



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\***  
**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	<b>4589</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Angola</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Expansion and Strengthening of Angola's Protected Area system</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4464 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,800,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$16,190,400</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$22,090,400</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>August 30, 2011</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 09, 2011</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Fabiana Issler</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	8-25-11 Yes. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-25-11 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$6,490,000 dated April 28, 2011. Cleared	
	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-25-11 Yes. UNDP now fully engaged in PA work in Angola. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	8-25-11 Yes. UNDP is providing \$1 million cash. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	8-25-11 Yes. There is a UNDP Country Office and three professional staff dedicated to	6-3-13 Cleared

		p.11 of PIF. Cleared	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-25-11 Yes. This project will be using \$6.38 million BD resources from the allocation of \$6.99 million. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	8-25-11 Yes. This project will be using \$6.38 million BD resources from the allocation of \$6.99 million. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	8-25-11 Yes. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	8-25-11 Yes. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	8-25-11 Angola is in the final stages of development and approval of an overarching program in support to the environment sector. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	8-25-11 Yes. See Component 1, page 7. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	8-26-11 Yes. See baseline project, page 6. Cleared	6-3-13 Cleared

Project Design			
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	6-3-13 Cleared	6-03-13 Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>8-25-11 This project offers a unique opportunity to expand and strengthen Angola's Protected Area system.</p> <p>GEBs. By the end of the project, 23 of the 32 main vegetation types will be included in the PA System from a baseline of only 11 at present. 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>), 18 other primate species, and many endemic mammal, bird, reptile, amphibian and plant species.</p> <p>These are the project's core elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National Institute of Biodiversity and Conservation Areas (INBAC): Building the capacity of INCAB to assume the operational responsibilities for PA management.</li> <li>2. New Protected Areas: The project will support the gazetting of 11 new PAs totaling 905,000 ha, from a baseline of 82,320 sq. Km.</li> </ol>	<p>6-3-13</p> <p>Context: Angola's protected area system comprises 13 protected areas covering 12.6% of the national territory. The operational management of these protected areas has been (and remains) wholly inadequate or totally absent since the 1970s. The majority of the wildlife remaining in the protected areas is now either vulnerable or threatened with extinction. Enforcement measures in these protected areas are grossly inadequate and, in most cases, completely non-existent. Protected area infrastructure, in particular, is severely degraded. The protected areas are served by a chronically weak administrative system, with extremely limited resources and capacity. The project is designed to improve ecosystem representation in the PA system and it will strengthen PA management operations at key sites.</p> <p>Results and Innovation: The project will result in the creation of new or expansion of existing protected areas totaling 140,000 ha covering 20 out of 32 vegetation types (baseline of 14 in</p>

		<p>3. Existing Protected Areas: Improve the management of three priority National Parks (Quicama, Cangandala and Bicular) totalling 18,460 sq Km.</p> <p>The project is co-financed by the Government of Angola (\$10 million cash), UNDP (\$1 million cash), the private sector (\$2 million in-kind), bilaterals (\$0.6 million cash) and CSOs (\$0.1 in-kind).</p>	<p>management effectiveness of three National Parks (Quicama NP, Bicular NP and Cangandala NP) by means of implementation of Management Plans, improving the number of park rangers with proper training and equipment, providing appropriate infrastructure, services and equipment, and engaging with local communities in the park management decision-making process.</p> <p>Sustainability: The financial sustainability of the system will be improved by means of increasing the Government's budget allocation for protected area management from US\$6.7M in 2013 to US\$12M by project end. As part of the sustainability plan, there will be 2 new tourism/recreation concessions (none at the moment) and 2 parks implementing user fee systems.</p> <p>Co-financing: Government of Angola (\$15M), UNDP (\$0.50M), Tripartite Ministerial Committee for the trans-frontier Conservation Initiative for Maiombe Forest (\$0.47), and USAID (\$0.22M) for a total of \$16.1M, all cash. Cleared</p>
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>8-25-11 Yes. Cleared</p>	<p>6-12-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8-25-11 Yes. Cleared</p>	<p>6-12-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar</p>		<p>6-12-13 Yes. As indicated in the CEO Endorsement, this project will provide the means to strengthen the country's PA system as a whole. First, it is necessary to increase PA management</p>

			<p>immediate, pragmatic action on-the-ground to address threats. This should not be postponed. Second, the areas identified for PA expansion in the "Plano Estrategico da Rede Nacional de Areas de Conservacao de Angola" (PLERNACA, 2011), have been selected based on importance (uniqueness, irreplaceability), urgency (vulnerability, threat) and opportunity (low societal cost of setting land aside for conservation).</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</p>	<p>8-25-11 These issues were properly addressed on pages 8 &amp; 9 of PIF. Cleared</p>	<p>6-11-13 Yes. As stated in the PAD, "The project is expected to yield local benefits through improvement in the living conditions of communities living in and around three National Parks: Quicama, 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).". Cleared</p>
	<p>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</p>	<p>8-25-11 Gender issues identified on page 9. Cleared</p>	<p>6-11-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	<p>20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>8-25-11 Main risks associated with the project have been identified. Cleared</p>	<p>6-12-12 Yes. See p. 9 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
	<p>21. Is the provided documentation consistent?</p>		<p>6-12-13 Yes. Cleared</p>

	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?		6-12-13 Yes. See details on pages 25-27 of PRODOC. Cleared
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	8-25-11 Yes. This project will complement GEF-4 "National Biodiversity Project" with focus on Iona National Park. Other related initiatives in the pilot areas are listed in p. 10. Cleared	6-11-13 Yes. "Initiate and maintain working partnerships with counterpart agencies in adjacent countries to improve the benefits associated with Angola's involvement in trans-boundary conservation/protected area initiatives (i.e. KAZA, Iona-Skeleton Coast TFCA, Liuwa Plain-Kameia TFCA, Maiombe Forest TFCA), and with focus on peer-assist exchange". Cleared
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	8-25-11 Yes. The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Ministry of the Environment. UNDP is the GEF Agency and will provide support from the Country Office and Regional Office. Cleared	6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-25-11 PM is 5% of GEF funding. Cleared	6-11-13 Yes. It is 5.3%. Cleared
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost	8-25-11 Yes. Cleared	6-11-13 Cleared

	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	8-25-11 There is significant co-finance: The project is co-financed by the Government of Angola (\$10 million cash), UNDP (\$1 million cash), the private sector (\$2 million in-kind), bilaterals (\$0.6 million cash) and CSOs (\$0.1 in-kind). Cleared	6-03-13 Letters of co-financing were provided for the Government of Angola (\$15M), UNDP (\$0.50M), Tripartite Committee (\$0.47), and USAID (\$0.22M) for a total of \$16.1M). Cleared
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6-11-13 Yes. See pages 53-57 of PRODOC. Cleared
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	8-25-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.  Note: An oncrease in co-financing was requested to the Agency.  8-30-11 Yes. The PIF submitted on 8-29-11 (with \$15.5 million con-finance) is recommended for clearance.	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		

	<b>37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		6-11-13 Yes. Cleared
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	August 25, 2011	June 12, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.



## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>9-29-11 Yes. The PPG will carry out the following activities, all eligible for GEF funding:</p> <p>1. Analysis of the baseline project investments, with particular focus on finance for protected area (PA) expansion and improved PA management throughout the country.</p> <p>2. Protected Area site-level survey. Complete baseline assessments for sites to be targeted by the project for rehabilitation.</p> <p>3. Designing interventions, conduct feasibility and risk analyses, strategy development and budget</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>9-29-11 Yes. There is a request for Local Consultants (\$1000/week) and International Consultants (\$3,000/week). This is justifiable, considering the very low capacities in Country. The surveys for Protected Areas QuiÃ§ama, Canadangala and Bicular will be contracted at \$38,000 total. This is justifiable considering the remoteness of the sites. Travel in the amount of \$12,000 is also included to cover the site visits. Cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>9-29-11 Yes. This PPG is recommended for approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 27, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.