



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT / APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project  
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: January 30, 2012

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 4082  
**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 4581  
**COUNTRY:** Angola  
**PROJECT TITLE:** National Biodiversity Project: Conservation of Iona National Park  
**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP  
**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** Ministry of Environment (MINAMB)  
**GEF FOCAL AREA(s):** Biodiversity  
**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(s):** BD- SO1 – SP3 ‘Strengthening Terrestrial PA Networks  
**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:**

Expected Calendar	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	Jan-10
CEO Endorsement	Mar-12
GEF Agency Approval	May-12
Implementation Start	Jun-12
Mid-term Review	Jun-14
Implementation completion	May-16

### A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** The project objective is to catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park

Project Components	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
<u>Component 1</u> Rehabilitation of Iona National Park	TA	<p><i>A functional and effective park administration is established, equipped and resourced to initiate the rehabilitation of Iona National Park (15,150km<sup>2</sup>); measured as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Management effectiveness (as measured by the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) of the park is improved from a baseline of 7% to &gt;45%</li> <li>- At least 12 permanent staff are appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the Park (from a baseline of no staff)</li> <li>- The proportion of the plains grassland habitats of the park overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle) is reduced from ~35% to &lt;20%</li> <li>- Key wildlife species (Oryx, Hartmann’s Zebra,</li> </ul>	<p>1.1 <i>Park staff are appointed, trained, adequately equipped and deployed in the park:</i> park manager appointed; park staff appointed; staff training completed; staff uniforms, vehicles and equipment procured.</p> <p>1.2 <i>Key park infrastructure, equipment and services are established:</i> infrastructure works designed; works specifications prepared; EIAs completed; works contracts tendered, awarded and implemented; bulk diesel tanks procured; voice, radio and data communications systems functional; computer systems installed.</p> <p>1.3 <i>An integrated park management plan is developed:</i> survey work</p>	750,000	16	4,087,770	84	4,837,770

Project Components	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
		<p>Springbok and Ostrich) populations increase in size by a factor of ~20%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 25% of the critical natural freshwater springs in the park are secured and accessible by medium-sized and large wildlife species</li> <li>- Poaching incidents and uncontrolled visitor use in the park are reduced</li> <li>- At least 60% of the local communities living in the park are adequately represented in park decision-making processes</li> <li>- At least 10 direct and 30 indirect job opportunities (from a baseline of 0) are created for local communities living in and around the park</li> <li>- Average annual income of households living in the park is increased from US\$155 to US\$250/annum.</li> </ul>	<p>completed; state of knowledge report prepared; strategic plan developed; subsidiary plans developed; annual operational plan prepared; annual performance review completed.</p> <p>1.4 <i>Community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park is built:</i> local communities profiled; local community governance structures described; livestock usage and impacts surveyed; community facilitator appointed; park-community communications implemented; cooperative governance structure/s constituted; alternative livelihood and park-based employment and entrepreneurial opportunities identified.</p>					
<p><u>Component 2</u> Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network</p>	TA	<p><i>The capacity of INBAC and MINAMB to administer and utilize scarce funds and human resources in the planning, management, and/or oversight of approximately 82,322 km<sup>2</sup> of protected area estate is improve; measured as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial sustainability of the system of protected areas shows significant improvement from a baseline of 3% to &gt;10% at end of project (EOP)</li> <li>- Capacity development indicator scores for the protected area system shows an improvement from a baseline of 42% (systemic), 39 (institutional) and 35% (individual) to 55%, 50% and 45% respectively</li> <li>- Total government budget allocation for protected area management improves from US\$1.5m/annum to &gt;US\$8m/annum</li> <li>- A strategic plan and policy framework for the protected area system is adopted by</li> </ul>	<p>2.1 <i>A strategic plan for the protected area system is prepared:</i> INBAC strategic plan prepared and approved; protected area policies developed and adopted.</p> <p>2.2 <i>The organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system is developed:</i> recommendations on organizational structure and staffing complement for INBAC prepared; recommendations on job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for INBAC staff prepared; in-service skill development and training programme for protected area staff implemented; mentoring and career-pathing programme for protected areas staff implemented; collaborative arrangements with regional counterpart institutions established.</p> <p>2.3 <i>The current state of national parks and strict</i></p>	1,056,000	44	1,349,770	56	2,405,770

Project Components	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
		government - An organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff is formally adopted by government - More than 50% of staff have been recruited to approved posts in the INBAC organogram - By EOP at least 20 protected area staff have completed in-service training and skills development programmes, while 3 senior protected area staff are participating in a structured mentoring programme (from a baseline of 0)	<i>nature reserves is assessed:</i> state of park reports prepared for 5 national parks and 1 strict nature reserve.  2.4 <i>Detail implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves are prepared:</i> Implementation plans prepared for the rehabilitation and rationalization of 5 national parks and 1 strict nature reserve.					
3) Project management				194,000	22	702,460	78	896,460
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6,140,000</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>8,140,000</b>

#### B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Project	%*
Impl. Agency	UNDP Angola Country Office	Grant	1,440,000	23.5%
Multilat. Agency	European Union: funding entrusted to UNDP for the project	Grant	2,700,000	44.0%
Nat'l Gov't	Ministry of Environment	Grant	2,000,000	32.6%
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>6,140,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

#### C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	Project Preparation Amount (a)	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee*	For comparison: GEF and Co-financing at PIF
GEF financing	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	200,000	2,000,000
Co-financing	0	6,140,000	6,440,000		6,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8,140,000</b>	<b>8,140,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>8,000,000</b>

\*PPG fee previously approved.

#### D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)

N/A

**E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks (GEF Only)</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)*</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
<i>Local consultants* [Sub-total]</i>	209	209,000	470,000	679,000
Park Manager (national for years 3 and 4)	-	0	120,000	120,000
Hydrologist	35	35,000	0	35,000
Tourism specialist	30	30,000	0	30,000
Social scientists	-	0	120,000	120,000
Vegetation ecologist	60	60,000	0	60,000
Independent community facilitator	60	60,000	0	60,000
Stakeholder engagement expert	24	24,000	0	24,000
Human resource development specialist	-	0	30,000	30,000
<i>Fiscais for Iona National Park over 4 years</i>	-		200,000	200,000
<i>International consultants* [Sub-total]</i>	18	54,000	570,770	624,770
Park Manager (international for years 1 and 2)	-	0	450,770	450,770
Habitat mapping expert	18	54,000	0	54,000
Mid-Term evaluation	-	0	60,000	60,000
Final evaluation	-	0	60,000	60,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>263,000</b>	<b>1,040,770</b>	<b>1,303,770</b>

\* Details are provided in Annex C.

**F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST**

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks/months (GEF only)</i>	<i>GEF amount \$</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)*</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
<i>Local consultants [sub-total] *</i>	208	194,000	538,904	732,904
Project Coordinator	104	120,000	538,904	658,904
Project Administrative Assistant	104	74,000	0	74,000
<i>International consultants [sub-total] *</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications [sub-total] *</i>		0	123,556	123,556
Office rental costs, supplies, communication costs and miscellaneous		0	63,556	63,556
Vehicle (4x4 fully equipped) for project field visits		0	60,000	60,000
<i>Travel*</i>		0	40,000	40,000
<i>Other:</i>		0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>194,000</b>	<b>702,460</b>	<b>896,460</b>

\* Details are provided in Annex C.

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?** yes [ ] no [X]

## H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project's M&E Plan is thoroughly described in the UNDP PRODOC. For more detail, refer to Section I, PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget. The table below provides a summary

### *Costed Monitoring & Evaluation Framework*

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 20,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP GEF RTA/National Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Oversight by National Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> </ul>	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RTA</li> <li>▪ UNDP EEG</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 60,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team,</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : 60,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ Project manager and team</li> </ul>	Indicative cost per year: 4,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 156,000	

**\*Note:** Costs included in this table are part and parcel of the UNDP Total Budget and Work Plan (TBW) in the PRODOC, and not additional to it. Costs will be shared between UNDP, EU and GEF according to the TBW.

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:**

### **A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:**

For more detail, refer to the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION I - PART I: Situation Analysis and PART II: Strategy. The project context, rationale and strategic approach may be summarized as follows:

Angola's protected area system was created during the colonial era (i.e. prior to 1975). It comprises 13 protected areas (6 national parks, 2 strict nature reserves, 1 regional park and 4 partial reserves), covering ~6.6% (82,322 km<sup>2</sup>) of the national territory. Due to prolonged periods of instability in the country (1975-2002) and growing population needs, many of the conservation areas have been almost completely abandoned, without adequate funding, equipment or staff. Angola's conservation areas are served by a weak administrative system, with extremely limited resources and capacity. The rationalisation and rehabilitation of the existing network of conservation areas, and the creation of new conservation areas, are considered important interventions required for the effective conservation of Angola's globally significant biodiversity and national reconstruction efforts.

The Project is designed as the *first phase* of a more comprehensive national program to rehabilitate, strengthen and expand Angola's system of protected areas. For this phase of the national program, the project will focus outputs and activities - over a period of four years - at two levels of intervention.

**At a national level**, the project will support the government in the establishment and operationalisation of the 'Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently approved *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC). It will specifically support: (i) the preparation of a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system; (ii) the development of an organisational structure and functional staffing complement for the protected area system; (iii) an assessment of the current state (biodiversity, infrastructure, management, settlement, land use, etc.) of national parks and strict nature reserves; and (vi) the preparation of detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of these national parks and strict nature reserves.

**At a local level**, the project will seek to assist the government to rehabilitate a single protected area - the largest National Park in Angola, Iona National Park (15,150 km<sup>2</sup>) - through: (i) the establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff complement for the park; (ii) the renovation and construction of key park infrastructure (i.e. accommodation, offices, roads, water supply, waste management facilities, electrical supply, fencing, etc.); (iii) the development of a park management planning system; and (iv) the piloting of a cooperative governance framework for the park.

The project **goal** is to *establish and effectively manage a network of protected areas to conserve representative samples of Angola's globally unique biodiversity*.

The project **objective** is to *catalyse an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park*.

In order to achieve the project objective, and address the barriers (see PRODOC, Section I, Part I), the project's intervention has been organised into two **outcomes** (this is in line with the components presented at the PIF stage):

### **Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park**

**Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network**

**Outcome 1: Rehabilitation of Iona National Park**

Work under this outcome will focus on the establishment of a simple, but effective, administration to manage Iona National Park. The administrative structure proposed for the park will comprise a central administrative base at *Espinheira*<sup>1</sup>, and a peripheral network of gate entry control points/ access control points (in the initial phase, these control points will be limited to *Charojamba* and *Iona*) and ranger outposts (in the initial phase, these ranger outposts will be limited to *Charojamba*, *Espinheira* and *Iona*)<sup>2</sup>. The location of the proposed administrative centre and the entry points, access control points and ranger outposts are shown in Map 3 in PROOC Section IV, Part II.

In the initial phase, the following basic staffing complement<sup>3</sup>, infrastructure, equipment and services will be procured – with GEF and EU funding support - at the three administrative nodes, within the four-year term of the project:

Administrative node	Staffing complement, and indicative staff safety equipment	Indicative infrastructural requirements	Indicative vehicle requirements and park equipment	Indicative services (water, waste, power) requirements
<b>ESPINHEIRA</b> <i>Administrative centre</i> <i>Ranger outpost</i>	4 staff - 1 park manager, 1 senior conservator, 1 administrative assistant, 1 general assistant Staff uniforms and protective clothing x 4 Staff camping and safety equipment (tent, torches, backpack, sleeping bag, GPS, utensils, binoculars etc) x 2 Radios Digital cameras	Install signage Upgrade 3 existing staff accommodation/ office space Renovate 1 new staff accommodation Construct outer wall to screen buildings Construct carport Clear landing runway/ helicopter pad	Bunded fuel store/s 2 4x4 pick up trucks 1 x quad/motorbike Radio and cellular communications 3 x Computer + printer + stationery Gas Office and accommodation furnishing and appliances (e.g. desks, storage, beds, linen, fridge, stove, chairs, etc)	Install water supply (e.g. borehole, solar pump, pipes, desalinator, water tanks) Install electrical supply (e.g. solar panels, generator, cabling, batteries) Install septic tank (incl. drainage and piping) Construct solid waste disposal facility
<b>CHAROJAMBA</b> <i>Gate entry control point</i> <i>Ranger outpost</i>	4 staff - 1 senior ranger, 1 ranger, 1 gate guard and 1 mechanic Staff uniforms and protective clothing x 4 Staff camping and safety equipment (tent, torches, backpack, sleeping bag, GPS, utensils, binoculars etc) x 2 Radios Digital cameras	Upgrade gate entry point Install signage Upgrade 1 existing staff accommodation Construct 1 new staff accommodation unit Construct store, workshop and garage Construct concrete causeway across Curoca river	Bulk steel diesel tanks, with fuel management system Bunded fuel store 1 4x4 pick up truck 1 x quad/motorbike 1 x 5-ton truck Radio and cellular communications 1 x Computer + printer + stationery Gas Office and accommodation furnishing and appliances (e.g. desks, storage, beds, linen, fridge, stove, chairs, etc)	Install water supply (e.g. borehole, solar pump, pipes, desalinator, water tanks) Install electrical supply (e.g. solar panels, generator, cabling, batteries) Install septic tank (incl. drainage and piping) Construct solid waste disposal facility
<b>IONA POSTO</b> <i>Access control point</i>	4 staff - 2 rangers, 1 gate guard and 1 general	Establish gate entry point Install signage	Bunded fuel store 1 4x4 pick up truck	Install water supply (e.g. borehole, solar pump,

<sup>1</sup> The selection of Espinheira as the administrative centre will however be dependent on the year-round availability of fresh water. If this cannot be secured, the administrative centre may be relocated to Iona.

<sup>2</sup> In later phases, additional entry control points and/or ranger outposts may be established at Tombua, Foz do Cunene, Montenegro, Uadiva, Pediva and Techibolombonga.

<sup>3</sup> The salaries of the permanent park staff complement to be deployed in the park will be funded by the Government of Angola (see the co-financing commitment in Section IV, Part IV)

Administrative node	Staffing complement, and indicative staff safety equipment	Indicative infrastructural requirements	Indicative vehicle requirements and park equipment	Indicative services (water, waste, power) requirements
<i>Ranger outpost</i>	assistant Staff uniforms and protective clothing x 4 Staff camping and safety equipment (tent, torches, backpack, sleeping bag, GPS, utensils, binoculars etc) x 2 Radios Digital cameras	Construct 2 staff accommodation units Construct 1 storage unit Construct carport	1 x quad/motorbike Radio and cellular communications system 1 x Computer + printer + stationery Gas Office and accommodation furnishing and appliances (e.g. desks, storage, beds, linen, fridge, stove, chairs, etc)	pipes, desalinators, water tanks) Install electrical supply (e.g. solar panels, generator, cabling, batteries) Install septic tank (incl. drainage and piping) Construct solid waste disposal facility

With an adequately equipped, resourced and capacitated permanent staff complement in place, the following basic management activities will – under the leadership of a Park Manager – then be undertaken in the park during the course of the project:

- Park enforcement and compliance (patrols both within and along the boundaries of the park).
- Access and visitor control management (entry, traversing and use right permitting system).
- Game management (species introductions, population monitoring, etc.)
- Maintenance of grounds, infrastructure and equipment
- Park management planning.
- Data collection (bio-physical, socio-economic, resource use, visitor profiles, etc.)
- Communications and community liaison.
- Incident management.
- Development, servicing and maintenance of basic visitor facilities (e.g. provision of basic, serviced camping sites).
- Environmental education.
- Development of park employment, and alternative livelihood, opportunities for communities living in the park
- Information management.
- Administration, procurement and financial management.
- Fund-raising and income generation.
- Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded sites/habitats/landscapes.
- Support to research and monitoring initiatives in park.
- Upgrade of park signage.

The outputs necessary to achieve Outcome 1 are thoroughly described in the UNDP PRODOC.

### **Outcome 2: Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas system**

The establishment, organisation and roles of the *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC) has recently been approved by the government of Angola (Decree 10/11 of 2011). However there are still no resources (staff, funding, equipment, infrastructure), systems, processes or procedures yet in place for INBAC to properly administer the protected area system. Work under this outcome will thus focus on supporting the development of capacity in INBAC to assume the authority, responsibility and accountability for managing protected areas in Angola.

The outputs necessary to achieve Outcome 2 are thoroughly described in the UNDP PRODOC.

## **B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND / OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/ PLANS:**

The text that follows has been reproduced from the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION I - Part II: Strategy, chapter 'Project consistency with national priorities/plans'.

The project will contribute to implementing Sub-Programme II ('Protection of biodiversity, flora, terrestrial and marine fauna') of the *Programa Nacional de Gestão Ambiental* (PNGA, 2009). It is directly aligned with the objectives and activities defined under the Sub-Programme II Project: 'Restructuring the system of protected areas'. This includes: identifying the current pressures, and their impacts, on protected areas (objective 1); conducting rapid assessments and inventories of biodiversity in protected areas (objective 2); evaluating the current state of conservation of protected areas, and defining their infrastructural and staffing needs (objective 3); developing a management model for protected areas (objective 4); and developing partnerships in the rehabilitation of protected areas (objective 5).

The project is consistent with Objectives C1 ('Re-assess the status of the existing conservation areas and their infrastructure ...'), C2 ('Rehabilitate the conservation areas and their infrastructure ...') and F1 ('Embark on vocational training and capacity building actions for Angolan officials ...') of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2007-2012). The project will specifically contribute to addressing the following priority actions identified in the NBSAP action plan: Action C1.1 (assess current status of biodiversity in conservation areas); Action C1.2 (rationalise, if necessary, the boundaries of the current conservation areas); Action C3.1 (rehabilitate existing conservation areas); Action C3.2 (prepare management plans for the rationalisation and restoration of conservation areas); Action C3.3 (assess the status of communities living in and around conservation areas); Action C4.1 (employ, train and capacitate conservation area staff) and Action F1.2 (provide basic and vocational training).

The project is closely aligned with Objectives 2.1 and 4.1 of the National Policy of Forest, Wildlife and Conservation Areas (2010). Objective 2.1 of the policy identifies the strategies needed for '*the upgrading and rehabilitation of the conservation areas*'. The project will seek to pilot the implementation of strategies (i) – (iv) in the rehabilitation of Iona NP. Objective 4.1 of the policy emphasises the requirements for '*improving*' and '*harmonising*' the national institution/s responsible for the planning and management of conservation areas. The project will support the implementation of strategies (ii) and (v) in supporting the establishment of INBAC.

The project will directly support the government in implementing elements of the recently approved *Plano Estratégico da Rede Nacional de Áreas de Conservação de Angola* (PLERNACA, 2011). It will support the following activities listed in the plan: (i) development of national policies for protected areas (activity 7.1); (ii) establishment, equipping and funding of INBAC (activity 7.3.3), especially in respect of the staffing complement for protected areas; (iii) employing and deploying a core of *fiscais* in protected areas (activity 7.4), particularly for Iona NP; (iv) capacity building of protected area staff (activity 7.5.1); (v) facilitating involvement of local communities in protected areas (activities 7.5.2 and 7.6.1), specifically in Iona NP; (vi) strategic planning for the protected area system (activity 7.11); and (vii) management planning for protected areas (7.12.3 – 7.12.6), specifically in respect of Iona NP.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:**

The text that follows has been extracted from the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION I - PART II: Strategy, chapter 'Project Rationale and Conformity to GEF Policies and Strategic Objectives'.

The project is aligned with GEF's Strategic Objective (SO) 1 of the Biodiversity focal area, 'Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems'. The project is consistent with Strategic Programme (SP) 3 of SO 1; 'Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks'. The project will contribute to the expected outcomes of SP 3 by investing GEF resources in improving the planning and operational management of the protected area system in Angola.

The project will contribute to the achievement of GEF’s outcome indicators under the strategic programming area as follows:

GEF-4 BD Strategic programmes	Expected impact	GEF-4 BD Indicators	Project contribution to indicators
SP-3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	Improved management of terrestrial protected areas	Protected area management effectiveness as measured by individual protected area scorecards	METT scores for Iona National Park will improve from a baseline of 7% to 45%

**D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES.**

The project objective will thus be achieved primarily through the provision of technical assistance. No loan or revolving fund mechanisms are considered appropriate, and therefore grant-type funding is considered adequate to enable successful delivery of project outcomes.

A justification for this request is provided in the UNDP PRODOC.

**E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:**

The text that follows has extracted from the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION IV - PART III: ‘PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Coordination with other Related Initiatives’

The project will work closely with MINAMB to ensure complementarity of its activities in support of the governance, institutional and legislative reform processes currently underway in Angola. These processes will include: the establishment and administration of the new *Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação* (INBAC); the finalisation of the Forest, Wildlife and Conservation Areas Law; the development of regulations for job descriptions and salary scales for national park staff; and the determination of medium term expenditure cost estimates for implementation of the *Plano Estratégico da Rede Nacional de Áreas de Conservação de Angola*.

The project is part and parcel of new *UNDP Overarching Programme in Support of the Environment Sector in Angola*. Under the mentioned Programme, a new GEF project (*Expansion and Strengthening of Angola’s Protected Area system*) is seeking the GEF Council’s approval for being developed. Although related, there will be no overlap with respect to capacity building activities in both projects, neither with respect to activities on the ground. At the protected area systems’ level, this project will focus on establishing a basic institutional and knowledge foundation as a *first phase* of a protected area programme. The new GEF project will take this one step further and have a strong focus on protected area finance. At site level, this project will develop ‘state of the park’ reports and ‘implementation plans’ (which are like an urgent measures action plan) for parks like Quicama, Cangandala and Bicuar. The new project will, in turn, take it a step further and focus on rehabilitation, management planning and enforcement. In this sense, both projects are complementary and represent a staggered approach to a broader protected area programme under INBAC and MINAMB.

Furthermore, this project will work in close partnership with a number of donor agencies, NGOs and government (provincial and national) institutions already actively involved in the rehabilitation of other National Parks - notably *Cangandala NP*; *Bicuar NP*; and *Quicama NP*<sup>4</sup> - in order to avoid duplication of effort, identify opportunities for collaboration, and share resources and knowledge. It will also collate lessons learnt from the

<sup>4</sup> See the [Baseline Analysis](#) for a further description of rehabilitation activities, donor agencies and NGO’s actively involved in these parks.

ongoing implementation of the *Giant Sable Conservation Project* in Cangandala and Bicular National Parks, with a particular emphasis on learning from efforts to integrate local communities into conservation activities.

The project will establish and maintain a strong working relationship with the *Angola Environmental Sector Support Project* (ESSP), particularly in respect of complementary initiatives linked to the strengthening of the legislative and regulatory framework for protected areas and facilitating the establishment of INBAC.

The project will actively support the efforts of MINAMB (and their counterpart agency in Namibia) to constitute and maintain a governance mechanism - as a means for activating and coordinating conservation initiatives between Angola and Namibia - for the *Iona-Skeleton Coast Trans-Frontier Conservation Area*. It will specifically facilitate training, mentoring, capacity building, knowledge exchange and skills exchange initiatives that would benefit landscape-scale conservation efforts between the countries.

The project will, through the *GEF Land Rehabilitation and Rangelands Management in Small Holders Agro-pastoral Production Systems in Southwestern Angola project*, work closely with FAO and local NGOs to combine resources in improving sustainable land management practices in the agro-pastoral and agricultural areas in and around Iona National Park. Inter-agency level coordination will be assured by the UN Representation in Angola, through the Resident Coordinator’s Office.

The project will seek to have representation on the *Conselhos de Auscultação e Concertação Social* (CACs) at the Provincial (Namibe) and Municipal (Tombua) levels as a mechanism for integrating and aligning conservation efforts in Iona National Park with local (provincial and municipal) economic development and infrastructural development initiatives.

Finally, the project will liaise closely with the different line Ministry’s to ensure the ongoing alignment of activities with the governments implementation of the *Programa Nacional de Gestão Ambiental* and NBSAP.

**In addition to the above**, refer to PRODOC Section I - Part I, chapter ‘Stakeholder analysis’, which contains a matrix with a thorough analysis of stakeholders and indications on how they will be involved in the project.

**F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :**

For more detail, refer to the UNDP PRODOC.  
 The Project’s baseline is described in UNDP PRODOC, PART I: ‘Situation Analysis’, Chapter ‘Baseline analysis’ and the alternative scenario is described in UNDP PRODOC, PART II: ‘Strategy’. More specifically, refer under it to chapter ‘Project Rationale and Policy Conformity / Rationale and summary of GEF Alternative’, summarized below in a matrix.

***Incremental Reasoning Matrix***

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	GEF Alternative (A)	GEF Increment (A-B)
<b>BENEFITS</b>			
<b>Global benefits</b>	Under the ‘ <b>business-as-usual</b> ’ scenario, the protected areas will continue to be served by a chronically weak administrative system, with extremely limited resources and capacity. The management approach to protected areas will remain fragmented, opportunistic and unsustainable. Most protected areas will not have an <i>in situ</i> staff	The project, which counts on financing from GEF, EU, UNDP and the Government of Angola, will remove key barriers for ensuring that improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park, will have a catalytic effect and are sustained. This will be done at two levels: At a <u>national level</u> , the project will support the government in the	The GEF increment will generate global biodiversity benefits by averting threats to biodiversity at the protected area system’s level and at the site level through a barrier removal and catalytic approach to overhauling Angola’s protected area estate. The rehabilitation of Iona National Park and the institutional support to INBAC will have a

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	GEF Alternative (A)	GEF Increment (A-B)
	<p>presence. In the few instances where protected area staff are deployed, nearly all will remain poorly equipped and trained. Enforcement measures in protected areas will be grossly inadequate and, in most cases, completely non-existent. Protected area infrastructure, in particular, will continue to degrade to the point where it cannot be rehabilitated. The majority of the wildlife remaining in the protected areas will remain vulnerable, and increasingly threatened with extinction. Most protected areas will become permanently occupied by local communities, who will – in the absence of a management presence – raise livestock, practice subsistence agriculture and burn forests at levels that will lead to the disappearance of many species. Funding support from government and donors for protected area management will largely consist of irregular <i>ad hoc</i> investments in a few, select national parks.</p> <p>A limited number of interventions have however been planned, or are under implementation, to address the severe capacity constraints of the protected area system in Angola. These activities are briefly described in the UNDP PRODOC, under chapter ‘<u>Baseline Analysis</u>’.</p>	<p>establishment and operationalisation of the ‘Department of Conservation Areas’ within the recently approved <i>Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação</i> (INBAC). It will specifically support: (i) the preparation of a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system; (ii) the development of an organisational structure and functional staffing complement for the protected area system; (iii) an assessment of the current state (biodiversity, infrastructure, management, settlement, land use, etc.) of national parks and strict nature reserves; and (vi) the preparation of detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of these national parks and strict nature reserves.</p> <p>At a <u>local level</u>, the project will seek to assist the government to rehabilitate a single protected area - the largest National Park in Angola, Iona National Park (15,150 km<sup>2</sup>) - through: (i) the establishment, training, and equipping of a functional staff complement for the park; (ii) the renovation and construction of key park infrastructure (i.e. accommodation, offices, roads, water supply, waste management facilities, electrical supply, fencing, etc.); (iii) the development of a park management planning system; and (iv) the piloting of a cooperative governance framework for the park.</p>	<p>catalytic effect in the overall system by serving as models, learning and examples of how this overhaul can be achieved. The project will provide protection to globally important biodiversity through the rehabilitation and improved management of Angola’s largest national park, comprising 15,150 Km<sup>2</sup> of unique ecosystems of the Karoo-Namib regional centre of endemism, which contains desert, shrublands, savannas, woodlands and thickets. The park harbours dramatically diverse landscapes, ecosystems and ecoregions, and is the principal habitat of one of the most distinctive and ancient plants known to science – <i>Welwitschia mirabilis</i>. It is home to a rich diversity of animals and plants known only from the Namib Desert, and of more widely distributed species that have local genotypes and phenotypes adapted to the desert environment. These will enjoy heightened protection. In addition, the project will carry out much needed surveys in other national parks (Cangandala, Bicular, Luando, Mupa, Cameia and Quiçama) and prepare (emergency) implementation plans for them. These parks harbour important ecosystems and species belonging to the Zambezian Centre of Endemism.</p>
<p><b>National and local benefits</b></p>	<p>Angola’s conservation areas are served by a weak administrative system, with extremely limited resources and capacity. Public and political support for protected areas will continue to diminish, and protected areas will increasingly come under pressure from other more productive land uses. Chronic lack of funding, staff, infrastructure and equipment to effectively manage Iona National Park has resulted in the degradation of the Park’s ecosystems and the loss of globally important biodiversity.</p>	<p>The project will engage a variety of stakeholders in supporting an overall programme for conservation and protected area management in Angola. Many of these stakeholders are already working in conservation related initiatives, though these initiatives lack the policy coherence and support to bring results to a higher level. The project will catalyse a shift from an <i>ad hoc</i> and opportunistic approach to conservation to a much more concerted investment in the rehabilitation of the entire terrestrial network of protected areas and in Iona National Park, in particular. These investment will, in turn, generate national and local benefits by creating sustainable jobs and building national capacity at various levels.</p>	<p>The project is expected to yield local benefits through improvement in the living conditions of communities living in and around Iona National Park by initiating a process of building a collaborative and cooperative relationship between the Park’s management, the local (municipal and provincial) government and the communities (e.g. health services, educational facilities, safety and security). At the national level, the project will support the establishment, organization and strengthening of the roles and mandate of the recently created <i>Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Áreas de Conservação</i> (INBAC). This will generate benefits through the capacity that will be built, encompassing the systemic, organisational and individual levels through a targeted programme</p>

**G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:**

The following table has been extracted from the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION I - PART II: Strategy, Chapter ‘Indicators and Risks’.

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><u>STRATEGIC</u> Local communities resident in the Park conflict with the park authorities over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource use practices in Iona</p>	High	Likely	High	<p>The population of humans and their domestic livestock (i.e. cattle, goats, sheep and donkeys) has expanded substantially over the past few decades and previously nomadic pastoralists have now become sedentary over most of the eastern half of the Park. Conflicts over access to land, grazing and water will certainly arise once restrictions are placed by Park Management on such resource uses.</p> <p>Component 1 includes an urgent focus on an evaluation on resource use conflicts and effective communication with local communities to resolve immediate problems and to plan longer-term mitigation measures. These might have to include re-design of Park boundaries, provision of community development facilities along the eastern buffer zone of the Park, and other incentives to reduce pressure on water and grazing resources that have to be shared by domestic animals and wildlife species.</p>
<p><u>POLITICAL</u> Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of the new National Institute for Biodiversity and Conservation Areas (INBAC)</p>	High	Moderately likely	Medium	<p>The project intervention can proceed through its planning and resource development stage under the leadership and administration of MINAMB. Project outputs under Component 1 provide for a contracted Park Manager who will lead the implementation of the project <i>in situ</i> and who will mentor national counterparts. Project outputs under Component 2 have been designed to support the financial planning and technical management capacities of INBAC (and MINAMB) at the national and PA levels, should INBAC not be established in the short to medium-term.</p>
<p><u>STRATEGIC</u> The Government of Angola assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development</p>	High	Moderately likely	Medium	<p>During project preparation, national and provincial governments have expressed strong political and institutional support for the project proposal. During project implementation, extensive consultations with all stakeholders with a sound communications strategy will develop a strong supportive community and continued high-level political support for the project. Furthermore, the development and effective implementation of co-management models with local stakeholders (local communities, local authorities and the tourism sector) will strengthen compliance with the management plans and also oblige INBAC to constructively engage with the relevant sectors and communities in order to achieve PA management effectiveness. Through this project INBAC will pilot and strengthen its communications capabilities and improve its enforcement capacities through community participation and NGO and local government engagement.</p>
<p><u>FINANCIAL</u> INBAC’s financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as Government,</p>	High	Unlikely	Low	<p>Securing complementary financial resources to support the ongoing rehabilitation and development of Iona National Park is critical for its recovery and longer-term financial sustainability. INBAC will prioritize work during project implementation to secure increased financial resources from Government and donors using an effective fund raising and</p>

IDENTIFIED RISKS AND CATEGORY	IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD	RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in the protected area system				communication strategy. Government co-financing for this project is \$2 million with a further 2 million Euros from the EU. Additional co-financing resources for conservation may be made available in the near future from other bilateral donors. Furthermore, Component 2 activities (e.g. PA business planning implementation) will focus on improving the revenue generation and management of financing for the protected area system.
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u> Climate change will exacerbate habitat fragmentation in the terrestrial ecosystems in and around Iona NP	Low	Moderately likely	Low	This project will focus on defining potential buffer zones and establishing and monitoring corridors between Iona and the adjoining Namibe Partial Reserve, and south of the Cunene, the Skeleton Coast National Park which may eventually serve as trans-border wildlife corridors. These buffer zones and corridors can act as a safeguard for PAs against the undesired effects of climate change by allowing biodiversity to alter distribution patterns and even migrate in response to climate change effects. Engagement with local communities to encourage the adoption of mitigation measures to reduce demands on firewood and charcoal will form part of the communication strategy of Component 1.

**H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:**

The text that follows has been reproduced from the UNDP PRODOC, SECTION I - Part II: Strategy, Chapter ‘Cost Effectiveness’

The project seeks to catalyse the rehabilitation of the national system of protected areas. It will however complement and build on the existing baseline rehabilitation efforts already underway in Quiçama, Bicuar and Cangandala National Parks.

The project is considered cost-effective for the following primary reasons:

It is estimated that the initial (i.e. over a period of the first ~3-4 years) capital expenditure costs and operating costs of establishing a basic, functional administrative structure for each national park in Angola is in the range US\$4 to US\$12 /ha/annum. Once an administrative structure is in place however, the ongoing capital and operational costs of sustaining this administrative capacity are significantly reduced to levels of ~US\$1 to US\$3/ha/annum beyond year 4. So, a catalytic investment by GEF and EU in the initial start-up costs of establishing park management capacity in Iona National Park will reduce the recurrent costs to government of maintaining this investment (by a factor of ~4).

The lessons learnt from establishing the staff complement, infrastructure, services, equipment and park planning products in Iona NP will, in turn, be used to further improve the cost-effectiveness of establishing or strengthening park administrative structures in other Angolan protected areas.

Project support towards initiating a process of building a collaborative and cooperative relationship between Iona National Park and the local (municipal and provincial) government and communities living in the park, will yield both long-term conservation benefits (e.g. mitigating impacts on park habitats through agreeing on, and enforcing : controls on access of livestock to grazing resources; access for wildlife to natural water points; regulations on the residential footprint; controls on livestock numbers) and an incremental improvement in the living conditions of communities living in the park (e.g. health services, educational facilities, safety and security).

A comparatively small investment by the project in developing an output-based, results-oriented management system (strategic planning, annual planning and policy development) and organisational structure (organogram, post descriptions, conditions of service) for INBAC will ensure the optimal deployment of limited institutional resources and capacity in the future management of the protected area system. An improvement in the business planning processes of INBAC will also provide the groundwork for improving the future long-term financial viability of the protected area system.

Project support toward the focused improvement of the proficiency and skills of protected area management staff within INBAC will ensure that the productivity and effectiveness of the limited human resources available to the institutions is enhanced and optimally organized. The initiation of a mentoring and staff exchange programme with counterpart regional conservation agencies will further incrementally improve local staff capacities. Significant cost-effectiveness will be achieved by selecting permanent protected area staff from the core group of 100 ex-combatants that previously received ranger and park management training (under a complementary donor-funded training initiative during 2008/9).

A modest investment in assessing the current state of the national parks, and the preparation of rehabilitation plans for these national parks, will enable the government to approach prospective donors (and other financiers) to co-finance different aspects of park rehabilitation efforts without losing the overall strategic approach to, and priorities for, park rehabilitation.

Financing support to building stronger institutional linkages with counterpart conservation agencies in the SADC region will result in an overall improvement in the cost-effectiveness of planning and operational activities in Angola's protected area system.

Alternate project approaches were considered, and are briefly discussed here. The alternatives include:

*No project:* There is an extremely limited institutional capacity, and very few resources, in Angola to implement an effective protected area rehabilitation programme, even at the individual park level. Without focused GEF support, initiatives to rehabilitate protected areas will continue to be addressed in an *ad hoc* and opportunistic manner, with an increasing political and public cynicism about the inherent value of protected areas. Any delays in GEF investments would result in the continued degradation of the biodiversity conservation value of protected areas.

*Investment in the rehabilitation of the entire terrestrial network of protected areas:* Because INBAC is not yet functional (i.e. in terms of staff, equipment, infrastructure and management systems), it was considered more practical to focus on two areas of support for this project: (i) pilot the rehabilitation of Iona National Park; and (ii) facilitate the establishment of a staff complement for INBAC and improve the management systems of INBAC. Once INBAC becomes fully operational, it is then envisaged that it will have developed sufficient capacity to incrementally scale up the rehabilitation to the other protected areas (initially national parks, and later other categories of protected area).

*Rehabilitation and conservation of Iona National Park, its adjacent buffer areas and the Iona - Skeleton Coast TFCA:* While it is critical that the management of Iona NP be ultimately linked to adjacent conservation areas (i.e. Namibe Partial Reserve, Namib-Naukluft NP and Skeleton Coast Park), there are currently no management or planning staff in either Iona or in the Namibe Partial Reserve to meaningfully participate in any landscape-wide conservation initiatives. It was felt that an immediate priority was rather to first establish a competent, functional management presence in the Iona NP. Once this administrative structure was in place, and a clear understanding of park management priorities developed, only then would the park be able to constructively engage with their Namibian counterparts in broader landscape and ecosystems conservation initiatives. Because the park management establishment and planning processes would take up to 4-5 years, it was thus considered prudent to rather contain project activities (for the moment) to the boundaries of Iona NP.

## **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

### **A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:**

See section B below.

### **B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:**

The project's management and implementation arrangements are more fully described in SECTION I - Part III: 'Management Arrangements' of the UNDP PRODOC. Refer to it for more details. The text that follows provides a summary of the project implementation arrangements:

The project will be implemented over a period of four years. UNDP will have responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the project. The project will be nationally implemented (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment (MINAMB), in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA of 18 February, 1977)<sup>5</sup> and the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP 2009-2013 of 14 May, 2009) signed between the UNDP and the Government of Angola.

The UNDP Country Office will monitor the project's implementation and achievement of the project outputs, and ensure the proper use of UNDP/GEF funds. Working in close cooperation with MINAMB, the UNDP Country Office (CO) will be responsible for: (i) providing financial and audit services to the project; (ii) recruitment and contracting of project staff; (iii) overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets approved by the Project Steering Committee (PSC); (iv) appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators; and (v) ensuring that all activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures.

The European Union (EU) will delegate the implementation of the joint-financing of 2 million Euros to the UNDP. The EU and UNDP will sign a 'Contribution Agreement'<sup>6</sup> that entrusts the implementation of the specific budget tasks to the UNDP. The Contribution Agreement will include *inter alia*: the parties to the agreement; the purpose of the agreement; the implementation and execution periods of the agreement; the financial value of the agreement; the financial reporting and payment arrangements; the description of, and budget for, the actions to be implemented; the general conditions of the agreement; and any other special conditions of the agreement.

MINAMB will have the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives. MINAMB will designate a senior official to act as the National Project Director (NPD). The NPD will provide the strategic oversight and guidance to project implementation<sup>7</sup>.

The day-to-day administration of the project will be carried out by a Project Coordinator, with the support of a Park Manager (PM) in Iona National Park and a part-time Project Administrative Assistant (PAA). The Project Coordinator and the PAA will be based in Luanda. The project staff will be recruited using standard UNDP recruitment procedures. The National Project Coordinator has the authority to administer the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of MINAMB, within the constraints laid down by the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The National Project Coordinator's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The Project Coordinator will liaise and work closely with all partner institutions to link the project

---

<sup>5</sup> In particular, Decision 2005/1 of 28 January, 2005 of UNDP's Executive Board approved the new *Financial Regulations and Rules* and along with them the new definitions of 'execution' and 'implementation'.

<sup>6</sup> It is probable that the Government of Angola, as the national implementing agent (i.e. MINAMB), will also be a signatory to the agreement.

<sup>7</sup> The NPD will not be paid from the project funds, but will represent a Government in-kind contribution to the Project.

with complementary national programs and initiatives. The Project Coordinator is accountable to the NPD for the quality, timeliness and effectiveness of the activities carried out, as well as for the use of funds. The Park Manager (PM) will be physically located in Iona National Park and oversee the day-to-day planning and implementation of all Component 1 project activities in the park. The Park Manager will work closely with, and report directly to, the Project Coordinator. The PAA will provide project administration support to both the Project Coordinator and PM, as required. The terms of reference for the Project Coordinator, PM and PAA are detailed in PRODOC Section IV, Part I.

The Project Coordinator and PM will be technically supported by contracted national and international service providers, including an international Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist with skills in finance and procurement. They will also work in close collaboration with counterpart conservation agencies and institutions in the SADC region, notably those in Namibia. Recruitment of specialist support services, and procurement of any equipment and materials, for the project will be done by the Project Coordinator and/or PM, in consultation with the NPD and in accordance with national rules and regulations. The terms of reference of the key national and international service providers to be contracted by the project are detailed in PRODOC Section IV, Part I.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be constituted to serve as the Project Board, which is its highest coordination and decision-making body. The Project Steering Committee will ensure that the project remains on course to deliver the desired outcomes of the required quality. The PSC will be chaired by MINAMB. The PSC will include representation from: EU; MINADER; INBAC; Provincial Government of Namibe and UNDP. Prospective additional members of the Project Steering Committee will be reviewed and recommended for approval during the Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC<sup>8</sup>) meeting. Representatives of other stakeholder groups may be included in the PSC, as considered appropriate and necessary. The PSC will meet at least twice per annum (more often if required).

The Project Coordinator and PM will produce Annual Work and Budget Plans (AWP&ABP) to be approved by the PSC at the beginning of each year. These plans will provide the basis for allocating resources to planned activities. Once the PSC approves the Annual Work Plan, this will be sent to the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for Biodiversity at the GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) in Pretoria (South Africa) for clearance. Once the Annual Working Plan and Budget is cleared by the Regional Coordinating Unit it will be sent to the UNDP/GEF Unit in New York for final approval and release of the funding. The Project Coordinator and PM will further produce quarterly operational reports and Annual Progress Reports (APR) for review by the PSC, or any other reports at the request of the PSC. These reports will summarize the progress made by the project versus the expected results, explain any significant variances, detail the necessary adjustments and be the main reporting mechanism for monitoring project activities. The PM will be required to provide the Project Coordinator with the information required to prepare the annual and quarterly plans and progress reports.

Refer to the UNDP PRODOC for more details on Financial and Other Procedures and the Audit Clause.

**PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:**

While the overall project design is still fully in line with the PIF, project elements initially identified in the PIF have, of necessity, been adjusted and/or improved as follows:

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
Objective: <i>To strengthen the Angolan Protected Areas</i>	Objective: <i>To catalyse an improvement in the overall</i>

<sup>8</sup> Refers to a UNDP procedural and minuted meeting which allows the Resident Representative to sign off on a Project Document.

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
<p><i>Network by rehabilitating Iona National Park as a key catalyst to improve management of globally significant biodiversity</i></p>	<p><i>management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park</i></p> <p>This is not a material change to the original formulation in the PIF. The adjustment was simply made in response to a request by stakeholders consulted during project preparation that the word ‘strengthen’ be replaced with the word ‘improvement’.</p>
<p>Indicative GEF financing for components at PIF stage:  Component 1 – \$1,000,000  Component 2 – \$900,000  Project management – \$100,000  Total GEF – \$2,000,000</p> <p>Indicative co-financing for components at PIF stage:  Component 1 – \$4,000,000  Component 2 – \$1,600,000  Project management – \$400,000  Total Co-financing – \$6,000,000</p>	<p>Current GEF financing for components:  Component 1 – US\$750,000  Component 2 – US\$1,056,000  Project management – US\$194,000  Total GEF – \$2,000,000</p> <p>Current and confirmed co-financing for components:  Component 1 – \$4,087,770  Component 2 – \$1,349,770  Project management – \$702,460  Total Co-financing – \$6,140,000</p> <p>While the changes are not significant, the budget adjustment was necessary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The EU requested that the bulk of its financial support be directed to support activities in component 1 (i.e. \$2,387,770 or 88% of it). GEF resources were subsequently re-allocated to supplement component 2 costs.</li> <li>(ii) During project preparation it became evident that due to the limited in-country capacity, the remoteness of Iona National Park (and of other parks) and the complexity of project administration requirements, the project management budget would need to be increased. For the GEF part, it increased only by \$94K, whereas it increased by \$304K for the co-financing. The increase is justified because when defining costs more closely at CEO Endorsement stage, it became clear that for ensuring that a well qualified and experienced Project Coordinator would lead the project, UNDP and GEF financial allocations for Project Management would need to increase. Project management costs covered by GEF, EU and UNDP are presented in detail in Part II, Table F of this document and in even more detail in the UNDP PRODOC, Total Budget and Workplan.</li> </ul>
<p>Expected outputs:  3.2 Community cross-fertilization pilot developed and implemented with rural communities engaged in conservation activities in Skeleton Coast Park in Namibia</p>	<p>This output was dropped.  The underlying assumption of this output – that a basic management presence was operating in the park and that some form of communication between the park and local communities in the park was taking place – proved to be</p>

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
	<p>incorrect.</p> <p>Field visits conducted during the project preparation phase highlighted the complete absence of any <i>in situ</i> management presence in Iona National Park, and the virtual absence of even the most basic facilities and services for park operations. Discussions with the <i>Soba</i> in Iona also suggested that the local communities in Iona National Park have no functional relationship with the responsible government agencies in respect of the management of the park, and that this situation has prevailed for the last 20-30 years.</p> <p>Further, no progress has been made by either the Namibian or Angolan governments in fostering any cooperative governance arrangements for the TFCA. In light of this, it was felt that it would thus be more prudent to focus project activities, and funder investments, for the first four years on: (i) the establishment of a simple, but effective, administration to manage the park; and (ii) to initiate the long-term mechanisms and processes of collaboratively working with the people living in the park.</p> <p>In later phases of the project (i.e. beyond the term of the GEF project), it is then envisaged that this activity can be operationalised from a more solid foundation of the management capacity and cooperative governance arrangements developed by the project.</p>

**PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Yannick Glemarec, UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator		January 30, 2012	Fabiana Issler, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, Biodiversity	+27-12354 8128	<a href="mailto:fabiana.issler@undp.org">fabiana.issler@undp.org</a>

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective</b> Catalyze an improvement in the overall management of the protected areas network, through rehabilitating Iona National Park	Financial sustainability scorecard for national system of protected areas	3%	>10%	Review of Financial Sustainability Scorecard	<b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– INBAC develops its organisational structure to meet its mandate for administering the protected area system</li> <li>– Revenues from protected areas are reinvested in the protected area system</li> <li>– Models of public-private partnerships are developed and implemented in protected areas</li> </ul> <b>Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBAC</li> <li>– The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development</li> <li>– INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas</li> </ul>
	Capacity development indicator score for protected area system	Systemic: 42% Institutional: 39% Individual: 35%	Systemic: 55% Institutional: 50% Individual: 45%	Review of Capacity Development Indicator Scorecard	
	Total government budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) (US\$ per annum) for protected area management	US\$1.5 million (as at 2010/11)	>US\$8 million <sup>9</sup>	Audited financial reports of INBAC and MINAMB	
	Number of protected areas in which the METT is adopted as a tool to monitor effectiveness of PA management	0	>7	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB	
<b>Outcome 1</b> Rehabilitation of Iona National Park	<b>Outputs:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Park staff are appointed, trained, adequately equipped and deployed in the park</li> <li>1.2 Establish key park infrastructure, equipment and services</li> <li>1.3 Develop and integrated park management plan</li> <li>1.4 Build community and local government support for, and participation in, the conservation of the park</li> </ol>				
	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool scorecard: Iona National Park	7%	>45%	Review of METT scorecard (every two years)	<b>Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– MINAMB recruits and funds the appointment of suitable permanent park personnel</li> </ul>
	Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park	0	12	Annual reports of INBAC and MINAMB	

<sup>9</sup> No annual adjustment for CPI

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
				Project reports Park annual reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The government of Namibe transfers the use of infrastructure at Espinheira and Charojamba to the park</li> <li>– Adequately qualified contractors can be sourced to undertake the construction projects in the park</li> <li>– The appointment of international/regional consultants/contractors is not unduly delayed by bureaucratic processes</li> <li>– Local communities in the park are amenable to employment and alternative livelihood opportunities created by park management</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Local communities resident in the park conflict with the park authority over restrictions on their traditional nomadic transhumance and other resource-use practices</li> <li>– Climate change exacerbates habitat fragmentation in terrestrial ecosystems in the park</li> <li>– The proposed Baynes Mountain Dam and hydro-power project results in severe negative impacts on the park during the construction and operational phases.</li> </ul>
	Percentage (%) of park visitors <sup>10</sup> obtaining a permit to traverse/overnight in the park	0%	>80%	Park visitor survey data Record of permits issued Park monthly and annual reports	
	Proportion (%) of the plains grassland habitats of the park (~600km <sup>2</sup> ) overgrazed by livestock (goats and cattle)	>35%	<20%	Livestock impact assessment data Park annual reports	
	Increase in wildlife populations: Oryx Hartmann's Zebra Springbok Ostrich	1650 265 2400 400	>2000 >300 >3500 >500	Game count survey data Park annual reports	
	Number of critical natural freshwater springs and wells secured and accessible for use by medium-sized and large wildlife species	0 (of 16)	4 (of 16)	Records of community meetings Formal community-park agreements Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park Park annual reports	
	Number of poaching incidents (park visitors) recorded in the park/annum	No data	<12	Park monthly and annual reports	
	Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes.	0	>60%	Records of community meetings Minutes of the cooperative governance structure established for the park	
	Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park	Direct: 0 Indirect: 0	Direct: >10 Indirect: >30	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	
	Average annual income (US\$) of households living in the park	US\$155/annum	>US\$250/annum	Socio-economic surveys of park communities Park annual reports	

<sup>10</sup> 'Visitors' are defined as any person not permanently residing in the park

	Indicator	Baseline	Target/s (End of Project)	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome 2</b> Strengthen institutional capacity to manage the protected areas network	<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1 Prepare a strategic plan for the protected area system 2.2 Develop the organizational structure and staff complement for the protected area system 2.3 Assess the current state of national parks and strict nature reserves 2.4 Prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves				
	Strategic Plan, and a policy framework, for the system of protected areas formally approved by government	No	Yes	Government Decree	<b>Assumptions:</b> – The government formally approves and adopts equitable job descriptions and remuneration levels for protected area staff – There is a pool of sufficiently qualified and experienced personnel who could be sourced, appointed and deployed to administer protected areas – The knowledge about, and access to, individual protected areas is freely available  <b>Risks:</b> – Political and institutional processes delay the effective establishment of INBAC – The government assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA development – INBACs financial sustainability does not improve sufficiently fast, as government, potential donors, foundations and private sector are reluctant to invest in protected areas
	Organizational structure for protected areas and job descriptions, remuneration levels and conditions of service for protected area staff formally adopted by government	No	Yes	Public Service Regulation	
	Recruitment of staff to approved protected area posts in the organogram of the protected area agency (as a % of posts with permanent staff appointed)	0	>50%	Annual report of PA agency	
	Number of protected area staff completing in-service training and skills development programmes	0	20	Annual report of PA agency	
	Number of senior protected area staff in a structured mentoring programme	0	3	Annual report of PA agency	
	Number of national parks and strict nature reserves with fully documented up-to-date assessments of their state and biodiversity value	0	7	State of Parks/Reserves reports	
	Number of protected areas where a structured rationalisation and rehabilitation programme is adequately resourced and under implementation	1	4	Annual report of PA agency	

## ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

GEF Secretariat Review Sheet dated 20 January, 2010

Comment	Response
<p><i>Recommendations at PIF</i></p> <p><u>26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement:</u></p> <p>Comment: 11-02-09</p> <p>The proposed activities and outputs of Components A &amp; B need to be clearly explained in the Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement document. For instance "Activities to strengthen the Ministry of Environment's internal capacity to establish and manage and integrated PA management system...." require a concrete and clearly defined set of activities and outputs. Same applies to "capacity building interventions to strengthen PA management skills..." In plain language, what is that GEF is paying for and what are the expected outputs? These comments apply to all activities and outputs, listed at PIF stage.</p>	<p>At the time of the drafting of the PIF, the roles and responsibilities of MINAMB in protected area management were still not clarified. Similarly, the establishment of INBAC was still in the conceptual stage of development. Hence the somewhat vague formulation of the project activities and outputs for institutional and individual capacity building.</p> <p>Subsequent to the PIF approval, the Government of Angola has however made considerable progress in clarifying the protected area mandate of MINAMB and, in turn, developing and approving the legislative and regulatory framework for the establishment of INBAC (under the administrative umbrella of MINAMB).</p> <p>This has enabled the project to, in close cooperation with MINAMB, better focus the institutional and individual capacity building activities in the project.</p> <p>The project activities under Outputs 2.1 to 2.4 have been specifically focused on complementing the utilitarian state budget allocations for the establishment of INBAC and the budget allocations for capacity building of INBAC and MINAMB under the ADB-funded <i>Angola Environmental Sector Support Project (ESSP)</i>.</p> <p>Project outputs and activities under Component 2 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitating the development of a strategic planning framework for INBAC to guide the implementation of its protected area mandate</li> <li>- Developing an organisational staffing structure for INBAC; identifying the specific protected area posts within the organisational structure, and their technical competence requirements; preparing job descriptions and conditions of service for each protected area post; assessing the training and skills development needs for each of the protected area posts; and developing and delivering in-service training.</li> <li>- Collecting and collating historical information on the following protected areas: Cangandala NP; Bicuar NP; Luando SNR; Mupa NP; Caméia NP; and Quiçama NP; undertaking comprehensive field surveys of the biodiversity, park boundaries, socio-economic characteristics and the condition of infrastructure in these parks/reserves; profiling the risks facing each of the parks/reserves; and making explicit recommendations on the rationalisation and rehabilitation needs of each of the parks/reserves</li> <li>- Preparing detailed implementation plans for Cangandala NP; Bicuar NP; Luando SNR; Mupa NP; Caméia NP; and Quiçama NPs that will operationalise the rationalisation and rehabilitation recommendations.</li> </ul> <p>All of the above is thoroughly described in the UNDP PRODOC under Section I, Part II 'Strategy', chapter 'Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities'.</p>

**ANNEX C: KEY CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES**

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
<b>For Project Management</b>			Refer to ToRs for all of these positions in the <u>UNDP PRODOC</u> , Section IV, Part I, chapter 'Terms of Reference for key project staff', which also contains ToR for other positions, which are financed by EU and UNDP
<i>Local</i>			
Project Coordinator	1,153.846154	104	
Project Administrative Assistant	711.538462	104	
<i>International</i>			
-	-	-	
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
<i>Local</i>			
Hydrologist	1000	35	
Tourism specialist	1000	30	
Vegetation ecologist	1000	60	
Independent community facilitator	1000	60	
Stakeholder engagement expert	1000	24	
<i>International</i>			
Habitat mapping expert	3000	18	
Justification for Travel, if any: Domestic travel to the project sites will be necessary for several technical assistance consultants. Fielding international consultants requires international travel.			

\* Dollar rate per person week is herein included with 6 decimals for some lines to avoid rounding-off errors.

Note: Split between local and International consultants is indicative and subject to procurement guidelines of Agencies and Governments. Consultants will be hired in line with UNDP rates. Also, in accordance with both UNDP and GEF policies, no GEF project resources will be used to pay any government, agency, or NGO staff personnel.

## ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

### A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

This project has not utilised GEF resources through a PPG.

Instead, UNDP Angola financed with own funds a **Preparatory Assistance Project** with the aim of producing the UNDP Project Document and ancillary GEF and EU documentation that is being currently submitted for the endorsement of the GEF CEO and later to the European Union.

The objective of this Preparatory Assistance was to develop, within the agreed deadline and with sufficient technical quality and mobilized co-financing, a UNDP Project document for the project titled *National Biodiversity Project – “Iona Conservation”*, as per GEF PIF approved by the January 2010 GEF Council, and noting that the GEF project effectively transferred from the World Bank to UNDP in May 2011.

This objective has been achieved in full and within the deadline of end January 2011 set by the GEF for submission for CEO Endorsement.

More specifically, the following outputs were achieved:

- Baseline data collected, information gap analysis and protected area management capacity assessments carried out
- Full project scoped and prepared in a participatory manner, with appropriate institutional arrangements, budget and M&E Plan
- Co-financing mobilized and formally confirmed
- Full Project widely endorsed by relevant stakeholders

### B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

There are no findings that would fundamentally affect the project design. During project preparation, meetings were held with the project partners to clarify the roles and responsibilities in implementation of project outputs.

### C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$) *</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent to date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount</i>	
1) Baseline data collection and information gap analysis	Completed	0	0	0	0	69,000
2) Capacity assessment for management of Protected Areas	Completed	0	0	0	0	35,000
3) Stakeholder consultation and engagement	Completed	0	0	0	0	83,000
4) Project costing, risk assessment and M&E planning	Completed	0	0	0	0	113,000
<b>Total</b>		0	0	0	0	300,000

\* Note: The amount of \$300K provided was funded by UNDP through a Preparatory Assistance Project (not a PPG). It is mentioned in UNDP’s co-financing letter and it allowed the preparation of the UNDP Project Document and ancillary GEF documentation for submission to CEO Endorsement, as well as the completion of EU required documentation.