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

GEF ID:	**5432**		
Country/Region:	**Angola**		
Project Title:	**Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Agropastoral Production Systems through Soil Fertility Management in Key Productive and Vulnerable Areas Using the Farmers Field School Approach**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	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:	**$6,668,181**
Co-financing:	**$23,619,230**	Total Project Cost:	**$30,587,411**
PIF Approval:	**July 01, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	**July 30, 2014**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Knut Sundstrom**	Agency Contact Person:	**Raul Alfaro Pelico**

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. Please see the section on Resource Availability.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated January 24, 2013 is on file. However, please see the section on Resource Availability.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	No. At this time, all the funding available currently under the equitable	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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		access principle for Angola has been programmed. It will be possible to consider this project only after additional resources become available. 02/06/2014 â€“ YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	02/06/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.	NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) does not specify the focal area outcomes towards which the project would contribute. Moreover, the table should not include a row for project management costs. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) use the correct template for the Request for CEO Endorsement, and include in Table A a breakdown of the LDCF grant and co-financing by focal area outcome. In addition, please (ii) remove the row for project management costs in Table A and adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per objective accordingly. 05/03/2016 â€“ YES.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	02/06/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would directly contribute towards the implementation of Angola's NAPA priorities, particularly those pertaining to soil erosion control, the use of locally adapted varieties, and crop diversification. The project is aligned	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)
		with Angola's Vision 2025, the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Security, the Strategy to Combat Poverty, and the Agricultural Sector Development Plan.	
Project Design	6. 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?	02/06/2014 â€“ NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on and enhance the resilience of the following baseline initiatives, their beneficiaries and their target areas: (i) the Special Program for food Security (SPFS); (ii) the Market-Oriented Smallholder Agriculture Project (MOSAP); (iii) Support to government institutions to improve the administration of land and other natural resources in the provinces of Huambo and Bie; (iv) the Environmental Sector Support Project (ESSP); (v) the Integrated Municipal Program for Rural Development and Combating Poverty (PMIDRCP); (vi) the Angola Partnership Initiative; and other baseline activities led by MINADER, with technical assistance from FAO. Overall, the baseline projects appear relevant. The PIF could nevertheless describe consistently the duration of each baseline initiative. Specifically, given that SPFS was launched in 2006, it is not clear to what extent the program can still incorporate the climate-resilient technologies and practices introduced through the proposed LDCF project with a view to enhancing the resilience of its beneficiaries and target areas. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i)	YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a very clear description of changes to the baseline scenario, relevant baseline initiatives and the associated, confirmed sources, amounts and types of co-financing.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		provide consistently the duration of each baseline initiative, and (ii) clarify whether SPFS would be under implementation at the start of the proposed project and able to incorporate the climate-resilient technologies and practices introduced. 06/19/2014 -- YES. The baseline scenario has been clarified as recommended. SPFS is no longer counted towards the indicative co-financing, and the duration of relevant baseline initiatives has been clarified.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	02/06/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 8, 16 and 17 below. Moreover, The numbering of outputs under Component 1 appears to be incorrect â€“ the project framework includes outputs 1.1 and 1.3, but not 1.2. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Sections 8, 16 and 17, please (i) adjust the Project Framework accordingly, if necessary; and (ii) ensure that the outputs under Component 1 are correctly numbered. 06/19/2014 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.	YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement describes clearly all changes to the project framework. The structure and scope of the project have been refined in line with the changes introduced to the baseline scenario and associated sources of co-financing.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	02/06/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits are broadly clear.	YES. Relevant changes and further details to the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits are well described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		With regard to the capacity building activities proposed under outputs 1.1.1, 2.1.1 and 3.1.2 and described in Section A.1.3 of the PIF, these could appear duplicative and the proposal would benefit from more clearly differentiating these sub-components or, alternatively, merging them. As for Component 2, beyond the training provided through existing and new Farmer Field Schools, it is not clear whether or how the proposed project would support farmers in gaining access to agricultural inputs and financial services necessary to adopt the climate-resilient practices and technologies introduced. Finally, the indicative LDCF amount directed towards Component 3 appears somewhat high, particularly in comparison with Component 1. It would be helpful to understand better the indicative cost structure of the component. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) clarify and adjust the description of the expected adaptation benefits and additional reasoning accordingly, if necessary; (ii) differentiate more clearly between outputs 1.1.1, 2.1.1 and 3.1.2, or merge them if necessary; (iii) clarify how the farmers benefiting from the training provided through the new and existing	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FFS would gain adequate access to inputs and finance in order to adopt the climate-resilient practices and technologies introduced; and (iv) provide further information regarding the cost structure of Component 3. 06/19/2014 -- YES. The additional reasoning has been clarified as recommended, and is now adequate for this stage of project development. The re-submission provides a clearer differentiation of the various capacity building activities, and proposes a revolving fund to help finance small-scale investments. The revised PIF also clarifies the cost structure of Component 3.	
	9. 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?		YES. The expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are clearly described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	02/06/2014 -- YES. Public participation, including the participation of CSOs, has been adequately considered for this stage of project development.	YES. Public participation, including of CSOs, is clearly described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	02/06/2014 -- YES. Relevant risks and mitigation measures have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.	YES. A complete risk analysis is provided in Annex 4 of the FAO Project Document, including all relevant risks and appropriate, associated mitigation actions.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	02/06/2014 -- YES. The proposal identifies relevant initiatives with which coordination and coherence will be sought.	YES. Coordination and complementarity with other relevant initiatives is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document.
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	02/06/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. Given the need to further clarify the additional reasoning, the project's innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please clarify further the project's innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up, if necessary. 06/19/2014 -- YES. The proposed project adopts the innovative and participatory farmer field school approach to demonstrate and disseminate climate-resilient technologies and practices for integrated land and water resources management. Complementing the community based training, planning and investment activities, the project would introduce small-scale financial services to help sustain and scale up investments in climate resilience; while strengthening capacities at various levels of policy-making with a view to mainstreaming climate change adaptation into Angola's agricultural development planning processes.	YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document present a viable strategy to ensure project sustainability, and to promote the scaling up of project outcomes. The proposed project is closely aligned with four, highly relevant baseline projects and programs; including in particular the World Bank â€“financed second phase of the Market-Oriented Smallholder Agriculture Project. As a result, the project will be well-placed to achieve considerable adaptation benefits with limited, well-targeted investments in institutional and technical capacity development at the national, sub-national and local levels. Thanks to on-going and planned baseline investments, the beneficiaries of the proposed LDCF grant will also benefit from increasing market access. In addition, the proposed project will contribute towards the integration of climate risks and appropriate adaptation strategies and measures across key environmental and agriculture policies and programs.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		YES. The cost-effectiveness of the proposed project is adequately demonstrated in the Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	02/06/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 8 and 17. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 8 and 17, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 06/19/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 8 and 17.	YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component seem appropriate and adequate.
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	02/06/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please revisit the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, particularly any co-financing associated with SPFS, and revise Table C accordingly, if necessary. 06/19/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.	YES.
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	02/06/2014 -- YES. The proposed LDCF funding level towards project management is appropriate, at $333,094,	YES. The proposed LDCF contribution towards project management has been adjusted to $315,000 or 5 per cent of the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		or 5.25 per cent of the sub-total for project components.	sub-total for project components.
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	02/06/2014 -- YES. A PPG of $150,000 is requested, in line with the norm established for projects up to and including $10 million.	YES.
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		YES. The tracking tool has been completed with baselines and targets for relevant indicators.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		YES. Comments from STAP have been addressed in Annex B of the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		YES. Comments from the LDCF/SCCF Council have been addressed in Annex B of the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	At this time, the resources to support this project are not available. It will be	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		possible to consider this project only after additional LDCF resources become available. Therefore, this PIF cannot be recommended at this time. 02/06/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17. 06/19/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		NOT YET. Please refer to Section 4 above. 05/03/2016 â€“ YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 21, 2013	March 15, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 06, 2014	May 03, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 19, 2014	

* **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.**