GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: Angola
Project Title: Angola: National Biodiversity Project
GEFSEC Project ID: **4082**
GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: UNDP
GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity
GEF-4 Strategic Program (s): BD-3;
Anticipated Project Financing ($): PPG: $0 GEF Project Allocation: $2,000,000 Co-financing: $6,140,000 Total Project Cost: $8,140,000
PIF Approval Date: January 20, 2010 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: March 17, 2010
Program Manager: Jaime Cavelier GEF Agency Contact Person: Fabiana Issler,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	09-16-09 Angola ratified the CBD 1998-04-01. Cleared	2-10-12 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		NA
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-15-09 Yes. The OFP provided a LoE for $2,585,000. Cleared	2-10-12 Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	09-15-09 SP3. Cleared	2-10-12 BD- SO1 â€“ SP3 (Strengthening Terrestrial PA Networks). Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	09-15-09 Yes. Cleared	2-10-12 Yes Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?	09-15-09 Yes. Angola is a Group Country and has not	2-10-12 Cleared

		used BD funding yet. Cleared	
	• The focal areas?	09-15-09 Yes. Angola is a Group Country and has not used BD funding yet. Cleared	2-10-12 Cleared
	• Strategic objectives?	NA	NA
	• Strategic program?	NA	NA
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	09-15-09 Yes. The Iona National Park, the largest in Angola (15,150 Km2). Cleared	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		2-10-12 Yes. Iona National Park. Cleared
	8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?	09-15-09 Yes. The project aims at strengthening the Angolan Protected Areas Network by rehabilitating Iona National Park as a key catalyst to improve management of globally significant biodiversity. The project is structured around the following components and outputs. 1. Rehabilitation of Iona National Park: i) Core Park infrastructure rehabilitated, ii) Park management plan formulated and under implementation, iii) Park staff recruited, trained and equipped to efficiently apply Park management plan, iv) Participatory community consultations conducted with local communities living in and adjacent to the Park and v) trans-boundary pilot project developed and implemented with rural communities engaged in conservation activities in Skeleton Coast Park in Namibia. 2. Strengthen Institutional Capacity to Manage the Protected Areas Network: i) Capacity	2-10-12 The architecture of the CEO Endorsement remained the same as in the approved PIF. This project will deliver: At the National Level: the project will support the government in the establishment and making operational the â€˜Department of Conservation Areas' within the recently approved Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidade e Ã□reas de ConservaÃ§Ã£o (INBAC). At the 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 km2). Cleared

		building assessment of the Ministry of Environment, select provincial governments and staff in rehabilitated National Parks, ii) Capacity building plan formulated and implemented for Ministry of Environment, provincial governments and staff in rehabilitated National Parks, iii) Sustainability strategy for PA Network approved by government officials, iv) High-level biodiversity conservation awareness campaigns formulated and delivered at the national level (Ministers, Parliamentarians) and in select provinces (Provincial government), v) Lessons from Iona NP rehabilitation process and results documented, disseminated and replication initiated. Please address the following issues: 1. What is the need of a transboundary activity with Namibia, when the PAs of Angola need so much attention? Is this activity really necessary? 2. While the outputs for Component 1 point to measurable and tangible GEBs, the proposed outputs for Component 2 (particularly the Capacity Building Plans) are less likely to have an impact on the ground. Although the establishment of the National Institute for the Conservation of Nature was rejected as an alternative scenario (under Cost-Effectiveness), are there particular budget lines in the approved Government of Angola's central budget for this Institute worth supporting? In all, would be possible to concentrate investment in fewer activities leading to more visible results? The focus presented in the 1st Components is diluted in the 2nd Component.	

		11-02-09 Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted October 16 (PIF dated October 7, 2009). Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	09-15-09 Yes. Cleared	2-10-12 Yes. Cleared
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-15-09 Although coordination is good in itself, is it necessary to invest in the coordination with Nambia now, when there is so much need within the Iona NP and budget is limitted? 11-02-09 Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted October 16 (PIF dated October 7, 2009). Cleared	2-10-12 Yes. This project will coordinate with the new GEF-5 project Expansion and Strengthening of Angola's Protected Area system, currently seeking GEF Council's approval. The project has the potential to coordinate with the GEF-FAO project Land Rehabilitation and Rangelands Management in Small Holders Agro-pastoral Production Systems in South-western Angola project to combine resources in improving sustainable land management practices in the agro-pastoral and agricultural areas in and around Iona National Park. Cleared
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	09-15-09 The alternatives were described and analyzed. Would be possible to reconsider the alternative on the investment on the National Institute for the Conservation of Nature? Any budget lines in need of support that may have a positive impact? 11-02-09 Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted October 16 (PIF dated October 7, 2009). Cleared	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		2-10-12 Cleared

	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		2-10-12 The reallocation of financial resources between the 2 components was explained in the CEO Endorsement (Part IV). Project Management increased for both the GEF and co-financing. Cleared
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	09-15-09 Yes. Thanks for listing and describing the risks and mitigation measures. Since the Institutional risk is high, would be possible to target activities in support of the Ministry and/or future NICA for support? 11-02-09 Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted October 16 (PIF dated October 7, 2009). Cleared	2-10-12 Detailed risk and mitigation measures provided on pages 13-14 of the CEO Endorsement. The main and highest risk is that "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". Cleared
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	09-15-09 Yes. Cleared	2-10-12 Yes. There is a very clear role for the GEF investment in this project in Angola. Cleared
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	09-15-09 What level of financing would this project is capable of absorbing without reducing the efficiency? 11-02-09 Issues properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted October 16 (PIF dated October 7, 2009). Cleared	2-10-12 Yes. Cleared
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		2-10-12 The GEBs that this project aims at delivering could be compromised without the GEF investment. Cleared
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	09-15-09 It is 5% of the GEF funding.	2-10-12 PM is now 10% of the GEF grant.

		Cleared	Justification provided in the CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		2-10-12 Tech Components: Domestic consultants ($1000/week) and International consultants ($3000/week). Project Management: Coordinators at average $1000/week. Cleared
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	09-15-09 Yes. Co-financing ratio is 1:3. Cleared	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		2-10-12 Co-financing increased by $140,000 for a total of $6,145,000. Cleared
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		2-10-12 Yes. Cleared
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		2-10-12 M&E budget is $156,000 and embedded in the cost of the two components. Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	**24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?**	09-15-09 No. Please address outstanding issues under item 9, 11, 12, 15 &. 17. Thanks. 11-02-09	

		PIF has been recommended by PM for CEO Clearance.	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.	11-02-09 The proposed activities and outputs of Components A & 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.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	**26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?**		2-9-12 Yes. The CEO Endorsement is recomended
Review Date	1st review	August 31, 2009	February 09, 2012
	2nd review	November 02, 2009	
	3rd review		

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	7-20-10 Yes. All proposed activities are appropriate for the PPG. The Activities are: 1. Baseline data collection and information gaps analysis of Park habitats, wildlife and livestock populations ($80K) 2. Assessment, plan and budget of the Park management infrastructure requirements ($45K) 3. Social Assessment ($40K) 4. Indigenous Peoples Process Framework ($10K)

		5. Park Management Plan ($10K) 6. Assessment of institutional capacity of the Ministry of Environment to manage the PA Network ($5K) 7. Assessment of the capacity building and equipment requirements of the National Biodiversity Institute's PA Network Management Unit($5K)
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	7-20-10 Yes. Cleared
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	7-20-10 Yes. GEF is contributing $714/week for local consultants ($1392/week total) and $2,700/week for international consultants ($4,000/week total). Cleared
Recommendation	**5. Is PPG being recommended?**	7-20-10 PPGs of previously approved PIFs cannot be funded by GEF-4. The deadline for these approvals was June 24th , as stated in the letter of the GEF CEO to the OFPs (May 18th, 2010). This PPG will be furthered processed, once the GEF-5 replenishment resolution has been adopted.
Other comments		
Review Date	1st review	July 20, 2010
	2nd review	
	3rd review	