



## 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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,416,210
Co-financing:	\$19,995,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,411,210
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	MARTTIN, FELIX JAN BAPTIST

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 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 natural resources management and climate change in AfDB Country Strategy Papers (CSP). The experience developed in the	

		<p>similar programs will be applied in the project design.</p> <p>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 LDCF intervention will complement closely this project.</p>	
	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, the AfDB's Country Strategy Paper (CSP) for Angola is fully aligned to the objective of improving the living	

		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.	
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.	
	• 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-induced economic losses and transfer of technology for adaptation.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NDFE	Yes, the Angola NAPA prioritizes sustainable land management for increasing agricultural production. The project is also consistent with Angola's Initial National Communication Plan	

		(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.	
	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.	
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?	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>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: Resolved. Additional financial information, including on the baseline project, has been provided.</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>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.</p> <p>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</p>	

		<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>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the project framework is reasonably sound and sufficiently clear.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>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>	
	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>Namely, the most vulnerable communities are expected to adapt to climate change, and the project would promote positive gender outcomes through various activities.</p> <p>Recommended action: By CEO endorsement, please provide a detailed description of the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions to be delivered by the project in support of the achievement of additional benefits.</p>	
	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.	

	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.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>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.</p> <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>	
	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>	

	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?	Yes, at slightly over 5%, the funding 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?	Not clear. Recommended Action: This section would need to be revisited after comments for section 13 and 15 have been addressed.  Update 3/28/2013: Yes, the funding and cofinancing per objective appear to be appropriate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Not clear. This section will be revisited after outstanding issues, namely in section 13 and 15, have been resolved.  Update 3/28/2013: The cofinancing, namely nearly \$20 million in loan financing is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The cofinancing the AfDB is bringing is in line with its role. However, please see the comment under 25.  Update 3/28/2013: This is cleared.	
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 and targets?		
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	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 22, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 29, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.