

Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and Human Wildlife Conflict

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9735

Countries

Angola

Project Name

Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and Human Wildlife Conflict

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/14/2019

Review completed by PM

3/28/2020

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

This is the entry in the CEO Endorsement:

A. describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original Child Project Concept Note

A.1. Project Description.

The project was designed in full accordance with the PIF with some necessary adjustments to the project Components, Outcomes, Outputs, co-financing, and budget made during stakeholder consultations and development (see Annex D for details). Brief description of the project is presented below.

NOTE: Annex D is the calendar of Expected Re-flows, not the changes since PIF approval. Please address.

Response to Secretariat comments

29 July 2019

Thank you for the comment! Changed to Annex E.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

While the structure/design of the project is, at least in theory, appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs, the budget is not enough. See comments below.

The list of proposed activities is so long and comprehensive, that is clearly aspirational and not based on an objective analysis of the needs and priorities of the country and certainly not viable considering the budget. Budget considerations are of high importance in a country like Angola where goods and services are particularly expensive.

DETAILED COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION AFTER ADDRESSING THE OUTSTANDING ISSUES LISTED IN THE POINT BELOW.

COMPONENT 1

Please reconsider budget allocation to output 1.2 (\$424,750) in light of the scope of work of output 1.3 (\$224,750). Do the training of the ECU staff (200-250), requires almost twice as much as the funding needed for the Environmental Polytechnic Institute - Wildlife School), serving 250-300 rangers?

Has Congo agreed on working with Angola on the Mayombe TFCA and allocate new financial resources to do so?

COMPONENT 2

Do the two local ECUs require basically the same as the central ECU (\$183,000)?

How much of the \$1,332,000 for the Management Plans of the two PAs is for Investment and how much for TA? The budget in the Prodoc suggest the later. The project needs to allocate as much as possible of the GEF funding to these two PAs. The current project suggest a budget of \$1.1/ha for the two PAs. This is low and needs to be increased. Funds should be re-allocated from Component 4 to Component 2.

Who is going to pay for the salaries of the 30 rangers mentioned on this component? Please indicate how many rangers are currently located in the two PAs.

COMPONENT 3

Please be specific about the proposed interventions with local communities. The language used in Output 3.1. reads as in a PIF. As currently presented activities could apply pretty much anywhere. (i.e. CBNRM, SLM, SFM, HWC). What are in reality the options for the local communities?

COMPONENT 4

Please significantly reduce the budget for this component and enhance the budget for Components 2 & 3.

8-2-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Comments	Response
----------	----------

Please reconsider budget allocation to output 1.2 (\$424,750) in light of the scope of work of output 1.3 (\$224,750). Do the training of the ECU staff (200-250), requires almost twice as much as the funding needed for the Environmental Polytechnic Institute - Wildlife School), serving 250-300 rangers?

Output 1.2 has actually two sub-sections:

sub-section for capacity building of National ECU (trainings, mentoring, and equipment) with total budget \$250,000. National ECU is the central and key organization in Angola to fight wildlife crime and its strengthening is a strategic objective for the government. They need a comprehensive mentoring program that was requested by the government. And the program budget was calculated based on similar experience of UNODC and other organizations in African countries.

Sub-section for specialised training (15 trainings total) for INBAC, Police, Customs, and Judiciary on investigation, prosecution, and penalization of wildlife crime with total budget of \$150,000. This is a critical gap to fill, particularly in Luanda and partly in the project areas.

Output 1.2 budget also includes part of the salary of the Project Coordinator for technical input to the Component 1.

Thus, given explanation above actually we cannot decrease the budget of Output 1.2 in favour of Output 1.3 without risk of under-delivery of Output 1.2 and decreasing the project impact on wildlife crime law enforcement. The clarification has been added to the Output 1.2 in CEO ER, pp. 13-14, and Prodoc, pp. 43-44

At the same time for the Output 1.3, along with the GEF project investments (\$224,750), the Wildlife School in Menongue will be supported by the Stop Ivory Project (\$222,510) and additional investment from KfW in framework of KAZA project support. The total goal of this joint initiative is to train no less than 1,500 PA rangers in Angola, while the project will support basic trainings for no more than 250-300 rangers only. These arrangements have been discussed with the partners above and reflected in the Output 1.3. However, based on your observation, we added \$24,750 to the Output 1.3 from deleted Output 1.4 (please, see below) and reduced the total number of training programs to the most important ones to make sure we have enough funding. Standard trainings for rangers are significantly cheaper than comprehensive mentoring program for ECU under Output 1.2.

The explanation and changes described above have been incorporated in the Output 1.3 in CEO ER, p. 15 and Prodoc, p. 45-46

<p>Has Congo agreed on working with Angola on the Mayombe TFCA and allocate new financial resources to do so?</p>	<p>The MoU on the Mayombe Transboundary Conservation Initiative was signed by governments of Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Republic of Congo in 2009, and by Gabon in 2013, in the framework of the UNEP-NORAD project. However, during the PPG phase we could not discuss investments for joint law enforcement activities under Output 1.4 with the Congolese government. Based on your other request to strengthen investments for target PAs and make the project less ambitious we decided to remove Output 1.4 and relocate its budget to Output 2.2.</p> <p>Relevant changes (Output 1.4 removal) have been made in the CEO ER: Table B, p. 2; Section 3- The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, p. 15; and Prodoc: Expected Results section, p. 46; Strategy section, p. 23, 27 (TOC diagram), p. 29 (lessons learned); Output 2.2, p. 47; Stakeholder Section, pp. 64-72; IX. TOTAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN section, budget lines 2-3, and 8; budget notes 2-3 and 8, pp. 107-110; Annex A., p. 4-5; Annex F., p. 29; Annex G., p. 38-39; Annex H., pp. 68 – 75; Annex I., p. 89; Annex J., p. 93-95</p>
<p>Do the two local ECUs require basically the same as the central ECU (\$183,000)?</p>	<p>The project has been designed to make main investments in the two project areas – Maiombe NP and Luando SNR. Given two local ECU start from scratch and currently have almost no equipment at all, they need at least some basic funding to be functional. Total project investments in the local ECUs is \$140,000 (mainly equipment). The output budget includes part of the salaries of the Project Management Unit for their contribution to the Outputs under Component 2.</p> <p>No changes were made to either PRODOC or CEO ER.</p>
<p>How much of the \$1,332,000 for the Management Plans of the two PAs is for Investment and how much for TA? The budget in the Prodoc suggest the later. The project needs to allocate as much as possible of the GEF funding to these two PAs. The current project suggest a budget of \$1.1/ha for the two PAs. This is low and needs to be increased. Funds should be re-allocated from Component 4 to Component 2.</p>	<p>Based on the suggestions, we decreased the budget for on-site PA ranger trainings to \$100,000, and reallocated \$20,000 to additional equipment for the PAs. Additional \$80,000 for the PA equipment have been allocated from Component 1 (from deleted Output 1.4). Additional \$100,000 have been allocated to the Output from Component 4 as requested. Thus, currently we have \$762,000 for direct Investments (equipment, infrastructure, and operational expenses) in the PAs under Output 2.2. However, we cannot increase it further without high risk of under-delivery of other project outputs. The number of the PA on-site trainings was decreased , while still ensuring they are repeated and effective.</p> <p>Total level of GEF funding for the PAs (under Component 2 and 3) is currently \$2,769,419 (67% of the project budget), or \$2.3/ha</p> <p>The changes described above have been made in the CEO ER: Output 2.2, pp. 18-19; Prodoc: Expected Results section, Output 2.2, pp. 50-52; IX. TOTAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN section, budget lines 5 and 7; budget notes 5-7, pp. 107-110.</p>

<p>Who is going to pay for the salaries of the 30 rangers mentioned on this component? Please indicate how many rangers are currently located in the two PAs.</p>	<p>The rangers' salaries are going to be paid by MINAMB. Current number of rangers in Maiombe NP and Luando SNR is indicated in the PRF: 0 for Luando SNR and 12 for Maiombe NP. However, the government plans to increase the ranger numbers in Angolan PAs from current 300 to 1,500 rangers. For example, total number of rangers in Luando SNR will be 120. However, we decided to use more realistic, moderate numbers for the project targets (e.g., 30 rangers for Luando SNR and 30 rangers for Maiombe NP).</p> <p>Current number of rangers is indicated in the PRF both in CEO ER and Prodoc. No changes have been made.</p>
<p>COMPONENT 3 Please be specific about the proposed interventions with local communities. The language used in Output 3.1. reads as in a PIF. As currently presented activities could apply pretty much anywhere. (i.e. CBNRM, SLM, SFM, HWC). What are in reality the options for the local communities?</p>	<p>There are numerous opportunities that have been discussed with local communities and organizations supporting local communities in Angola (FAO, ADPP, FAS, and AfDB) on CBNRM and sustainable livelihood development in the project areas, based on experience of other livelihood projects in Angola. Some of the opportunities, like Community Management Areas and Community Councils for sustainable natural resource management are mentioned in Angolan government policies, but have never been realized. Unfortunately during the PPG we had neither time nor money to make an appropriate feasibility assessment of all the options (no CBNRM and livelihood activities have ever been implemented in the project areas, except initial HWC initiatives in Maiombe). Thus, actually we initially decided to have a wide spread of discussed initiatives to be narrowed down after feasibility assessment that will be implemented as the first step to deliver Output 3.1. After the assessment the best and the most realistic options will be supported by trainings and grant program for selected local communities. We used similar strategy for community grant programmes in other GWP projects for Zimbabwe, Mali, and Kenya.</p> <p>No changes have been made.</p>
<p>COMPONENT 4 Please significantly reduce the budget for this component and enhance the budget for Components 2 & 3.</p>	<p>The budget for Component 4 has been decreased by \$130,000 and currently is \$289,962 (funds have relocated to Component 2 and 3). However, we probably cannot decrease it further without high risk of insufficient resources for the project M&E, lessons learning and dissemination. \$115,000 reserved for Component 4 at the PIF stage is not quite realistic for 6 years project with only mandatory M&E activities (without travel and KM) costing \$160,000. We definitely should reserve at least \$20-30K/year for KM management (events, publications, some travel) given Angola is learning from other countries experience in conservation.</p> <p>Relevant changes have been made in the CEO ER: Table B, p. 2; Output 4.1, p. 25; Prodoc: Output 4.1, p. 56; IX.TOTAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN section, budget lines 17-18; budget notes 17-18, pp. 108-111.</p>

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

No. The project has FAR TOO MANY activities for the proposed budget. The long list of proposed activities is presented in the 12 pages of the CEO Endorsement dedicated to the description of the components (pages 24 to 36). It is virtually impossible to deliver all those activities with the proposed budget for the project of GEF \$4.1 million. This is clear when looking at the Budget of the Project Document on page 109 (Local Consultants, Contractual service, Equipment and Furniture, Materials and Goods, Travel, Training, workshop, meetings).

Please clearly separate the proposed activities to be funded by the GEF from those covered by co-financing. Please list the GEF funded activities in the body of the CEO Endorsement, and move the activities to be covered by co-financing to an Annex. Please clearly state who is going to co-finance those activities that go in the Annex.

The budget for Component 4 was increased from \$115 K at PIF stage to \$418K at CEO Endorsement. A budget approaching 1/2 million dollars is totally unjustifiable for KM when the needs on site are so numerous and expensive. Return to the amount requested at PIF stage and reallocate the difference to Component 2 and/or 3.

8-2-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

29 July 2019

Comment	Response

<p>No. The project has FAR TOO MANY activities for the proposed budget. The long list of proposed activities is presented in the 12 pages of the CEO Endorsement dedicated to the description of the components (pages 24 to 36). It is virtually impossible to deliver all those activities with the proposed budget for the project of GEF \$4.1 million. This is clear when looking at the Budget of the Project Document on page 109 (Local Consultants, Contractual service, Equipment and Furniture, Materials and Goods, Travel, Training, workshop, meetings).</p>	<p>The following adjustments to the project have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output (1.4) was completely deleted; Focus of the Output 1.1 has been narrowed to three priority legislation documents; number of training activities under Outputs 1.2, 1.3 and 2.2 have been reduced by 25%. <p>The budget has been adjusted accordingly. Please see our responses above. However, we would like to leave detailed description of the project Outputs for the project management team to understand the logic of the output delivery and have more or less full guidance on the project implementation. The detailed description does not mean that there are any unrealistic activities, but actually demonstrate detailed discussion of the project outputs with national and international stakeholders. Also, detailed Outputs actually helped our team to develop realistic budget for their implementation.</p> <p>For some of the Outputs (e.g. 2.2 and 3.1) the project allows some flexibility and provide the project management team with an option to procure the most needed equipment and select for implementation the most needed activities based on the situations at the project start (that can be delayed for different reasons for 1-3 years). As was demonstrated the GEF OPS5 Fifth Overall Performance Study, the projects that allow some flexibility in design and built on stakeholder ownership are the most successful. Thus, we tried to follow that recommendations in design of Angola project</p>
<p>Please clearly separate the proposed activities to be funded by the GEF from those covered by co-financing. Please list the GEF funded activities in the body of the CEO Endorsement, and move the activities to be covered by co-financing to an Annex. Please clearly state who is going to co-finance those activities that go in the Annex.</p>	<p>As has been mentioned above all updated project Outputs mentioned in Prodoc and CEO ER have been carefully discussed with stakeholders and are realistic for delivery with GEF funds only. Some of the Outputs (e.g., 1.1, 2.2, and 3.1) has options for activities to deliver the Output that can be chosen by the project management team based on the situation at the project start. For example, under Output 1.1 the project lists priority legislation and policy to improve Angolan wildlife management and wildlife crime enforcement. However, under the Output the project can actually update only 3-4 legal documents from the list with GEF funds – the most actual and needed ones at the moment of the project initiation. Others can be updated if co-financing is available as planned. Under Output 1.3 the project is going to train 250-300 PA rangers with GEF funds, but if Stop Ivory and KAZA co-financing will be actually provided 1,500 rangers are going to be trained. Thus, the cofinancing in many cases will not actually increase the number of project activities, but increase impact of the activities via targeting more rangers, more community members, providing more trainings, and more investments in equipment and infrastructure. Based on your request we added Annex H: GEF Project Outputs with GEF funds and co-financing to the CEO ER to clarify the co-financing role for the project, p. 74</p>
<p>The budget for Component 4 was increased from \$115 K at PIF stage to \$418K at CEO Endorsement. A budget approaching 1/2 million dollars is totally unjustifiable for KM when the needs on site are so numerous and expensive. Return to the amount requested at PIF stage and reallocate the difference to Component 2 and/or 3.</p>	<p>As has been mentioned above, the budget for Component 4 has been decreased by \$130,000 and currently is \$289,962 (funds have relocated to Component 2 and 3). However, we probably cannot decrease it further without high risk of insufficient resources for the project M&E, lessons learning and dissemination. This is a 6-year long project.</p>

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Thanks for identifying the there top risks as HIGH.

Please reconsider if the risk of

Are the "Benefits provided by the project to local communities may be insufficient to draw them from poaching, illegal wildlife trade and other illegal activities" Moderate or High? Please elaborate mitigation factors accordingly.

8-2-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

29 July 2019

Comment	Response

<p>Please reconsider if the risk of "Benefits provided by the project to local communities may be insufficient to draw them from poaching, illegal wildlife trade and other illegal activities" Moderate or High? Please elaborate mitigation factors accordingly.</p>	<p>The risk was changed to High. Following mitigation measures have been suggested in the Prodoc and CEO ER:</p> <p>"The risk is only partly under project control due to limited funding. Currently a significant number of local populations in the project areas are involved in illegal bushmeat hunting and trade, illegal logging, burning of the woodlands and other unsustainable activities (see also Annex G. UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Template (SESP)). The project can decrease the risk partly via implementation of the Outputs 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 (sustainable livelihood of the local communities and community participation in the PA management) and partly via increased level of law enforcement (under Outputs 2.1 and 2.2) that will allow much less opportunities for illegal practices. At the same time, the project will identify economically and socially feasible ways to involve local communities in sustainable livelihood, conservation and CBNRM as well as in effective markets for community-based products, and will build effective partnerships with international donors and private sector in the project areas to ensure higher sustainability and local ownership of the Output 3.1. To mitigate the risk the project investment in the local communities is quite high (\$1,105,000, or 26% of the GEF grant), however, the total area of the investment is limited to 20,000 ha only (\$54/ha of the most important poaching hotspots in the project areas) to achieve high impact".</p> <p>The changes have been made in the Prodoc: v. Project Risks and Mitigation Measures section, p. 79; CEO ER: Risk section, p.41; and Annex J. UNDP Risk Log, p.95</p>
--	--

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

The LoC from UNDP is missing.

The language of the LoC from ICCF and Stop Ivory suggest a contribution in-kind. Please adjust.

In Table C please include if the co-financing is for TA or Investment Mobilized.

8-2-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

29 July 2019

There must have been a misunderstanding. UNDP is not in the position to provide any co-financing and hence cannot provide an LoC for this project.

However, the LoC of MINBAC had been accidentally excluded from the PRODOC Annex in the submission. This has now been resolved, the Annex was updated to include the MINBAC LoC.

Given the new GEF definition of Grant and In kind co-financing (GEF 2018) we changed category of co-financing letters from MINAMB, ICCF and Stop Ivory from Grant to In kind. The changes have been made in the **Prodoc**: VIII. FINANCIAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT section, p. 104; and **CEO ER**: Table C., p 4.

However, we decided to not change the co-financing letters as we reduced the category from cash to in kind so considered this unnecessary.

Column "Investments Mobilized" was added to Table C and completed, CEO ER, p. 4-5. The updated Annex M is also enclosed in this resubmission.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Yes. The TTs for the two target PAs were included. Same for indicators.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

Yes. There is a detailed response to STAP comments. Although there is no response to Germany's comments, the CEO Endorsement addresses the two points made by Germany.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

29 July 2019

Please, see our responses above.

In addition, the entire section XI. RISK MANAGEMENT in the PRODOC was updated to the latest standard of UNDP.

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-2-19

No. Please address outstanding issues. Thanks.

8-2-19

No.

Please remove paragraph 214 in Prodoc (UNDP Direct Project Services as requested by Government). The budget (\$51K) should be used by the Government to carry-out these activities. Consider a third party to perform these activities if appropriate.

3-4-20

No.

The fact that Direct Project Costs were "subsumed into the budget line 25" didn't resolve the issue because the "procurement" is still there as part of the TOR for the "**Administration and Finance Assistant**". Procurement is also in the TOR for the **Project Assistant**.

As stated in the review : *The budget (\$51K) should be used by the Government to carry-out these activities. Consider a third party to perform these activities if appropriate.*

Please address this to avoid a new round of revisions.

- Prepare periodic accounting records by recording receipts, disbursements (ledgers, cashbooks, vouchers, etc.) and reconciling data for recurring or financial reports and assist in preparation of annual procurement plans;
- Support procurement and contracting processes (Individual Consultants, services and goods);
- Support documentation for Contract Assets Procurement (CAP) meetings and Regional Asset Contract Procurement submission;|
- Undertake project financial closure formalities including submission of terminal reports, transfer and disposal of equipment, processing of semi-final revisions, and support professional staff in preparing the terminal assessment reports;
- Ensure that contractual processes follow the stipulated UNDP and GEF procedures;
- Compile technical and financial reports as required;
- Ensure proper filing of all project related documents.

3-28-20

This CEO Endorsement is recommended for technical clearances

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON BUDGETING

4-12-20

1- UN Volunteer position charged to Component 3. Is it a Volunteer or a UN Paid staff? Agency's staff cannot be paid using GEF resources. Institutional arrangements and description of duties indicate a position within the PMU.

2- The GEF can't support the purchase of 3 Toyota Landcruiser and 3 Pick-ups. Reduce to 1 per PA. Remove purchase of satellite phones (equipment and charges are expensive).

No	General Description	Contract Value USD (cumulative)
1	Toyota Landcruiser for the national Environmental Crime Unit	35,000
2	Radios, satellite phones, cameras, computers, software, investigation equipment for the national Environmental Crime Unit	15,000
3	Training equipment for the Wildlife School in Menongue on the Years 1-2	80,000
4	Special equipment for the inter-agency cooperation of border agencies in Cabinda Province on Year 2	10,000
5	2 Toyota Landcruisers for local ECUs in the Maiombe NP and Luando SNR on the Years 2 and 3	100,000
6	Field equipment for the officers of local ECUs in the Maiombe NP and Luando SNR	20,000
7	3 Toyota Pick-Ups 79 for patrol units	120,000

3. 3- PMC staff cost (Project Coordinator, Project Technical and Administrative Assistant, and Project Driver) charged to project components 1 and 2. The TOR for Project Coordinator seems to indicate all project management and coordination tasks without any specific deliverables under project component 1 or 2. As per Guidelines, Project Coordinator has to be charged to the PMC (GEF portion + co-financing portion). Otherwise, if the intent is to charge him/her to the Project Components, comprehensive TOR's that show the deliverables per component of this person are required, otherwise it is not possible to determine what the GEF is paying for. Project Coordinator expected to work on "Project Coordination".

4- The M&E budget shows NIM audit, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan. NIM audit need to be charged to PMC, For the Gender and Stakeholder plans, please conform that these charges are for follow-up only. Please note that in the project budget, NIM audit is shown to be charged to component 4 and present the NIM consistently across all the documents and in Portal.

4-30-20

This CEO Endorsement is Recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

Reply of 04 March 2020

Paragraphs 214-216 as well as Annex L in the Project Document referring to UNDP project services were deleted. Budget line and budget note 26 on Direct Project Costs (DPC) were deleted from the Total Budget and Work Plan (TBWP) in the Project Document and subsumed into budget line 25.

In addition, the Section VII *Governance and Management Arrangements*, was updated to the latest standard version, inter alia removing any language that could imply an implementation role for UNDP.

"In addition, the Section VII Governance and Management Arrangements, was updated to be compliant with the latest official UNDP project document template of January 2020, inter alia removing any language that could imply an implementation role for UNDP."
The CEO Endorsement Request was updated as required after changes in the Project Document.

Reply of 10 March 2020

The last resubmission unfortunately contained several minor leftover errors that led to the misunderstanding reflected in this last GEF Review Sheet dated 4 March. These are corrected now.

All the PMU posts will be project staff and based at government premises. This includes the Project Assistant, which for purposes of clarity was now renamed Project Technical and Administrative Assistant; and the Project Finance and Administration Assistant, which for purposes of clarity was now renamed and recategorized to Project Finance and Procurement Officer. The latter post – which is object of Budget Line 25 – therefore is a government post, wherefore the budget of \$51K will indeed be used by the Government, as requested.

This also implies that it was normal that the TORs included references to procurement support, these are part of the national counterpart / project capacity needed to operate under national implementation.

The TORs for the two posts, in Annex E, were reviewed and overlaps between the two eliminated. References in three of the TORs in Annex E that “UNDP Angola is looking for a [post title]...” that had been left by accident in the last resubmission, were now replaced with “The Ministry of Environment / National Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas of Angola (MINAMB/INBAC) is looking for a [post title]...”.

Minor changes were made to Paragraphs 167 and 201, including the deletion of a leftover reference to the UNDP portfolio manager providing project management support.

Minor changes were made to Budget Notes 5 and 25 in the Total Budget and Work Plan (Section IX).

Minor changes and additions were made to Annex F Overview of Technical Consultancies and to the Indicative Procurement Plan in Annex L1.

Reply of 29 April 2020

On 1. UN Volunteer in Component 3.

The UN Volunteer was replaced by an International Technical Advisor, with the budget and amended budget note merged into Budget Note 12. TORs were added to PRODOC Annex E. References to the UN Volunteer in various sections of the PRODOC were amended to International Technical Advisor and responsibilities were aligned accordingly, under the sections on Project Management (Para 167), Governance Arrangements/PMU (Para 201), Annexes F, J and L1.

Changes made in the PRODOC in the project management arrangements were also reflected in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request.

On 2. Equipment purchases.

References to satellite phones were deleted, as requested, from Components 1 and 2 – in the project description (Para 99.7), in the budget notes and in the procurement plan (Annex L1, Table 1). The budget surplus was maintained in the same summary budget lines.

With regard to vehicles for the project, we propose to maintain three vehicles of the six initially budgeted and have budgeted accordingly: to equip Maiombe NP (1) and Luanda SNR (1), as requested in the GEFSEC comment, and in addition a third for the Environmental Crime Unit to be deployed as per the greatest need. It is also proposed that all three are pickups, at reduced budgets of \$40,000 each. Changes were made to Para 86.1, 99.7 and 105 subitems as well as in the budget notes and in the procurement plan (Annex L1, Table 1). Budgets surpluses were reallocated within the components.

Changes made in the PRODOC in the project description and project management arrangements were also reflected in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request.

On 3. Budgeting of project staff cost.

The Project Coordinator assumes both coordination and technical functions. This was reflected in the amended TORs in Annex E. At the same time, the budget for the Project Coordinator was redistributed between Components, from 50% C1 and 50% C2, to 40% C1, 40% C2, 5% C3 and 15% PMC. In consequence many other budget lines and budget notes had to be adapted, including to maintain the Component subtotals. All this was amended in the PRODOC Section IX *Total Budget and Work Plan* including in the budget notes. References in the project description to Output budgets were removed to prevent confusion/misalignment – and this was also reflected in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request.

After the request to implement the project under full National Implementation, a Project Finance and Procurement Officer was added in prior resubmissions who was entirely budgeted under PMC. Under the 5% PMC ceiling, it was not possible to allocate a greater share of the Project Coordinator to the PMC budget. The Government, UNDP and other cofinanciers are not in the position to contribute specific funding for this purpose.

On 4. NIM audit, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan.

In PRODOC Section IX *Total Budget and Work Plan*, Audit Costs were moved into Project Management Costs.

In PRODOC Section VI *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan*, Table *Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget*, NIM Audit, Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Plan were removed and the total was recalculated. This was also reflected in the GEF CEO Endorsement Request.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

CONTEXT

Angola has been at peace and politically stable since 2002. Although the country is slated to move into middle-income status, poverty is still a major challenge, especially in rural areas, resulting in high dependence on natural resources. Due to the high value of ivory (US\$6,000 for a single tusk in the black market), poaching and illegal wildlife trade represent a short-term solution for food and income shortages to local communities. Although Angola has depended heavily on oil revenues, there is currently large interest in the diversification of the economy, including through the development of sustainable tourism. This interest as well as Angola's international obligations under agreements such as CBD and CITES, has reinforced political support for the expansion and strengthening of the country's protected areas system, and for the local communities to benefit directly or indirectly from wildlife. The conservation Angola's natural assets is an imperative for the country to use nature tourism as an axis of sustainable development.

PROJECT

The project has the following outcomes and associated outputs: 1) The strengthening of the policy, legal and institutional framework to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade (IWT) and to reduce Human Wildlife Conflict -HWC [Outputs: **1.1.** National policy and regulatory framework for IWT control and wildlife management is reviewed and updated: National Wildlife Crime Enforcement Strategy, HWC Strategy, updated wildlife crime legislation with higher penalties, and CBNRM legislation, are developed and approved by Government; the Maiombe NP and Luando SNR laws are updated; **1.2.** National Environmental Crime Unit and

other wildlife law enforcement agencies are provided with training, manuals and equipment to effectively enforce, prosecute and penalize wildlife crime: the ECU has at least 20 officers and is provided with a comprehensive mentoring programme on wildlife crime intelligence, investigation, and prosecution, and necessary equipment; 200-250 INBAC, Customs, Police, and Judiciary officers are trained to investigate, prosecute, and penalize wildlife crime; **1.3.** The Environmental Polytechnic Institute (31st January Wildlife School) in Menongue has comprehensive national training programmes for PA rangers and provides necessary training for PA staff: The Institute has instructor staff and equipment; at least 250-300 PA rangers are trained in anti-poaching approaches and technologies. 2. Strengthening capacity of selected PAs and law enforcement agencies in the target areas to control poaching, IWT, HWC, and habitat degradation [Outputs: 2.1. Two local inter-agency Environmental Crime Units (local sub-divisions of the national Environmental Crime Unit) are established in the project areas and provided with comprehensive anti-poaching trainings, equipment, and initial operational support: the local Units have staff of at least 12 inspectors and necessary equipment and operational support from Local and National Government for effective wildlife crime enforcement in Maiombe NP and Luando SNR; 2.2 2.2. Comprehensive and participatory Management Plans for the PAs in the project areas are updated and implemented, including PA support with training, equipment and infrastructure: Maiombe NP and Luando SNR have at least 30 rangers each and supported with basic infrastructure, necessary equipment and on-site trainings to fight poaching and manage PAs and HWC;

3) Engaging local communities in sustainable wildlife, forest and PA management [Outputs: 3.1. Pilot projects on community-based conservation, HWC management, sustainable use of natural resources, and alternative sources of income for local communities are developed and implemented in the project areas: 10,000-12,000 local people (50% of women) in Maiombe NP and Luando SNR are trained in CBNRM, SLM, SFM and HWC management, and supported with grants to initiate community sustainable livelihood projects; 3.2. Public awareness campaign targeting IWT, bushmeat consumption, HWC and habitat degradation is developed and implemented in the project areas and at national level. 4) Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming [Outputs: 4.1. Participatory project monitoring, evaluation and learning framework is developed and implemented; 4.2. Lessons learned from the project are shared with national and international conservation programmes, including GWP; 4.3. Gender strategy developed and used to guide project implementation, monitoring and reporting.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

The following Global Environmental Benefits will be delivered by the project: 1) Improved protection and management of two PAs with high level of biodiversity – Maiombe NP and Luando SNR with total area of 1,200,400 ha; 2) Stable area of Tropical Rain Forest in Maiombe NP: 196,275 ha;; 3) Stable area of Miombo Woodlands in Luando SNR: 929,191 ha; 4) Stable populations of Forest Elephant, Western Gorilla, and Central Chimpanzee in Maiombe NP and Black Giant Sable in Luando SNR; 5) At least 10,490 (40% are women) of the direct project beneficiaries, 95% of those are local people in Maiombe NP and Luando SNR.

INNOVATION

Particularly innovative aspects of this project include: i) the development of an institutional framework that delivers national and site level action to address IWT and monitor trends for the first time in post-conflict Angola, ii) benefits from community-based natural resource management and monitoring contribute to combat wildlife crime and human-wildlife conflict, including poverty alleviation.

CO-FINANCING

Provided by the Government of Angola (\$5.5 million); KfW (\$6.0 million); CSOs (\$5.0 million) for a total of \$16.5 million.