



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Expansion and Strengthening of Angola's Protected Area system		
Country(ies):	Angola	GEF Project ID: ¹	4589
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4464
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment (MINAMB)	Submission Date:	May 15, 2013
		Re-submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	n/a	Project Agency Fee (\$):	580,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area System	1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	New protected areas and coverage of unprotected ecosystems: (a) Extent of the terrestrial network of protected areas is expanded from 16.2 million ha to >16.5million ha; Coverage of vegetation types in the protected area network increase from 12 (out 32) to >20.	GEF TF	5,800,000	16,190,400
Total project costs				5,800,000	16,190,400

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To enhance the management effectiveness, including operational effectiveness and ecosystem representation of Angola's Protected Area System, with due consideration for its overall sustainability, including ecological, institutional and financial sustainability.

Project Component	Grant Type ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening the legal, planning, policy, institutional and financial frameworks for protected area expansion	TA	<p><i>Angola's Terrestrial PA System, covering 16.2 million hectares, is strengthened with respect to ecosystem representation, financial aspects and management capacity, as evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PA estate is expanded to cover >20 out of 32 vegetation types in the protected area network, from a baseline of 14. - Financial sustainability is improved, with results from the financial scorecard for national system of protected areas system reaching at least 10% from a baseline of 3%. 	<p>1.1 The institutional capacity to plan and implement protected area expansion is developed</p> <p>1.2 A protected area expansion programme is effectively implemented</p> <p>1.3 The financial</p>	GEF TF	1,359,460	2,940,400

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² TA includes capacity building, and research and development.

Project Component	Grant Type ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National capacity for PA systems' management is improved, evidenced by improved scores of the Capacity Development Scorecard at the following levels: <i>Systemic:</i> from 42% to >55% <i>Institutional:</i> from 39% to >50% <i>Individual:</i> from 35% to >45%. - Total government annual budget allocation (including operational, HR and capital budget) for protected area management increased from ~US\$1.5 million (as at 2011) and ~US\$6.7 million (as at 2013) to - >US\$12 million by project end. - A Technical Unit is set up within MINAMB to oversee the PA expansion process. - The number and extent (ha) of new, or expansion of existing, protected areas formally proclaimed progresses as follows: 2 newly proclaimed areas of a pipeline of 16 in PLERNACA, reaches >8 and >140,000ha by project end. - The total investments (government grant, own income, donor funds, loans, trust funds, etc.) available to finance protected area planning, development and management costs increased from <US\$18m/annum to >US\$23m/annum. 	sustainability of the expanded protected area network is improved.			
2. Rehabilitating, and improving the management of, three existing National Parks	TA	<p><i>The conservation effectiveness of the three national parks slated for rehabilitation improve as a result of the project, evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - METT scores for National Parks Quiçama (QNP), Candangala (CNP) and Bicular (BNP) will improve from a baseline of 25%, 28% and 34% to >45%, >47% and >50% respectively. - Number of park management staff appointed, equipped, trained and deployed in the park by project end: QNP 49 from a baseline of 5 (of 41) CNP 26 from a baseline of 0 (of 19) BNP 59 from a baseline of 5 (of 59). - Number of sites in the park with functional park management infrastructure, bulk services, equipment and staff accommodation: QNP HQ=1; Outposts=2, from a baseline of 0 CNP HQ=1; Outposts=2, from a baseline of 0 BNP HQ=1, from a baseline of HQ=1 - Wildlife populations (total across Quiçama, Bicular and Cangandala) increase in number from conservation and enforcement measures (numbers to be confirmed during inception): Elephant >300, from a baseline of 210 Roan >200, from a baseline of 110 	2.1 Rehabilitate, and improve the management of, Quiçama National Park 2.2 Rehabilitate, and improve the management of, Cangandala National Park 2.3 Rehabilitate, and improve the management of, Bicular National Park All target sites under Component 2 will conduct activities under the following "strategic interventions": (i) Establish, equip, train and resource an initial basic staff complement in the park;	GEFTF	4,150,540	12,000,000

Project Component	Grant Type ²	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
		<p>Hippo >20, from a baseline of 10 Buffalo >50, from a baseline of 5 Giant Sable >30, from a baseline of 20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All three national parks (Q, C, B) have developed management plans, from a baseline of none. - Effective enforcement of the plan reduces the number of illegal incidents in the three national parks (Q, C, B) - (the indicator will fully developed once a systematic tracking system is established). <p><i>Communities living in the QNP, CNP and BNP have are consulted and participate more actively in the rehabilitation of the PAs, as thus evidenced:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proportion (%) of communities living in the park that are adequately represented in the park management decision-making processes increases to 60% for all three parks by project from a baseline of zero. - Number of job opportunities (direct and indirect) created for local communities living in, or adjacent to, the park: QNP Direct=>15; Indirect=>30, from a baseline of 0 and 0. CNP Direct=>10; Indirect=>30, from a baseline of 18 and 0. BNP Direct=>5; Indirect=>30, from a baseline of 0 and 0. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (ii) Renovate and construct basic accommodation, infrastructure and services to house, and support the operations of, this park staff complement; (iii) Develop a utilitarian, but functional, park knowledge and management planning system to guide and direct the park operations; and (iv) Establish the capacity and governance mechanisms to enable a constructive engagement with the local communities living in, and using the parks natural resources. 			
		Subtotal			5,510,000	14,940,400
		Project Management Cost (PMC) ³		GEFTF	290,000	1,250,000
		Total Project Cost			5,800,000	16,190,400

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	MINAMB – Ministry of Environment	cash	15,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Angola	cash	500,000
Others	Tripartite Ministerial Committee for the Transfrontier Conservation Initiative for Maiombe Forest	cash	470,400
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	USAID Southern Africa - SAREP Southern Africa Regional Environmental Program	cash	220,000
Total Cofinancing			16,190,400

³ **NOTE:** Management costs from GEF, amounting to 5.3% of the sub-total, are presented in detail in the PRODOC Total Budget and Workplan, and is the same amount approved at PIF stage. Angola is considered a high-transaction country from an operational point of view, justifying the costs presented herein.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount(\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Angola	5,800,000	580,000	6,380,000
Total Grant Resources				5,800,000	580,000	6,380,000

¹In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table.

PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	948,450	463,266	1,411,716
National/Local Consultants	105,000	3,160,000	3,265,000

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

Refer to PRODOC, Section I –PART I: Project consistency with national priorities/plans. Else, the following can be added:

The Project continues to be aligned with Angola’s National Environment Management Plan (NEMP, approved in 2009), the National Policy of Forest, Wildlife and Conservation Areas was approved (approved, in 2010) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, approved in 2006).

The NBSAP is currently undergoing review to align it with the global Aichi Targets. In connection with it, Aichi-inspired targets are being formulated at the national level. Among them, the following are particularly relevant for the project, and were not mentioned in the PIF: a) to fully realise the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and incorporate these values into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies (Targets 1 and 2); b) to increase the global terrestrial protected area estate from 12% to 17% and the marine estate from 6% to 10% (Target 11); c) to restore and safeguard key ecosystem services, especially for water, health and livelihoods (Target 14); and d) to strengthen ecosystem resilience to climate change and promote ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and mitigation (Target 15).

The project is supportive of Angola’s Strategic Plan for the Protected Area Network, approved by the approved by the Council of Ministers in April 2011 (*Plano Estratégico da Rede Nacional de Áreas de Conservação de Angola* -

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

PLERNACA). The PA gap analysis behind the PLERNACA builds on a priority-setting exercise concluded in 2010 (the *Angolan Protected Area Expansion Strategy – APAES*, which had been mentioned in the PIF. The PLERNACA document expands the intentions of the NBSAP by: (i) detailing the basis on which existing protected areas will be rehabilitated; (ii) how new protected areas are selected; (iii) providing details of potential new PAs for gazettal, most of which in the terrestrial environment, plus a few in the coastal and marine environment; (iv) proposing administrative and management systems under which the PA system will be developed. It also provides recommendations on the financial needs and sources to achieve the implementation of PLERNACA.

Refer also to the following sub-chapters in PRODOC Part I - Section I for more details:

- Context and global significance, '[Policy and Legislative Context](#)'; and
- Baseline Analysis, '[Advances in the PA expansion agenda](#)'.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

This is described in detail in the PRODOC, Part I, Section II – [Strategy](#). A summary is provided in Part I of this document.

The PRODOC provides a more focuses proposal for how the project will achieve its objective and contribute to the GEF's Focal Area Objective BD1 and Outcome 1.1.

When needs were assessed and inputs costed in detail, it appeared logical to re-balance the allocation of funding per Component.

As per the Total Budget and Workplan in the PRODOC (summarized in Part I, Table B above), the amount for Component 1 is \$359K higher than what had been proposed at PIF stage, and Component 2 an equal amount lower. Management costs remained unchanged.

This re-allocation of funds across components represents only 6% of the total GEF grant and was necessary to appropriately cater for PA systemic activities proposed under Component 1.

Also, the inputs proposed in the budget under both components and project management take into consideration the co-financing offered by the government to various items and posts.

With the recent proclamation of Maiombe National Park in Cabinada Provice, as well as the re-proclamation of previous hunting zones in Cuando Cubando Province as National Parks, namely Mavinga and Luiana-Luengue, to form part of the KAZA initiative, Angola increased in 2011 its protected area coverage from 6.6% of the land surface to 13%. Yet, the ecosystem representation gap remains at the PA network level. Only 14 out of 32 vegetation types are currently represented in the PA network.

By focusing on the overall conservation effectiveness of Angola's PA terrestrial sub-system, covering 16.2 million hectares, the project will make a contribution to strengthening the system, with respect to ecosystem representation, financial aspects and management capacity, and to strengthening existing national parks that need rehabilitation. At site level, the focus continues to be on improving the management effectiveness of existing sites through the utilitarian PA rehabilitation programme initiated with the previously approved GEF project benefitting Iona National Park. There are no change in site coverage in Component 2.

A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

NA (No changes since PIF approval.)

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address.

The UNDP PRODOC provides a country-specific analysis on underlying financial, economic and policy causes behind the weaknesses in Angola's PA System. It is underpinned by technical reports, contextual analysis and application of scorecards/tracking tools.

This Project has been designed as the second GEF-financed intervention within a more comprehensive national protected area (PA) programme for Angola. It will focus investments in the terrestrial network of protected areas, in direct response to the immediate threats to their ecological integrity. It will direct GEF funding at two levels of support: at the PA system's level and at the level of individual sites. Currently, the Angolan system of protected areas has two main weaknesses: first, it falls short in terms of its bio-geographic representation—with several terrestrial ecosystems currently under-represented in the terrestrial PA network; second, constituent PAs in the current system have sub-optimal management effectiveness and are not effectively mitigating the threats to ecosystems, flora and fauna. The project is designed to address both sets of weaknesses simultaneously. It will improve ecosystem representation in the PA system and it will strengthen PA management operations at key sites. Both sets of interventions are needed to address threats to Angola's biodiversity. This will be underpinned by investments at the system's level, to strengthen the institutional foundations and financing framework for PA management.

Refer to PRODOC, Part I – Section I, Baseline Analysis, as well as other relevant sections and chapters of the PRODOC.

At the protected area system's level, the GEF investment will facilitate the achievement of ambitious targets set by the government for expanding the terrestrial protected area network to be more representative of Angolan ecosystems. This will be done, according to both national priorities, a suitable and science-based 'gap analysis'. The project will also foster the systematic development of capacities and the mobilisation of financial resources for supporting and sustaining the PA expansion effort. Angola's terrestrial network of protected areas currently covers 16.2 million hectares, or 13% of the country's land surface. While there may be a modest increase in surface coverage, the primary goal of the expansion effort is to make the ecosystem representation within the estate more balanced, so that at least 20 of the 32 mapped vegetation types are represented through the proclamation of new sites by following due process, consulting stakeholders and applying safeguards with respect to possible negative effects. In terms of PA finance, the project will work over the next 4-5 years to gradually decrease the gap between financial needs and funds actually available for PA management, including through measures that increase the system's own capacity to generate revenue to itself.

At the level of sites, the project will focus GEF resources on continuing the implementation of the PA rehabilitation programme for three priority national parks, which started with Iona NP in 2012. For this project three other parks will be targeted: Quiçama, Cangandala and Bicuar. This will systematically improve the management effectiveness of these areas in a highly replicable way, fostering the development of national capacity in the management of terrestrial PAs management through hands-on experience. The active rehabilitation of three national parks will ensure enhanced conservation security over 1.8 million hectares. It will avert threats to biodiversity in several vegetation groups in the Zambebian centre of endemism, which is rich in fauna and flora within Angolan territory. All three parks are Important Bird Areas (refer to METTs in for more detail). Candangala National Park includes, among others, the habitats where the critically endangered sub-species *Hippotragus niger variani* still survives.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning

The project seeks to enhance the management effectiveness - including operational effectiveness and ecosystem representation - of Angola's Protected Area System, with due consideration for its overall sustainability, including ecological, institutional and financial sustainability.

Two components are proposed:

Component 1. Operationalising the PA expansion

Work under this outcome will focus on establishing and capacitating a dedicated team within MINAMB to guide the roll-out of a structured programme of protected area expansion in Angola. This will include inter alia: (i) the establishment, resourcing, staffing and training of a protected area expansion team within MINAMB; (ii) procurement of key equipment and software for this team; (iii) strengthening the enabling policy, legal and regulatory framework for PA expansion; (iv) collection, management and maintenance of all supporting maps, surveys and other data; (v)

strategic planning, detailed operational planning and feasibility assessments; (vi) preparation of background information documents for stakeholder communications; (vi) implementation of targeted stakeholder communications and public participation processes; (vii) surveys of protected area boundaries and facilitating formal proclamation processes; (viii) development and implementation of innovative financing mechanisms and tools to secure sustainable funding for the expanded protected area system; and (ix) development and maintenance of trans-boundary conservation/protected area partnerships.

Component 2. Operationalising PA sites

Work under the second outcome is focused on supporting the rehabilitation and management of 3 National Parks - Quiçama, Cangandala and Bicuar. GEF investments under this outcome will be directed towards supplementing the governments' baseline investments in each of the three targeted national parks.

While each park has its own unique challenges and needs (see the detailed status reports for each park in the Technical Reports in Annex 4), the GEF-funded support for the rehabilitation, and improved management, of each national park will typically be structured around four strategic areas of intervention:

- (i) establish, equip, train and resource an initial basic staff complement in the park;
- (ii) renovate and construct basic accommodation, infrastructure and services to house, and support the operations of, this park staff complement;
- (iii) develop a utilitarian, but functional, park knowledge and management planning system to guide and direct the park operations; and
- (iv) establish the capacity and governance mechanisms to enable a constructive engagement with the local communities living in, and using the parks natural resources.

The outputs necessary to achieve both Outcomes/Components are thoroughly described in the PRODOC, Part I, Section I – Strategy, chapter Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities.

An Incremental Cost Analysis has been carried and it is reproduced below from the PRODOC, Section II – Part II.

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Increment (A-B)
BENEFITS			
Global benefits	Under the 'business-as-usual' 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. Efforts to expand Angola's PA system will continue to show an unbalanced ecosystem representation. Progress in implementing in implementing the PLERNACA and the APAES will be slow and the risk of creating more paper parks will be enhanced if specific capacities for managing the PA expansion process are not fostered. Financial resources dedicated to the management of PAs will continue to be	The project, which counts on financing from GEF, UNDP, USAID and the Government of Angola, will remove key barriers for ensuring that improvement in the overall management of Angola's protected areas. This includes the operational effectiveness, ecosystem representation and various aspects of sustainability (ecological, institutional and financial). <u>At the protected area system's level</u> , the GEF investment will facilitate the achievement of ambitious targets set by the government for expanding the terrestrial protected area network to be more representative of Angolan ecosystems. This will be done, according to both national priorities, a suitable and science-based 'gap analysis'. The project will also foster the systematic development of capacities and the mobilisation of financial resources for supporting and sustaining the PA expansion effort, whose primary goal is to make the ecosystem representation within the estate more balanced. At least 20 of the 32 mapped	The GEF increment will ensure that Angola's protected area estate can make a much more significant contribution towards conserving its globally unique set of ecosystems and several threatened species. Various terrestrial ecosystems that are currently under-represented in the terrestrial PA network will have a sample of their coverage under formal protection, mitigating direct threats to them, to the species that they harbour and the ecosystem services that they render. This will enhance the national contribution to the achievement of <u>global Aichi Targets 11</u> on protected areas, but also <u>Target 12</u> on species, <u>Targets 1 and 2</u> on the realisation of biodiversity values, <u>Target 14</u> on ecosystem services, and <u>Target 15</u> on climate resilience. In terms of the project's work at the PA systems'

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Increment (A-B)
	<p>insufficient. As a result, national parks and reserves will benefit from limited management intervention on the ground and will continue to gradually lose their biodiversity values.</p>	<p>vegetation types will be represented in the estate through the proclamation of new sites. In terms of PA finance, the project will work over the next 4-5 years to gradually decrease the gap between financial needs and funds actually available for PA management, including through measures that increase the system's own capacity to generate revenue to itself. <u>At the level of sites</u>, the project will focus GEF resources on continuing the implementation of the PA rehabilitation programme for three priority national parks, which started with Iona NP in 2012. For this project three other parks will be targeted: Quiçama, Cangandala and Bicuar. This will systematically improve the management effectiveness of these areas in a highly replicable way, fostering the development of national capacity in and experience with terrestrial PA management. The active rehabilitation of three national parks will ensure enhanced conservation security over 1.8 million hectares.</p>	<p>level, new PA sites in the pipeline for proclamation will afford the legal protection of habitats, that harbour endangered species such as the Lowland Gorilla <i>Gorilla gorilla</i>, Western Chimpanzee <i>Pan troglodytes</i>, (plus 18 other primate species) and many endemic mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian and plant species. In particular, the lowland, escarpment and montane forest habitats that they occupy will be secured. The upstart of the 'Iona Project' has already had a catalytic effect in triggering a process of rehabilitating of existing PAs and promoting an overhaul of the entire system, starting with finance. More specifically, the government budget dedicated to PA management has increased from \$1.5 million in 2011 to \$10.6 million currently. The current project will enhance the process of mobilising PA finance. The project will provide protection to globally important biodiversity through the rehabilitation and improved management of 1.8 million hectares of three existing national parks. It will avert threats to biodiversity in several vegetation groups in the Zambebian centre of endemism, which is rich in fauna and flora within Angolan territory. All three parks are Important Bird Areas (refer to METTs in for more detail). Candangala National Park includes, among others, the habitat where the critically endangered sub-species <i>Hippotragus niger variiani</i> still survives.</p>
<p>National and local benefits</p>	<p>Under the 'business-as-usual' scenario, efforts to reconcile competing demands for land across Angola will gradually foreclose the current opportunity for creating new PAs in sites that were deemed strategic from a conservation perspectives. Potential national and local benefits that could be derived from PAs will be foregone. Ecosystems in existing PAs will become increasingly degraded and will cease to render essential services to local resource users. Over time, this will represent a loss to the Angolan economy and to local stakeholders. The survival of the <i>Palanca Negra Gigante</i>, a critically endangered animal species, which is the country's national symbol, would</p>	<p>The project will engage a variety of stakeholders in supporting an overall programme for conservation and protected area management in Angola. The country will make more definite steps towards actively managing its protected area estate as a result of targeted capacity building interventions. It will expand the number of nationals who become specialists and/or gain experience in the various aspects of PA planning and management, both at the field level and centrally. The proclamation of new sites will follow due process for boundary demarcation, which includes stakeholder consultation, the identification of socio-economic benefits and the application of safeguards for possible negative effects. At site level, jobs will be created through investments in the rehabilitation of infrastructure, the training and engagement of PA personnel and community guides. Basic ecotourism facilities and opportunities for</p>	<p>The project is expected to yield local benefits through improvement in the living conditions of communities living in and around three National Parks – Quiçama, Cangandala and Bicuar. The project will initiate 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 formation of technical unit within MINAMB to support the PA expansion programme. This will generate benefits through the capacity that will be built, encompassing the systemic, organisational and individual levels through a targeted PA expansion</p>

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Increment (A-B)
	be at risk. It depends entirely on the continued management of Cangadala NP.	sustainable agricultural activities on the periphery of the PAs will also generate national and global benefits.	programme.
COSTS			GEF + mobilised co-financing beyond the baseline
Outcome 1: Strengthening the legal, planning, policy, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion	Baseline: \$ 8.9-9.6 million Sources: MINAMB, FAO, KfW, USAID	Alternative: \$ 10.6-11.3 million	Increment: \$1.9 million GEF 1.4 Maiombe Initiative 0.5 TOTAL 1.9
Outcome 2: Rehabilitating, and improving the management of, three existing National Parks	Baseline: \$ 32.2-36.4 million Sources: MINAMB, Provinces, Kissama Foundation	Alternative: \$ 36.4-40.7 million	Increment: \$4.1 million GEF 4.1 TOTAL 4.1
Project Management	n/a	n/a	Increment: \$0.8 million GEF 0.3 UNDP 0.5 TOTAL 0.8
TOTAL	Baseline: \$ 41.0-46.0 million	Alternative: \$ 47.0-52.0 million	TOTAL Increment: \$6.8 million GEF 5.8 Maiombe + UNDP 1.0 TOTAL 6.8

A.6. Risks

A more thorough risk analysis than that of the PIF has been carried out and is contained in the PRODOC, Section I, Part II – Project Risks. It is reproduced herein . Refer to PRODOC Annex 3 for the Project Risk Assessment Guiding Matrix.

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><u>POLITICAL</u> Capacities at different levels of government increase at a slower pace than required by the needs of the PA system</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> <i>HIGH</i></p>	<p>The project forms an integral part of a broader and more extensive programme to strengthen the capacity of MINAMB to more effectively administer the network of protected areas in Angola. This nationally co-ordinated programme will seek to achieve this through a long-term and three-tiered capacity-building approach (i.e. improving systemic, institutional and individual capacities).</p> <p><i>This project will focus on capacitating MINAMB at two levels of intervention. At the <u>institutional level</u>, the project will support the roll-out of a structured programme of protected area expansion⁵ and consolidation in MINAMB. This will include strengthening the financial sustainability of the protected area system to meet the needs of an expanded network of protected areas. At the <u>park level</u>, the project will further support MINAMB in rehabilitating, and improving the management of 3 National Parks -</i></p>

⁵ The term ‘protected area expansion’ will include the establishment of new protected areas, the extension or rationalisation of the boundaries of existing protected areas and the establishment and maintenance of trans-boundary protected area/ conservation initiatives with adjacent countries.

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
	<p>Quissama, Cangandala and Bicuar</p> <p>These activities have been designed to build on, and complement, other strategic investments in building the capacity of MINAMB, including:</p> <p>(i) The GEF-EU <i>funded National Biodiversity Project</i>, which will develop the capacity in MINAMB to prepare a strategic business planning framework for the protected area system, develop an organisational structure and functional staffing complement for the protected area system, and prepare detailed implementation plans for the rehabilitation of national parks and strict nature reserves; and</p> <p>(ii) The <i>Environmental Sector Support Project (ESSP)</i>, financed from a loan from the African Development Fund (ADF), will further develop the capacity in MINAMB by strengthening the legislative and regulatory framework for protected areas; developing infrastructure and procuring equipment for protected area agencies; and piloting best practices in biodiversity conservation practice in demonstration sites.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC Attitudinal rigidities amongst the local populace <i>viz.</i> PAs inhibit efforts to change practices that degrade natural resources and threaten biodiversity</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> HIGH</p>	<p>In component 1, the project will facilitate the development and implementation of a comprehensive stakeholder consultation and communication programme for each priority area targeted for expansion to obtain input into the proposal to establish, or expand an existing, PA</p> <p>The active involvement of communities living within and around existing PAs in the management of these areas is still in its embryonic stage in Angola. Component 2 will thus include an urgent focus on the evaluation of resource use conflicts and ensuring effective communication with local communities to resolve immediate problems, and to plan longer-term mitigation measures. The project will also create the enabling conditions for communities to be represented on park management boards - giving them a voice as to how these parks are being managed.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC The Government of Angola assigns less priority and limited financial support for PA expansion, rehabilitation, and operational management</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> MEDIUM</p>	<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 MINAMB to constructively engage with the relevant sectors and communities in order to achieve PA management effectiveness. Through this project MINAMB will pilot and strengthen its communications capabilities and improve its enforcement capacities through community participation and NGO and local government engagement.</p> <p>Finally, the project will invest in maintaining the high level political support to ensure that the PA agenda continues to grow in prominence and as a priority within the national development paradigm.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC Land tenure conflict may hamper the rehabilitation, consolidation and expansion of PAs.</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> MEDIUM</p>	<p>In Component 2, rehabilitation activities will include zonation and conflict resolution mechanisms (to be implemented with the full involvement of local communities) as a means to address potential land conflict risks. Clear land use zonation and management arrangements will be developed in order to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of each land tenure holder are clearly defined and effectively enforced.</p> <p>With the exception of the Afro-montane forests, all of the proposed new PAs are in areas of low population density and low opportunity cost of land.</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL Climate change will exacerbate habitat fragmentation in the terrestrial ecosystems of Angola</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u></p>	<p>This project will establish landscape scale buffer areas and where possible, corridors connecting PAs. 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.</p> <p>Engagement with local communities to encourage the adoption of mitigation adaptation measures to - for example, reduce demands on firewood and charcoal - will form part of the stakeholder engagement strategy of Component 2.</p>

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
LOW	

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

NA (no changes since PIF).

Else, refer to PRODOC, Section IV –PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Coordination with other Related Initiatives

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Stakeholder engagement in project implementation

A thorough stakeholder engagement plan is contained in the PRODOC.

Refer to PRODOC, Section IV –PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Coordination with other Related Initiatives.

B.2 Socio-economic benefits at the national and local levels, including gender dimensions considerations

and how these will support the achievement of global environment / adaptation benefits

The project will engage a variety of stakeholders in supporting an overall programme for conservation and protected area management in Angola. The country will make more definite steps towards actively managing its protected area estate as a result of targeted capacity building interventions. It will expand the number of nationals who become specialists and/or gain experience in the various aspects of PA planning and management, both at the field level and centrally. The proclamation of new sites will follow due process, which includes the identification of socio-economic benefits and the respecting of safeguards for possible negative effects. At site level, jobs will be created through investments in the rehabilitation of infrastructure, the training and engagement of PA personnel and community guides. Basic ecotourism facilities and opportunities for sustainable agricultural activities on the periphery of the PAs will also generate national and global benefits.

The project is expected to yield local benefits through improvement in the living conditions of communities living in and around three National Parks – Quiçama, Cangandala and Bicular. The project will initiate 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 formation of technical unit within MINAMB to support the PA expansion programme. This will generate benefits through the capacity that will be built, encompassing the systemic, organisational and individual levels through a targeted PA expansion programme.

PPG site assessments summarized in the Technical Report document considered socio-economic benefits of the developing the national parks.

Refer to PRODOC Annex 4 for the Technical Reports.

Gender dimensions remain unchanged since the PIF.

Furthermore, UNDP carried out due diligence prior to clearance of the PRODOC and screened the project for potential social and environmental negative effects.

Refer to PRODOC Annex 5 for the UNDP Environmental and Social Screening applied in May 2013.

B.3. Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design

The cost effectiveness analysis has been further developed since the PIF. Cost-effectiveness is enshrined in the project strategy and its choices.

For a summary refer to PRODOC, Section I, Part II – Cost Effectiveness Analysis, which is reproduced herein.

At PIF stage, UNDP indicated that the current developments in the PA agenda in Angola represented an opportune moment to strengthen the country's PA system as a whole; and that that would effectively ensure that the PA network would fulfil its purpose as a storehouse of protected biodiversity while safeguarding natural capital vital to development (including ecosystem services, such as water provisioning, and future tourism development potential). This continues to be true. Although the two-pronged objective, targeting both PA expansion and rehabilitation, may still seem ambitious at this juncture, a combined approach is critical given the current reality. Here is why:

First, it is necessary to increase PA management effectiveness of existing parks by taking immediate, pragmatic action on-the-ground to address threats. This should not be postponed. Second, the areas identified for PA expansion in the PLERNACA have been selected based on the following criteria: (1) importance (uniqueness, irreplaceability); (2) urgency (vulnerability, threat); and (3) opportunity (low societal cost of setting land aside for conservation).

Notably, the opportunity cost of land in Angola is in the increase. There is currently a unique window of opportunity to establish the planned new protected areas—which is likely to be foreclosed in the future. Angola's economy is growing fast. Although the country faces severe social and economic problems, and remains a LDC, the fiscal situation is improving.

PPG finance assessments have shown that investment in PA management are increasing. There is a need to develop institutional capacities and know-how for PA management and cost effective management solutions, to ensure that these investments yield solid environmental benefits. The project will address this need and by doing so, it will enhance the sustainability of the PA system.

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 co-financiers in the initial start-up costs of establishing park management capacity in existing national parks will reduce the recurrent costs to government of maintaining this investment (by a factor of ~4).

Project support towards initiating a process of building a collaborative and cooperative relationship between targeted national parks and the local (municipal and provincial) government and communities living in the area, 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 for the PA expansion agenda will ensure that it follows an informed process with good prospects for the sustainability of newly established PAs as well as those in the pipeline. This also includes tangible progress in addressing the issue of PA finance from both costs and revenue generating aspects.

Finally, the project is learning lessons from establishing the staff complement, infrastructure, services, equipment and park planning products in Iona National Park through the 'Iona Project'. This will be used to further improve the cost-effectiveness of establishing or strengthening park administrative structures in other Angolan protected areas. Both GEF supported interventions will form part of a nascent 'PA Programme' for Angola.

C. 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.

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"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 22,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	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"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	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"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 60,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team, ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 60,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: printing costs only, if any.	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	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"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	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"> ▪ Project manager and team ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RTA ▪ UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 157,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Pedro Samuel	CEO for the National Environment Fund and GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment	Apr 28 2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adrian Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		May 15, 2013	Fabiana Issler Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems & Biodiversity, Africa, UNDP-GEF	+27-12- 3548128	fabiana.issler@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

(Either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Refer to specific sections and pages in the PRODOC for a reference:

SECTION II: Strategic Results Framework (SRF) and GEF Increment

page 62 - 66

PART I: Strategic Results Framework Analysis:

Programmatic Links

Indicator Framework as part of the SRF

Project Outputs

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

(From GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
STAP Scientific and Technical Screening of the PIF <i>Consent</i>		
<p><i>‘The nature of these challenges, and the diverse strategies available to address them, are well known throughout the region and are reflected in similar undertakings in neighbouring countries that draw in some cases draw on over 30 years of experience in integrating biodiversity conservation goals into broader landscape management and community development paradigms. STAP wishes to emphasize that the project developers take every opportunity to draw lessons from this experience, and effectively integrate into the knowledge base which exists in this domain in the region.’</i></p> <p><i>‘STAP believes that there is a unique opportunity for lessons and knowledge sharing with these (Trans-Frontier Biodiversity Conservation Initiatives) and similar initiatives throughout the region that is being missed and Angola is uniquely positioned to take full advantage of this diverse knowledge base.’</i></p>	<p>This has been fully acknowledged in the strategic design of the project. Angola has very limited expertise and experience in modern protected area planning, development and management. It will thus have to draw heavily on adopting and adapting good practices that are already well established in neighboring countries.</p> <p>A number of activities have been specifically identified to facilitate this process of knowledge sharing. These activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Developing the capacity to initiate and maintain working partnerships with counterpart agencies in adjacent countries in order to strengthen trans-boundary conservation initiatives (Output 1.1) (ii) Facilitating the delivery of specialised professional short-course programmes (primarily sourced from neighbouring countries training service providers) for MINAMB PA expansion staff (Output 1.1) (iii) Facilitating financial management training and skills development (including a staff exchange/mentoring partnership with counterpart regional conservation agencies) for key responsible staff in MINAMB and INBAC (Output 1.3) (iv) Employing a regional CTA, with experience in biodiversity conservation practices across the SADC region) to provide support to the Project Manager and strategic and technical support to the project (v) Sourcing experienced and technically skilled regional service providers to work alongside national counterparts, notably in respect of financial sustainability and park planning. 	<p>No changes</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>'STAP believes that this UNDP-led GEF-funded initiative in Angola represents a unique opportunity to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between community welfare and protected area management. This opportunity is particularly relevant in areas where new protected area establishment is proposed within this project.'</i></p>	<p>Angola is still in a very early stage of understanding the highly complex relationship between community welfare and protected area management. Further it has extremely limited capacity and expertise to undertake any rigorous evaluation and assessment of the multi-faceted relationships between communities and protected areas, under a range of different operational management challenges and scenarios.</p> <p>The project has adopted a utilitarian approach to initiating the iterative building of relationships between protected areas and local communities. This may include the following elements, depending on the <i>in situ</i> capacity, or contracted services, to implement these steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Mapping and profiling the people currently living in (and immediately adjacent to) the park or area targeted for park establishment. (ii) Identifying the current governance structures and their functioning (i.e. assessing the power relationships of the various interest groups to determine patterns of resource use) in the local communities living in the park. (iii) Surveying the numbers, spatial/temporal distribution and ownership of all livestock (cattle, goats, sheep) living in and/or using the park (or targeted park area) for grazing/browsing. (iv) Qualifying and quantifying the extent and impacts of livestock and fisheries activities on park (or targeted park area) species, habitats and ecosystem functioning. (v) Surveying and characterising illegal activities occurring in the park (or targeted park area). (vi) Surveying attitudes of local communities to the park, and identifying key issues of concern. (vii) Developing appropriate attitudes of park staff towards local people, replacing the traditional 'police' role with a more cooperative and collaborative role. (viii) Initiating genuine and open dialogue with the community, and community representatives (i.e. sobas and municipal administrators) to reduce stereotypes, increase understanding and arrive at mutually acceptable ways forward. (ix) Establishing formal structures that can inter alia: facilitate community and local government participation in the park (or targeted park area) management decision-making affecting local communities; agree on regulations required to control community access to park natural resources; enforce tenure and natural resource use agreements between the community and park management; and provide an accessible and transparent dispute-resolution mechanism. (x) Identifying and facilitating conservation- and tourism-related employment opportunities for members of local communities living in, and adjacent to, the park (or targeted park area). (xi) Identifying and developing opportunities for alternative livelihoods in local communities living in the park as a means of offsetting the impacts of any resource use restrictions and improving diversification of household income (or targeted park area). (xii) Training of community members in support of their participation in either employment or alternative livelihood opportunities. (xiii) Implementing an ongoing communication and education programme in communities and specific targeted stakeholders. <p>Information collected from the implementation of these steps will then be collated and maintained in a structured protected area information management system (which does not currently exist), to be established by the project.</p>	<p>No changes</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
Comments by GEF Council Member Germany on Work Program (for projects submitted to November 2011)		
<p><i>'The final project proposal should elaborate more clearly on the following issues: The capacity development strategy should be described more clearly. The question arises how a significant expansion of the protected area system in Angola can realistically be managed in view of the current low institutional and human resources base. To what extent will regional centres of excellence and training institutions be used to address existing capacity building needs for rangers and managers of protected areas (e.g. Southern African Wildlife Centre)? The proposal should elaborate to what extent the Angolan legislation on forests, wildlife and protected areas allows for the participation of local communities in co-management of protected areas and wildlife, and how the project will address policy gaps taking into consideration benchmarks established in the context of the KAZA Transfrontier Conservation Area (communal conservancy approaches and game management areas). The project should establish mechanisms for exchange and learning from the rich experience of neighbouring countries. The links and synergies with sub-regional and regional programmes and structures (KAZA Secretariat; SADC Secretariat) should be strengthened. It is emphasized that the project will have a strong focus on protected area finance, taking into consideration that MINAMB and the Forestry Development Institute have one of the</i></p>	<p>The project has been carefully designed to optimize prospects for improving the sustainability of the system of protected areas through capacity development. The current strategy implies that Component 1 will be focused on PA expansion and Component 2 on the operationalisation of existing PAs. Investment in both is necessary in spite of the low baseline.</p> <p>Under both components, activities are designed to maximise the development of national capacity through a barrier removal approach that considers the low institutional and human resources base and the incipient level of development of Angola's PA system. Reference is made e.g. to chapter 'Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution'. Under activities, a step-wise approach, with due consideration for the low baseline and sustainability, has been adopted. The following can be highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 implies the establishment, resourcing, staffing and training of a protected area expansion team within MINAMB. Their skills profile is defined, so are their tasks. MINAMB will recruit and pay the salaries and running costs of the PA expansion team members. The GEF project will provide technical assistance to the team. ▪ Output 1.3 will focus on financial sustainability, exactly to ensure that the institutional and human resource grows in tandem with financial management at the PA system's level. ▪ The strategy under Component 2 is also one of capacity development through hands-on field experience through the four strategic interventions. <p>Altogether the project represents an comparatively small investment in developing an output-based, results-oriented management system for the PA expansion agenda. Much of the costs will be absorbed by the Ministry. This investment will ensure that the expansion follows an informed process with good prospects for the sustainability of newly established PAs as well as those in the pipeline. This also includes tangible progress in addressing the issue of PA finance from both costs and revenue generating aspects.</p> <p>Several consultancies will be launched through calls for proposals. If entities like the Southern African Wildlife Centre present solid proposals, it can be engaged in activities such as training and capacity building. However, due procurement process will need to be carried out first.</p> <p>The PRODOC indicates that the National Policy of Forest, Wildlife and Conservation Areas was approved in 2010 and that the development of laws and regulations for ensuring policy effectiveness is still on-going.</p> <p>Under the Iona Project, funds are foreseen for the technical assistance and consultations around the mentioned package. It is hence outside the scope of this project. Yet, it can be informed that, in connection with the development of legislation on the topics of PAs and wildlife, Angola is analysing successful models from other countries, many of which allows for the participation of local communities in co-management of protected areas and wildlife.</p> <p>Else, the project will be indirectly supportive of the KAZA initiative and work with neighbouring countries in the following manner:</p> <p>Under Output 1.1, item "x", includes the following initiating and maintaining</p>	<p>No changes</p>

Comments	Responses	Changes made in full project
<p><i>lowest budgets in Africa. The project proposal should provide details on the measures that will be taken to identify new funding sources for the PA system”</i></p>	<p>working partnerships with counterpart agencies in adjacent countries to improve the benefits associated with Angola’s involvement in trans-boundary conservation/protected area initiatives, including the KAZA and where applicable through and with focus on peer-assist exchange.</p> <p>Under Output 1.3, the project will implement measures that will lead to identify new funding sources for the PA system through the following activities:</p> <p>(iii) Identify and describe the critical activities that would be required to: improve the current levels of investment in protected areas; mobilize additional financial resources for the protected area system; strengthen financial management systems; and improve business planning capabilities.</p> <p>(iv) Identify practical mechanisms to improve revenue streams for protected areas. This may include increasing the current income from conventional financial sources (i.e. government grants, fines, donor funding, and entry fees) as well as developing new funding sources (e.g. user permits, tourism/recreation concessions, biodiversity offsets, and trust funds).</p> <p>(v) Provide ongoing technical support and advice to MINAMB on the cost-effective use of financial and business planning tools in: (i) medium-term and annual budget planning; (ii) financial management systems; (iii) financial control mechanisms; and (iv) annual auditing.</p> <p>(xi) Support donor management processes, including: targeting potential funders for projects, preparing detailed project proposals, liaising with different funders, and building working partnerships with funding agencies/ institutions.</p>	
Comments by GEF NGO network on Work Program (for projects submitted to November 2011)		
<p><i>‘...all the projects submitted (...) are government driven and has no participation of other stakeholders e.g. CSOs. When the term multiple benefits is mentioned, it opens up an age old term where the community members are used as recipients or benefactors when the reality on the ground is often opposite. For instance, is it true that at this age and time, a government has never acted to expand and strengthen protected areas? What is meant by improvement of management effectiveness? Or Shire natural management systems? Does it mean there has been no management systems before? Generating natural benefits within and protected areas?’</i></p>	<p>The lack of involvement of ‘other stakeholders’ (specifically NGOs and CSOs) in project implementation is a legitimate concern.</p> <p>The number, and capacity, of conservation NGOs and CSOs in Angola is – for a variety of historical, bureaucratic and political reasons – very weak to virtually non-existent. This is however not a desirable state, and it is incumbent on the government of Angola to create the enabling conditions for improving the working partnerships between NGO’s/CSO’s and state conservation agencies.</p> <p>However, the project has had to be developed in the prevailing institutional context, hence the focus on MINAMB as the ‘driver’ of the project.</p> <p>In the case of Angola, whose current protected area network is verging on a state of collapse and whose socio-economic priorities for government investment are very high, the likelihood of the expansion of protected areas without GEF investment is exceptionally low.</p> <p>The project has adopted the METT as the framework for the ‘definition’ of the elements of management effectiveness. While the METT has significant and fundamental weaknesses in its conception, this does then enable the project activities to be evaluated against a global monitoring standard for management effectiveness.</p> <p>UNDP encourages conservation oriented NGOs to carve a more prominent role for them in the project. Grants for the purpose have been budgeted for in Component 2 so at least two-three calls for proposals per park can be launched aimed at fostering NGO/CSO participation in the process of community engagement in the operationalisation of parks.</p>	<p>No changes</p>

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

A. DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF PPG ACTIVITIES AND FINANCING STATUS

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Establish 'baseline project investments'	10,000	17,765	0,00
2. Site level survey	38,000	8,091	22,144
3. Other baseline assessments	0	-	-
4. Project scoping and strategy development	52,000	-	52,000
Total	100,000	25,856	74,144

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (IF NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT IS USED)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)