



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9735		
Country/Region:	Angola		
Project Title:	Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade and Human Wildlife Conflict in Angola		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5993 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,603,161
Co-financing:	\$16,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,103,161
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Penny Stock

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	2-2-17 Yes. BD-1 P1 and BD-2 P3 Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	2-2-17 Yes. See pages 15 and 16. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	2-2-17 Financial sustainability. Please explain who is going to cover the	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?	<p>recurrent costs of the institutions the GEF is going to support getting started or upgraded (i.e. NWCTF, WCU, Center for Excellence for Wildlife Management").</p> <p>3-3-17 Clear</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>2-2-17</p> <p>1. Not clear if the baseline projects are related and are sufficient to justify the proposed interventions in all the geographic and thematic areas of the project.</p> <p>2. Do co-financiers know that they are listed in this project with the amounts in Table C?</p> <p>3. Is the co-financing by the Government in Cash (similar as GEF's?)?</p> <p>4. The \$ figures in the tables to not add-up. Please review all numbers.</p> <p>3-3-17 Clear</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>2-2-17</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>Although the project is well</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>structured, there are far too many outputs. This project is seriously overpromising and very likely to under-deliver. The GEF strongly suggest reduce the geographic and thematic scope of project or increase the budget significantly. Below some suggestions.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>Output 1.1.1. If the proposal is to develop and implement a new National Strategy for Illegal Wildlife Trade and Poaching, the project needs to determine what parts of the strategy will be implemented. Remove implementation of the strategy as the elements are unknown. Keep some of the activities listed as part of the other outputs.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2. Same as above.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3. Is this an assessment on IWT and HWC? What is the relationship with the new National Strategy for Illegal Wildlife Trade and Poaching? Suggest combining is related.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4. What does The Inter-ministerial Commission Against Environmental Crime and Crime</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Against Wild Fauna and Flora need to run their business? Isn't this just a commission with reps from the ministries? That is different from the development of the strategy that they will lead. Not sure this output has merit.</p> <p>Output 1.1.5. i) Please provide a diagram to visualize the administrative and operational positions of the different government entities listed in the project, including the NWCTF and WCUs. ii) Who came up with the architecture of the Government's institutions to address IWT and HWC? Since the NWCTF's function is for oversight, what are the financial needs of this structure? Suggest removing output as this does not appear to request much GEF funding. This should be covered with co-financing.</p> <p>Output 1.1.6. How many of these WCUs will be set-up? Are these WCUs permanently structure and personnel stations together or are these WCUs officials that get together for operations on WC?</p> <p>Output 1.1.7. What does the appointment of a National Prosecutor require an output (and budget) in a</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEF funded project? Isn't this a function of the Government? Suggest remove</p> <p>Output 1.1.8. This output requires significant resizing. There is far too much in it. There are too many institutions to support (police, judiciary, customs, police, military, immigration, intelligence, etc.) and far too many items for investment (IWT legislation, enforcement systems, intelligence gathering, forensic investigations, human resources management and operations management).</p> <p>Output 1.1.9. What is the nature of this nationwide system? Potentially very expensive and costly if deployed nationally. Please reconsider.</p> <p>Output 1.1.10. Are these countries aware of the proposed activities? Very expensive if implemented in full. Please redesign.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>Output 2.1.1 What are the items to be updated? Who is going to cover the recurrent costs of the "Centre of Excellence for Wildlife Management"?</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Output 2.1.2. Far too ambitious. How management plans will be updated? Please reduce list based on current threats.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. There are far too many items in this output (site identification, population and ecosystem status, threat/risk assessments (including IWT), camera-trap surveys and monitoring of elephants and great apes in Maiombe, cooperation with timber concessions to carry out inventories and wildlife monitoring). Please provide the name of the institution/researchers that have been working on this matters and may be available for the project. This is something that cannot be done during PPG. Need to be clearly identified at PIF stage.</p> <p>Output 2.1.4. Name target PAs. Shouldn't this be part of output 2.1.2?</p> <p>Output 2.1.6. What is this "community-based monitoring network"? This is very fuzzy.</p> <p>Output 2.1.7. There are far too many items. Select the priority activities.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>OUTCOME 3.1. Too many PAs for the improvement of site level capacity to combat IWT. Are they all under threat?</p> <p>Output 3.1.1. How many WCUs can be realistically be supported with the project? Please narrow-down the list.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2. What is the target audience? List of items for capacity building is far too long.</p> <p>Output 3.1.3. Same as above. Need to narrow-down the list of PAs and the list of infrastructure and equipment to be delivered.</p> <p>Output 3.1.4. Virtually impossible to achieve if all TFPAs are included. Please be selective.</p> <p>Output 3.1.5. Need target PAs.</p> <p>Output 3.1.6. Narrow-down the list of "alternative livelihoods" and PAs to be tested. The list of options is aspirational rather than potentially doable.</p> <p>Output 3.1.7. Include this output if there are some Logging Companies already on board. Again, the language</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		is aspirational and is difficult to know if any of the ideas can be deliver. Output 3.1.8. Remove. Beyond the means of this project. 3-3-17 Clear	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	2-2-17 Please elaborate on the socio-economic aspects (local communities) and gender (as appropriate) after the reduction in the geographic scope of the project. 3-3-17 Clear	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	2-2-17 Yes Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	2-2-17 No. Please address outstanding issues listed above. Thanks	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3-3-17 Yes. This PIF is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	February 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 03, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review	March 03, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		