



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

GEF ID:	5231		
Country/Region:	Angola		
Project Title:	Integrating Climate Change into Environment and Sustainable Land Management Practices		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,416,210
Co-financing:	\$7,560,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,126,210
PIF Approval:	April 05, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	May 02, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Zinso BOUE

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Angola is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC, and it has completed its NAPA.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement signed by the Operational Focal Point is included.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Not clear. The Agency's comparative advantage for this project is clearly described. For instance, the AfDB has proven experience in preparing, financing, and managing investment projects with SLM components linked to climate change and is promoting the inclusion of integrated sustainable	YES. No change from PIF.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>natural resources management and climate change in AfDB Country Strategy Papers (CSP). The experience developed in the implementation of Niger basin and other similar programs will be applied in the project design. However, it is not clear why the activities selected here center around policy reform, demonstration activities and capacity building, given AfDB's ability to undertake a more investment-oriented approach to mainstreaming climate change in a given sector.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide further clarifications concerning the comparative advantage justifying the choice of activities to be funded, or consider adjusting the project design, with a view of scaling up and linking with an appropriate baseline intervention or priority development investment activities at risk of climate change.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: The Agency's comparative advantage has been further clarified. Further information has been provided on the baseline project, which will be financed through a loan agreement. The baseline project consists of components in environmental governance, capacity building and institutional strengthening, as well as four pilots in integrated natural resource management. The</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		LDCF intervention will complement closely this project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the AfDB's Country Strategy Paper (CSP) for Angola is fully aligned to the objective of improving the living conditions of the Angolan people and encouraging the most vulnerable groups to actively participate in the economic and social development process. Both the regional resource center in South Africa and the Angola field office in Luanda have adequate staff capacity to contribute to the successful outcomes of this project.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested under this project is available for Angola under the principle of equitable funding.	YES. No change from PIF.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, Components 1, 2, and 3 are well-aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3: reducing vulnerability, strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		induced economic losses and transfer of technology for adaptation.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	YES. No change from PIF.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the Angola NAPA prioritizes sustainable land management for increasing agricultural production. The project is also consistent with Angola's Initial National Communication Plan and the National Action Plan for SLM (NAP) to combat desertification which is currently being developed and validated in Angola, while sustainable Land Management (SLM) is a key part of Angola's NAP.	YES. The project would support the implementation of Angola's NAPA, and it is consistent with the country's National Strategy for Climate Change (2011); the 2013-17 National Development Plan; the Energy and Water Sector Action Plan for 2013-17; the National Afforestation and Reforestation Strategy (2010); the Strategic Plan for Disaster Risk Management (2011); and it would contribute towards the implementation of the adaptation component of Angola's 2015 Intended Nationally Determined Contribution to the Paris Agreement on climate change.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, through capacity building in risk assessment, risk reduction, vulnerabilities assessment, and adaptation technologies, including development policy frameworks, training of staff, and institutional building and strengthening, all of which are expected to underpin the sustainability of the project outcomes. In addition, local communities will be engaged to enable them play an active role in implementation.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 below. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revisit the proposed sustainability strategy. 04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 below. Update 7/01/2016: Additional information has been provided as requested, and this is cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Not entirely. According to the proposal, the baseline project will focus on Environmental Governance, Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening and Integrated Natural Resource Management and Environmental Conservation. The key performance indicators for the baseline project include i) implementation of revised environmental policies and strategies in selected sectors such as agriculture, water, fisheries, forestry and mining, ii) application of EIA guidelines to screen socio-economic interventions iii) reduction of deforestation from 0.8 to 0.3% in project areas iv) capacity built among key staff through training v) increased national environmental awareness vi) establishment of the National Biodiversity Institute vii) Establishment of the climate risk management unit.</p> <p>However, it is unclear what the size of the baseline project or projects is, the source of funding, the arrangements, including when and how the baseline project(s) is/are expected to be implemented.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide more background including financial and project management information on the baseline project.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013:</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a very limited description of the expected impacts of climate change and the associated vulnerabilities, particularly in the four provinces where pilot activities will take place.</p> <p>The proposed LDCF grant would build primarily on the AfDB financed Environmental Sector Support Project (PASE). The project entered implementation more than six years ago and it is not clear whether it remains active, and what baseline investments would be carried out during the three-year duration of the proposed LDCF grant.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, and outputs 1.1.1 and 1.2.2 in particular, it is unclear how the proposed project relates to Angola's ongoing national adaptation plan (NAP) process, including activities supported in the context of the LDCF-financed NAP Global Support Program.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the Request for CEO Endorsement (p. 13) suggests that the baseline project already incorporates climate change adaptation into demonstration activities across the four pilot sites and it is not clear what gaps and needs would remain under the baseline scenario.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i)</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Resolved. Additional financial information, including on the baseline project, has been provided.</p>	<p>describe the expected impacts of climate change and the associated vulnerabilities, particularly in the four provinces where pilot activities will take place. Moreover, clarify (ii) whether the baseline project (PASE) remains active and, if so, what investments would be carried out over the 2016-2018 time frame. If PASE is closed (as suggested on devex.com for example), please identify alternative baseline investments on which the proposed LDCF grant can build and that it can strengthen, and revise the sources, amounts and types of co-financing accordingly. Moreover, please (ii) describe how the proposed project relates to and helps advance Angola's NAP process; and (iii) what specific gaps and needs Component 2 would aim to fill, given the climate change adaptation measures that are already being supported in the pilot sites.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – NOT CLEAR. As recommended the revised Request for CEO Endorsement provides further information regarding the expected impacts of climate change and the associated vulnerabilities, particularly in the four provinces where pilot activities will take place.</p> <p>As for the baseline project (PASE), the Request for CEO Endorsement notes that the project will not be closed until the end of 2016. Even so, it is not clear</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>how the project could contribute US\$18 million in co-financing towards the proposed LDCF project that would likely enter implementation in the second half of 2016. Moreover, the Request still describes the objectives and design of PASE, rather than the outcomes achieved as well as on-going and planned activities in the targeted provinces and sites.</p> <p>With respect to the NAP process, the Agency's response to GEFSEC comments notes that the Climate Change Department at the Ministry of Environment plays a central role in Angola's NAP process, and would do so in implementing the proposed project as well. It is not clear, however, what concrete steps have been taken or planned to advance the country's NAP process over the coming years, and how the proposed project would complement these steps.</p> <p>Finally, regarding the gaps and needs in the targeted regions, it seems the baseline project has built Agro-Ecological Centers (AEC) in each of the targeted provinces. Aside from this, however, it is not at all clear whether any baseline investments have been planned for the duration of the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address previous recommendations (ii)-</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			(iv). Update 7/01/2016: This has been done.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 15, please revisit Section B.3 of the Request for CEO Endorsement. 04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15. Update 7/01/2016: This has been done.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	No, the justifications is currently not based on additional reasoning. There is no clear rationale concerning the additional nature of LDCF financing, with respect to the baseline project. In addition, as per comments under section 11, the baseline project description provided is unclear, making it difficult to assess whether there is sufficient ground for additional cost reasoning. Recommended Action: Upon addressing recommendations in section 11, please consider providing clear additional cost reasoning for each of the project components, drawing clear linkages between the baseline activities on one side, and the additional activities that would build the resilience of the	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. With respect to Component 1, in addition to the need to articulate how the proposed project would help advance Angola's NAP process, it is not clear how the proposed outputs would result in the expected outcomes. The project would review relevant policies and strategies, and develop risk assessment guidelines, but the Request for CEO Endorsement does not specify whether relevant ministries would be mandated to apply the guidelines and to revise or strengthen the aforementioned policies and strategies. As for Component 2, the Request for

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>baseline using LDCF funding on the other side.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: The clarifications on the linkages between the baseline activities and the additional activities have been provided. This is satisfactory.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement does not provide a clear rationale for piloting or demonstrating SLM practices and technology. On the one hand, given previous GEF projects, and the baseline PASE project, among other, it is not clear whether the proposed technologies are new and in need of further demonstration. On the other hand, the Request does not clearly demonstrate that the proposed technologies and practices will reduce the vulnerability of the targeted beneficiaries and pilot sites to the adverse effects of climate change. Indeed, the Request cites mainly global environmental benefits rather than adaptation benefits (p. 19).</p> <p>With regard to Component 3, finally, the Request for CEO Endorsement argues that previous experiences have not been adequately disseminated. The description of the baseline project suggests, however, that a national awareness campaign is carried out under the baseline scenario. It is not clear why this campaign would not be used to disseminate the outcomes of the adaptation measures carried out under the proposed LDCF project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please strengthen the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant. In particular, (i) ensure that Component 1 is based on a realistic</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>results chain from outputs to outcomes; (ii) reconsider the need to further pilot and demonstrate SLM technologies and practices, given past investments; (iii) describe how the proposed technologies and measures under Component 2 will contribute towards reducing the vulnerability of the targeted beneficiaries and pilot sites in the face of climate change; and (iv) clarify how Component 3 would build on and complement, rather than duplicate, ongoing and planned efforts to disseminate good practices under the baseline project.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – NOT CLEAR. It appears that no more significant baseline investments are planned through PASE, and the proposed LDCF project lacks clear linkages to other ongoing and planned investments. Accordingly, the additional reasoning remains unclear.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the previous recommendation stands and there is a need to clarify how the proposed activities will lead to far-reaching policy and legislative change across several sectors.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the Request for CEO Endorsement argues for piloting and demonstration given that such support has not been provided through PASE, but also argues that the proposed</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>project would contribute towards large-scale dissemination. These are very different objectives, and the contribution of the proposed project could be clarified, including based on a clearer understanding of baseline investments carried out through projects and programs other than PASE.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the outstanding recommendations in Section 11, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly, particularly for components 1 and 2 in line with previous recommendations (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Update 7/01/2015: This has been done.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Yes, the project framework is reasonably sound and sufficiently clear.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revise the components, outcomes, outputs and financing amounts in the project framework (Table B) accordingly.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>7/01/2016: This has been done.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not clear. Recommended action: Please revisit comments under sections 11 and 13. This question will be revisited upon the successful resolution of the issues raised in 11 and 13.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: Yes, adequate justifications have been provided.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>The project framework (Annex A) does not provide a baseline or target for the impact indicator on the number of direct beneficiaries (and the percentage of them who are women). As for the number of hectares under SLM, the baseline refers to "land restoration" rather than SLM, and the zero baseline does not seem consistent with what is planned under Component 2 of the baseline project.</p> <p>Under Outcome 1, the notion of an "adequate" policy and regulatory framework is not clear; and "again" the zero baseline overlooks e.g. the existing National Strategy for Climate Change and Department of Vulnerability and Climate Change.</p> <p>Outcome indicator 2.2 refers to the number of people (and the percentage of them who are women), whereas the associated target refers to the number of "communities".</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revise the project results framework accordingly. Please ensure, in particular, that indicators are used consistently across targets and baselines; and that the baseline value reflects investments</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>carried out under the baseline project.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>The Project Results Framework still lacks a target for the impact indicator on the number of direct beneficiaries (and the percentage of them who are women). Outcome indicator 1.1 remains unclear. Outcome indicator 2.2 is not clear, and the number of communities cannot be disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revise the project results framework accordingly.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: Outcome 1.1 remains unclear. In particular, it is unclear why the baseline figure for the hectares of land with reduced vulnerability is 200 ha. Please provide clarification for this number.</p> <p>8/3/2016: Cleared.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>Yes, for this stage. Namely, the most vulnerable communities are expected to adapt to climate change, and the project would promote positive gender outcomes through various activities. Recommended action: By CEO endorsement, please provide a detailed description of the socio-</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 15, please revise Section B.2 of the Request for CEO Endorsement accordingly.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		economic benefits, including gender dimensions to be delivered by the project in support of the achievement of additional benefits.	04/12/2016 – NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15 above. 7/01/2016: This is clear.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, the key stakeholders have been identified, and specific partners will be further identified during the project preparation stage.	YES. Public participation, including CSOs, is adequately considered in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	18. 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)	Yes, the project identifies the major risks, such as inadequate participation by all stakeholder groups, and limitations in adoption of sustainable land management practices, and provides mitigation measures.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 10, 11 and 13 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 10, 11 and 13, please review and revise Section A.6 of the Request for CEO Endorsement accordingly, as needed. 04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 10, 11 and 13 above. Update 7/01/2016: This has been done.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Not clear. The PIF identifies a number of related initiatives. However, there are two projects, financed under the LDCF, by UNDP (under the name of "Promoting climate-resilient development and enhanced adaptive capacity to withstand disaster risks in Angolan's Cuvelai River Basin") and UNEP ("Addressing Urgent Coastal Adaptation Needs and Capacity Gaps in Angola"), which are not addressed in the proposal.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please include, in Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, the LDCF-financed NAP Global Support Program (GEF ID: 5320 and 5868). 04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Recommended Actions: Please identify ongoing projects that could support all components of the proposed project. Please consider the activities proposed under this project in light of other interventions, with an emphasis on synergies and drawing upon respective comparative advantages.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: The description of relevant parallel initiatives has been provided, including on the complementarities with the LDCF-funded UNEP project in Angola. This is satisfactory.</p>	<p>The NAP Global Support Program is mentioned, but the revised Request for CEO Endorsement does not explain what concrete steps have been taken or planned to advance the country's NAP process over the coming years, and how the proposed project would complement these steps.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: This has been done.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please explain the roles of the executing partners and of the coordinating partners in the project implementation.</p>	<p>YES.</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: There has been minor modifications in order to better align the project with the baseline, including a modification of the baseline. This is clear.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>NA</p>
	23. Is funding level for project	<p>Yes, at slightly over 5%, the funding</p>	<p>YES. No change from PIF.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	level for project management cost is acceptable.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Not clear. Recommended Action: This section would need to be revisited after comments for section 13 and 15 have been addressed.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: Yes, the funding and cofinancing per objective appear to be appropriate.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 14 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 14 please adjust the proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 14 above.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: Not clear. It is understood that the cofinancing has been revised to reflect the undisbursed amount of funds for the ESSP/PASE, but please review the totals in Table B, and correct as appropriate.</p> <p>8/3/2016: Cleared.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Not clear. This section will be revisited after outstanding issues, namely in section 13 and 15, have been resolved.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: The cofinancing, namely nearly \$20 million in loan financing is appropriate.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please adjust the sources, amounts and types of co-financing accordingly, as needed, and provide appropriate confirmation.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. Clearly the full loan associated with PASE, which</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>will hardly overlap with the proposed LDCF project, cannot be considered as co-financing.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: Not clear. Please provide a confirmation of the revised cofinancing (i.e. letter indicating the remaining undisbursed funding under ESSP/PASE, or other documentation to that effect.)</p> <p>8/3/2016: Cleared.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>The cofinancing the AfDB is bringing is in line with its role. However, please see the comment under 25.</p> <p>Update 3/28/2013: This is cleared.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 25 above.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 25 above.</p> <p>Update 7/01/2016: Not clear. This will be considered upon addressing item #25 above.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 15, please complete the tracking tool with baselines and targets corresponding to the strategic objectives and outcomes cited in the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), and in line with the revised project results framework.</p> <p>04/12/2016 " NO. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15 above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>The current tracking tool has been heavily modified to mirror the project results framework, rather than provide baselines and targets corresponding to the GEF's strategic objectives and outcomes.</p> <p>7/01/2016: Not clear. The tracking tool resubmitted is an improvement, but remaining issues need to be addressed as per item #15 above before clearance.</p> <p>8/3/2016: Cleared.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 15 and 16 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13, 15 and 16, please revise accordingly the response to Council comments contained in Annex B of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 15 and 16 above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	NA	07/1/2016 Not clear, please address the pending item under #15. 8/3/2016: Cleared. NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Please see comments under sections 3, 11, 13, 15, 19, 25, and 26. Update 3/29/2013: Yes, the PIF is ready to be recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		NO. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please complete Annex C of the Request for CEO Endorsement. 04/12/2016 – YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 32. 04/12/2016 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29. 07/15/2016: Not yet. Please address the remaining items under 15, 24, 25, 26, and 29.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			8/3/2016: All pending items have been resolved. The project is ready for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 22, 2013	February 09, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 29, 2013	April 12, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 15, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		August 03, 2016
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.