



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

GEF ID:	<b>5177</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Angola</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promoting Climate-resilient Development and Enhanced Adaptive Capacity to withstand Disaster Risks in Angolan's Cuvelai River Basin</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5166 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$28,050,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$36,250,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Lucas Black</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?	Yes, Angola is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement stating the date of September 2, 2012 and signed by the Operational Focal Point is included. However, the letter endorses and agency fee of 10%. Please note that the agency fee cannot exceed 9.5%.  Update 12/2/2012: This is cleared. The agency fee has been adjusted.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDPs comparative advantage to support this project is clear, given its long-standing relationship with key entities in Angola with respect to cooperation on environmental issues.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. UNDP has been working on environmental sustainability in Angola for over a decade and currently has 2 projects in sustainable land management and sustainable management of the Okavango River Basin.	
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. This will be Angola's first project under LDCF.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	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, increasing the adaptive capacity, and transfer of technology for adaptation.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Not completely. The project also appears to contribute to CCA-1. Recommended action: Please ensure all relevant objectives are identified and reflected in table A.  Update 12/2/2012: CCA-1 is now	

	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 project is aligned with NAPA priorities 7 and 13 (as in the NAPA document), creating an early warning system for flooding and storms and climate monitoring and data management system.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the project has a training component for at least 5 officers in the Provincial government and Civil Protection to operate and maintain climate monitoring infrastructure, and a component to Strengthen the Civil Protection's capacity for assimilating forecasts and monitoring into existing development planning, and disaster management systems, including the provincial contingency plan.	
Project Design	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>No.</p> <p>Baseline project #2 (USAID's Global Climate Change Integration (GCCCI) Pilot Proposal for Angola) is focused on Adaptation training and increase climate resilience. As an adaptation project, it cannot be considered a baseline project, as the proposed intervention would not generate additional benefits of adaptation to that project.</p> <p>Baseline Project # 1 and 3 are research and data collection oriented with no physical project identified.</p> <p>Baseline Project #4 (Angola Water Sector Institutional Development Project) needs to be elaborated on further.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please provide further information on baseline projects, namely Angola Water Sector</p>	

		<p>further justifications on how the LDCF-funded activities would be additional.</p> <p>Update 12/2/2012: This has been done. Please ensure by CEO Endorsement further elaboration on the types of activities that will serve as the baseline intervention, and confirmation and detailing of linkages with respect to additional cost reasoning.</p>	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>Not clear. Please see #11.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please strengthen the justifications provided linking the baseline initiatives and proposed LDCF-funded activities.</p> <p>Update 12/2/2012: Yes, however please refer to #11. By CEO Endorsement, please ensure an elaboration of activities with linkages to the baseline initiatives based on sound additional cost reasoning.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Not clear. The project framework appears sound, however, please refer to Sections 11 and 13. In addition, it is unclear in Component 1 what is an Investment and what is Technological Assistance.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please ensure that recommendations made in Sections 11 and 13 are reflected in the project framework as needed</p>	

		Update 12/2/2012: This has been done. However, by CEO Endorsement stage, please ensure consistency in the project design taking into account issues raised under 11 and 13.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Not clear. Upon addressing concerns under Sections 11 and 13, this question will be revisited.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please refer to Sections 11 and 13.</p> <p>Update 12/2/2012: For PIF stage this is satisfactory. However, by CEO Endorsement the comments made under #11 apply.</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>Yes, for this stage.</p> <p>The proposal lacks a direct description of socio-economic benefits. The project intends to use "gender-integrated planning and implementation" approach to the project, yet it is unclear how.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information concerning the key direct socio-economic benefits expected to reach the target population.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Yes. One of the baseline projects (#3) is carried out by a leading national NGO. The project also provides a detailed list of local organizations including private sectors, local governments, NGOs, and indigenous peoples groups.</p>	
	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)	<p>Yes. Risks, and measures to mitigate them, are clearly identified in the project document.</p>	

	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The project is coordinated with National and Regional initiatives implemented by the local government, NGOs, USAID, and the World Bank.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. Project management should be less than 5%. It is currently now at 5.12%.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please lower the management cost or provide justifications.</p> <p>Update 12/2/2012: The management cost has been lowered to 5%.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes, assuming cash grants of \$28 million, not counting USAID funding (please see comment under Section 11).	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		

Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat?	N/A	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	N/A	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	No, please refer to comment # 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 23.  Update 12/2/2012: All outstanding issues have been addressed and 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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 18, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 18, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 08, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	Yes.

Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 02, 2013
	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.