilized and recurrent expenditure, respectively. The justification for the investment mobilized is provided in the ProDoc and also pasted below:

Jane Goodall Institute (JGI) has committed \$5,500 grant co-financing from US Cooperate partners not related to the GEF. This flexible funding will cover licensing costs of using Esri ArcGIS Software and the cost of accessing Maxar very high-resolution satellite imagery monitoring habitats, human land uses, threats and informing the implementation of the project activities.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

-Done. The institutions without co-financing letters have been omitted, namely, the Government of Angola - Ministry of Environment, Provincial Government of Cabinda, and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

We are currently following up on co-financing letters from the Government, but their slow response turnaround is delaying the resubmission of the package. In the interim, we have opted to submit the package with the other comments addressed while continuing to pursue the government's co-financing. Overall, there is will from the government to commit to co-financing, but the challenge is bureaucracy and a slow decision-making process. We intend to include the letters in the next submission.

-JGI's cofinancing amount of \$188,177 has been revised to Recurrent Expenditures

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 RequestAddressed at PFD and concept level.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestAddressed at PFD and concept level.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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 RequestAddressed at PFD and concept level.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

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?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024.

- Please, note that the proposed table is out of the margins and therefore not readable. Please, correct.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Addressed. Annex C has been adjusted to the margins of the portal.

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 RequestYes

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestAddressed.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

Clearance noted.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 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 1st, 2024

Addressed.

November 1st, 2024

Not addressed. The point is responded in the review, but the change is actually not reflected in the budget (2 versions) and the prodoc.

Please, note that the two versions of the budget are not coherent on this point. It might create a problem at quality control" 1) please reflect the change and 2) verify that the two versions of the budget say the same thing. For other projects under the CFB IP, we asked to provide only the excel version using the GEF template.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD eq.)								Sub-Total	M&E	PMC	Total (USD eq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2					Component 3	Component 4					
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 2.4	Outcome 2.5	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1 KM					
	Personnel -													

Other Operating Cost	Office telephone, internet expense and office supplies	5,500	5,500	-	-	-	-	5,500	-	16,500	-	16,684	33,184	ADPP
----------------------	--	-------	-------	---	---	---	---	-------	---	--------	---	--------	--------	------

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USD000)								Sub-Total	M&E / SI	PMC	Total (USD000)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2					Component 3	Component 4					
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 2.4	Outcome 2.5	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1					
Personnel	APPP Technical and Programme Advisor (ICT)	547,324.00	236,442.00	344,752.00	332,356.00	546,887.00	746,174.00	732,396.00	258,017.00	3,747,364.00	207,638.00	167,750.00	4,162,752.00	ADPP
Equipment	Computers (5) and IT equipment	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	1,684.00	13,472.00	-	-	13,472.00	ADPP
	Disaster control equipment and field supplies	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,000.00	-	11,000.00	-	-	11,000.00	ADPP
	Office telephone, internet expense and office supplies	4,730.00	4,715.00	4,715.00	4,715.00	4,715.00	4,715.00	4,715.00	-	33,020.00	-	-	33,020.00	ADPP
Other Operating Cost	Preparation of communication/ dissemination tools (brochures, posters, etc.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,560.00	21,560.00	-	-	21,560.00	ADPP
Grand Total	3	547,324.00	236,442.00	344,752.00	332,356.00	546,887.00	746,174.00	732,396.00	258,017.00	3,747,364.00	207,638.00	167,750.00	4,162,752.00	

October 30, 2024

The point is not addressed: Please, transfer all expenses related to "Office telephone, internet expense, and office supplies" in the pmc. These are typically pmc expenses.

October 1, 2024

- All expenses related to "Office telephone, internet expense, and office supplies" should be included in the pmc. Please, revise.

July 19, 2024

Budget

- Please, provide the budget under the GEF excel table - please note that comments in the contents will further be made when the excel file will be available.
- The budget table should be available in the portal. Please, correct
- Please, confirm the amounts for the components 3 and 5 (C3: 258K? and C5): 207 KUSD?).
- The budget should be revised once the result framework would have been adjusted: the budget for the multiple international consultants on adaptation should be reallocated.
- We do not understand the budget of \$191,586 assigned under each component for a "Lead International Technical/Strategic Consultant: that comes into duplication of a Technical and Operations Advisor (\$198,617), the Project Director (\$247,130).
- The budget does not reflect any coordination and KM activities in connection with other country projects, and especially the Congo Regional Coordination Project. To be revised. We recommend the project team to contact the RCP at UNEP to adjust these components, outputs, activities, and the related budget.
- The line "Project Executive Director" should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components.
- "Office telephone, internet expense and office supplies" should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project component.

Agency Response

CI GEF ? November 1st, 2024

We apologize for this error.

1. Portal section **ANNEX G: Project Budget Table** now only contains the last version of the budget and reflects the change. The budget has been uploaded in word since this is the only type of file that this section allows to upload. As well the Prodoc is updated and the section Annex F match with the last budget uploaded.

2. Portal section on Annex G now only contains the last version of the budget.

CI GEF - October 31, 2024

The budget line for "Office telephone, internet expenses, and office supplies" is now fully charged to PMC, with the remaining portion of these costs covered through co-financing. This adjustment is reflected in the revised budget.

As well see ProDoc attached, that has Annex F updated to match the new values.

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

These budget items, such as internet, telephone, and office supplies, are shared across components and PMC because they directly contribute to delivering all project outputs. A reallocation was made to increase the percentage allocated to PMC (over 50%), while the remaining portion was distributed to other components to support activities and field office operations effectively.

CI-GEF 09/18/2024

1 ? Excel Budget uploaded in the Portal

2 ? Excel Budget uploaded in the Portal

3 ? The revised budget, reflecting the recent adjustments, is outlined below:

Component 1: 555,981

Component 2: 2,172,158

Component 3: 761,209

Component 4: 258,016

Component 5: (M&E) 207,638

Sum of PMC: 197,750

4 - Following the deletion of Outputs 2.5.1 and 2.5.4, the associated budget lines for international and national consultants have been removed as these activities are no longer aligned with the adjusted results framework. The specific budget lines deleted are:

- ? International Consultant - Business Case for Investment in Adaptation and Resilience: \$7,150.00
- ? International Consultant - Community-Based Disaster Preparedness Planner: \$8,580.00
- ? National/Local Consultant - Business Case for Investment in Adaptation and Resilience: \$9,900.00
- ? National/Local Consultant - Community-Based Disaster Preparedness Planner: \$9,900.00

The total amount of \$35,530.00 has been reallocated to the budget line ?Micro-grants to local communities to strengthen project sustainability? to support this activity under outcomes 2.4 and 2.5, new amount for this activity is \$659,078.00.

Additionally, the budget line ?Disaster Control Equipment and Field Supplies? has been renamed to ?Field Supplies Kit for Park Rangers and Scouts? to better align with the component's objectives.

5 - To streamline project management and avoid duplication of roles, we have merged the Project Executive Director (National) and the ADPP Technical and Operations Advisor (National) into a single role: **Project Technical and Operations Lead**. (Paragraph 149). This role will be charged to both Project Management Costs (PMC) and Components, aligning with the updated Terms of Reference (Annex H). This position will be full-time with a budget allocation of \$425,959.00 for all the project execution. The \$19,788.00 were strategically distributed among other staff positions, allowing for increased assigned workdays for the:

- ? Stakeholder Engagement and Field Coordinator: Increased by USD 1,385.
- ? Finance Manager: Increased by USD 3,896
- ? Grant and Contracts Officer: Increased by USD 5,755.
- ? Gender and Safeguards Specialist: Increased by USD 2,178.
- ? M&E Officer (P/T): Increased by USD 6,574.

Lead International Technical/Strategic Consultant: This consultant will now be contracted as the **International Strategic Landscape Advisor** part-time (approximately two months annually). The advisor will provide high-level technical and strategic guidance during project implementation, addressing Angola's limited technical capacity by supporting national project staff with quality assurance, strategic input, and control measures. The International Strategic Landscape Advisor brings a blend of international expertise and a deep understanding of the Maiombe landscape, along with established relationships with key stakeholders. This unique positioning ensures that strategic guidance and quality technical support are available to the project team, mitigating potential delays and enhancing the overall project quality.

6 ? The coordination with the Congo Basin RCP, other Critical Forests IPs and Countries is discussed under Component 4 (Knowledge management and transboundary coordination). In the budget this is under the line ?Participation in regional/international meetings and other relevant forums, promotion of the project? with an allocated amount of 44,682.

7 - The roles of Project Executive Director (National) and ADPP Technical and Operations Advisor (National) have been consolidated into a single position, which will be charged to both PMC and components. The new designation is "**Project Technical and Operations Lead.**" The updated Terms of Reference (see Annex H) have been revised to align with the role, thereby justifying the allocation of costs to both the PMC and the project components. As the project leader, the Project Technical and Operations Lead will collaborate closely with the Project's Finance Manager on executive decisions pertaining to project finances, administration, operational management, and procurement processes. Despite the considerable managerial responsibilities associated with the role, its primary focus remains on technical matters, which justifies its categorization under both the PMC and the project components. (Paragraph 149)

8 - Given the essential nature of the "Office telephone, internet expense, and office supplies" budget line for the overall success of the project, these expenses must be incurred. 20% of these expenses are charged under PMC, with the remaining amount distributed across Components 1, 2, and 3. This distribution is justified as internet expenses, in particular, are critical for supporting the activities under all components.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 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 RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

November 1st, 2024

All comments are addressed. The project is recommended for clearance, quality control, and Council consultation.

November, 1, 2024

The comment has been responded in the review, but the change is not reflected in the budget (there are 2 versions of the budget with different numbers) and the prodoc.

Please, address this remaining comment and check the constituency of documents.

October 30, 2024

All comments are addressed, but one. Please, address the remaining comment and the project will be recommended for clearance and Council consultation.

October 1, 2024

Thanks for the revised version and the progress, please address the pending comments above.

July 19, 2024

The project is not recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

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	7/19/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/1/2024	

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2024	