



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5230		
Country/Region:	Angola		
Project Title:	Addressing Urgent Coastal Adaptation Needs and Capacity Gaps in Angola		
GEF Agency:	UNEP and UNDP	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-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,180,000
Co-financing:	\$12,311,467	Total Project Cost:	\$18,641,467
PIF Approval:	October 29, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 25, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Barney Dickson,

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.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated December 20, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	No. UNEP was the lead agency in developing the country NAPA and has a thorough understanding of the adaptation needs of Angola. UNEP has a comparative advantage in proof of concept and testing of ideas, and its primary focus is on the environment.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, unchanged.

*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>Therefore, role of UNEP in installation and operation of weather/climate systems is unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please clarify the comparative advantage and experiences of UNEP in installation and operation of climate monitoring systems. This section would need to be revisited after the comments provided for section 14 are addressed.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. The provided explanation that UNEP is implementing a number of similar projects in other African LDCs is sufficient.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>Not clear. Information about the alignment of the proposed project with Angola's UNDAF is provided. However, alignment of the proposed project with UNEP's other programs, and ongoing activities is not explained. Also UNEP's staff capacity in Angola is not described.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please provide information on UNEP's ongoing and future programs in Angola and their linkages with the proposed project. Please also describe the agency's staff capacity in the country.</p>	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, unchanged.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>3/19/2013 No. The project design is sound, however it is deemed that the lack of UNEP's presence in Angola will significantly affect the project preparation and implementation. Kindly identify a national executing agency that can overcome this barrier and can implement the project successfully or consider co-implementation with the project with an IA that has in-country presence.</p> <p>6/21/13 Yes. The project will be co-implemented with UNDP, which has country presence in Angola and has been working on environmental issues in the country for over a decade, with well-established relationships with key national partners and donor agencies.</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. The funding requested under this project is available for Angola under the principle of equitable access.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, project has been formulated to respond to the latest LDCF results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project aims to contribute towards CCA objectives 1, 2 and 3.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, GEF-6 LDCF/SCCF objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 have been identified.
	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 6 and 7 on creating early warning systems for floods, storms and extreme events, and with NAPA priority 8 on national institutional mechanism for adaptation planning and mainstreaming.	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>Not clearly. The project has a component on setting up local demonstrations of ecosystem restoration and adaptation measures in coastal areas. The project will also provide training on using and interpreting agro-meteorological services. However, activities need to go beyond demonstrations, so that local communities have the know how and implement these measures through the proposed project.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please ensure the proposed project not only demonstrates climate resilient measures but also integrates them in the local practices during the project life.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. Project activities have been</p>	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		modified to include capacity building activities to ensure sustainability of project outcomes.	
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>Not clear. Poor urban planning, illegal occupation of coastal lands, and poor construction of physical infrastructure are stated as the baseline problems in the Angolan coastal areas.</p> <p>Local Development Project - Status of the project at the proposed sites is unclear. Also, the description provided does not clearly explain how the baseline project is addressing the specific problems related to coastal zone described in the PIF.</p> <p>Support to the Environment Sector- Status of the project and specific activities at the project site of interest is unclear.</p> <p>Support to Fisheries Sector - It is not clear what improved institutional support in this project entails.</p> <p>Angola Water Sector Institutional Project - Status of the project and specific activities at the project site of interest is unclear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please provide further information on Local Development Project and Support to Fisheries Sector. For each please provide project status and description of activities in the project site of interest.</p>	DS, February 8, 2016: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3/19/2013 Yes. Baseline projects have been described adequately as requested.	
	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?		DS, February 9, 2016: Unclear. The UNDP project document clearly outlines cost-effectiveness of project design approaches as compared to alternative approaches. However, the increase in Project Management Cost, as proposed in the CEO Endorsement Request package and as justified in particular in the UNEP project document, to above 9%, seems insufficiently justified. High living costs in Luanda are acknowledged and an increase in Project Management Costs should therefore be granted, however, the current levels of living costs seem to justify an increase from 5% to perhaps 7-7.5%. Please clarify whether other factors than living costs are deemed to contribute to the higher than usual Project Management Costs and consider reducing them to 7-7.5%. DS, March 22, 2016: Project Management Costs have been reduced to 7.2% of total project costs. Comment cleared.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Not clear. Please see comments for section 11. Climate change risks to each of the baseline project have not been explained. Each baseline project is expected to address the baseline	DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>problems through a number of interventions. It is not clear which intervention is at risk of climate change and how. Because of lack of this information it is not clear how the LDCF project will make the baseline projects more resilient to climate change.</p> <p>Angola Water Sector Institutional Project is also a baseline project for a recently proposed LDCF project to be implemented by UNDP. Added value of two LDCF projects providing climate change resilience to one baseline project is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please explain climate change risk to each of the baseline projects, specific to its activities. Please use such information to provide strong justifications for the LDCF funds.</p> <p>Please justify the use of the Angola Water Sector Institutional Project as a baseline project, given that it is also proposed as a baseline project for a UNDP-LDCF project.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. Provided explanation and description that link baseline projects, climate risks and the proposed project is adequate for the PIF stage.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Not clear. The project framework by itself appears sound, however, please	DS, February 9, 2016: Partly. The project framework itself

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>refer to Sections 11 and 13. All the components are Technical Assistance. The project framework should have a strong component on investment activities that related to the TA activities.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please ensure that recommendations made in Sections 11 and 13 are reflected in the project framework, as needed. Please include a strong investment related component or components that build on the proposed TA activities.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. Requested changes, in line with comments for section 11 and 13, have been made.</p>	<p>seems sound and clear, however, please note some remaining items: (1) The total co-financing amount listed in Table A (\$12,161,467) does not match the sub-totals (\$12,261,467); it also does not match the amounts listed in Table C (\$12,261,467). Please ensure that co-financing sub-totals in all tables add up to the same amount and that the latter is stated correctly in all tables. (2) Monitoring and evaluation is listed separate from the components in Table B. Please list M&E as part of a component or as a separate component in Table B so that the sub-total excluding Project Management Cost includes M&E.</p> <p>DS, March 22, 2016: (1) Comment cleared. (2) Comment cleared.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Not clear. Please see sections 11 and 13.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes.</p>	<p>DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.</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 PIF stage.</p> <p>The project aims to build capacity of government staff to understand and use climate information. It is expected that through the project coastal communities will receive climate information appropriate for planning agricultural production and other livelihoods.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please provide</p>	<p>DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		information about the type of training communities will receive and the specific kind of climate change risks that would be addressed in each district through the training is unclear (comments for section 11 and 13). Also, please describe how gender dimensions will be included in the different project components.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. The information provided is adequate for PIF stage. Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please identify and describe the role of each stakeholder in the project.	DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.
	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 PIF identifies lack of government and local level capacity, lack of coordination among government departments, and extreme weather conditions as potential risks to the project. Appropriate mitigation measures for each have been suggested.	DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.
	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 few projects that focus on production systems. It would be helpful to identify projects related to acquisition and operation of climate monitoring systems. More information is needed on Climate for development in Africa Programme (ClimDev-Africa) to determine how the proposed activities in component 3 are different from the ongoing activities under ClimDev-Africa. In addition to the UNDP-LDCF project, an AfDB project is also seeking LDCF	DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>funding for an adaptation project in Angola.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please identify ongoing projects that could support all components of the proposed project. Please provide details on ClimDev-Africa to help distinguish its activities from the component 3 of the proposed project. Please determine how the proposed project could coordinate with the proposed LDCF-AfDB project, if necessary.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. Requested information has been provided.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please explain the roles of the executing partners and of the coordinating partners in the project implementation.</p>	DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. The project management cost is at 7.8% of the total project grant.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please include</p>	DS, February 9, 2016: Unclear. Please refer to comment under Question 12 above.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		<p>M&E costs in the project management costs and please ensure that the total is at most 5% of the project grant amount.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes. However, M&E costs are not supposed to be included in the PMC. This comment overrules the previous contradictory comment.</p>	<p>DS, March 22, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: This section would need to be revisited after comments for section 14 have been addressed.</p> <p>3/19/2013 Yes.</p>	<p>DS, February 9, 2016: Please ensure that amounts stated in various tables are coherent, as per comment under Question 14 above.</p> <p>DS, March 22, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Total co-financing of \$11.26 million is indicated from the National Government, the World Bank, an NGO and the UNEP.</p>	<p>DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>The UNEP is bringing \$550,000 to the project, 4.8% of the total indicative co-financing, which is not in line with its leading role in the project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please increase the indicative co-financing from the UNEP so that it reflects the agency's role in the project.</p> <p>Please also adjust the agency fees to align it with the GEF Fee Policy initiated in January 2013.</p>	<p>DS, February 9, 2016: Unclear. Please elaborate whether co-financing from agencies will be provided and if not, why not.</p> <p>DS, March 22, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3/19/2013 Yes. Requested changes have been made.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DS, February 9, 2016: Unclear. Tracking tool information has been annexed to UNEP project document, however, no Excel file has been submitted containing that information. Please kindly provide tracking tool as Excel file per latest GEF standard practices. DS, March 22, 2016: Comment cleared.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DS, February 9, 2016: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see sections 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, and 26. 3/19/2013 yes. 4/15/2013 No. Please see comments in section 5. 6/21/13 YES. The project is technically cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval		However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		DS, February 9, 2016: Partly. Annex C contains information on PPG activities financed and the remaining amounts committed, however, the sub-totals for amounts spent to date and amounts committed do not add up to the total budgeted PPG amount. Please clarify and revise, accordingly. DS, March 22, 2016: Comment cleared.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		DS, February 9, 2016: Not yet. Please refer to comments under Questions 12, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 32. DS, March 22, 2016: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 15, 2013	February 09, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 19, 2013	March 22, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 21, 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. PPG funds will be used to determine project sites and in depth analysis of the livelihoods, governance structure and ecosystems related to the proposed project.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. 80% of the PPG budget is dedicated towards technical studies and stakeholder analyses.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes.
	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.