



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

Project Type: Full-sized Project

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Land rehabilitation and rangelands management in small holders agro-pastoral production systems in south western Angola			
Country:	Angola	GEF Project ID:	4720
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	615423
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministério Do Ambiente (Ma), Ministério Da Agricultura E Do Desenvolvimento Rural E Das Pescas (Minander), Governo Provincial Do Namibe, Governo Provincial Do Huila, Governo Provincial De Benguela	Submission Date:	January 16, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	301,364

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
LD-1	1.1 Enhanced enabling environment within the agricultural sector	1.1 National policies that guarantee smallholder and community tenure security	GEFTF	373,000	345,000
LD-1	1.3. Sustained flow of services in agro ecosystems	1.3 Suitable SLM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems.	GEFTF	1,628,000	7,930,000
LD-1	1.4 Increased investments in SLM	1.4 Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base.	GEFTF	83,000	2,606,000
LD-3	3.1: Enhanced cross-sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape management	3.1: Integrated land management plans developed and implemented	GEFTF	528,000	2,980,000
LD-3	3.2: Integrated Land management practices adopted by local communities	3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	GEFTF	220,942	3,080,000
Subtotal				2,832,942	16,941,000
Project Management Cost				180,694	350,000
Total project costs				3,013,636	17,291,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To enhance the capacity of southwestern Angola's smallholder agro-pastoral sector to mitigate the impact of land degradation processes and to rehabilitate degraded lands by mainstreaming SLM technologies into agro-pastoral and agricultural development initiatives.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Rangeland management planning	TA	<p>1.1: Capacity is created and knowledge is available for participatory integrated land management planning at national, provincial and local (community) level.</p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD-3.i) Score 3 (cross-sectoral training courses addressing cross-sectoral issues are conducted).</i></p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD-3.i) Eight integrated territorial land management plans in place.</i></p>	<p>1.1.1: 40 MA, MINANDER, and provincial government staff trained on-the-job in the implementation of LADA methodology assessment and LD knowledge (including local degradation processes and causes).</p> <p>1.1.2: Capacity of 20 decision makers and 20 civil society organizations is increased for ecosystem-wide participatory land management planning at the local level.</p> <p>1.1.3: Integrated land management plans developed with the participation of farmers/pastoralists and customary associations covering an area of 3,000 ha.</p>	GEFTF	500,000	2,900,000
2. Rangeland rehabilitation through best range and herd management practices for small agro-pastoralists	TA	<p>2.1: Integrated APFS-herd management practices lead to an increase in agropastoral production with a total of 2 800 herders (30% women) benefitting there from.</p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD1.ii) Score 5 (livestock productivity with increases that are sustained over the long-term).</i></p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD3.iii) One methodology (rotational grazing including crop residues use) applied in the broader landscape.</i></p> <p>2.2: Ecosystem based restoration (seeding) is undertaken in over 13 500 ha of which 600 ha are rehabilitated and 900 ha set as mise en defense leading to an improvement in vegetation cover.</p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD1.iii) 13 500 ha of production</i></p>	<p>2.1.1: A core group of 20 program managers, trainers and extension service staff trained as APFS/FFS facilitators in SLM and herd management practices.</p> <p>2.1.2: 70 SLM FFS/APFS established and 2 800 herders and farmers (at least 25 percent women) adopting SLM and herd management practices through an APFS based community action plan.</p> <p>2.2.1: Communities capacitated in ecosystem based rehabilitation principles and assessments undertake seeding in an area covering 500 ha.</p> <p>2.2.2: 6 APFS-based verification and experimentation systems for grasses adaptability and palatability in place and 6 fodder and/or natural grazing land areas established and managed by communities.</p> <p>2.2.3: Community improved water management and livestock water availability through participatory rehabilitation of 15 water points.</p>	GEFTF	1,792,942	10,850,000

		<p><i>system with increased vegetation cover.</i></p> <p>2.3 Livelihood of households in at least 70 communities have improved through; (i) scaling up the production of livestock products, and (ii) supporting two small-scale non livestock based production systems.</p> <p><i>Indicator : Increase in revenue by 5% (50% of target group)</i></p>	<p>2.2.4: 900 ha of <i>mise en défens</i> areas established in three communities for strategic livestock feeding, pasture improvement, as well as land and biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>2.3.1: Agro-pastoralists and farmers in five pastoral communities adopt improved production technologies.</p> <p>2.3.2: Agro-pastoralists and farmers in five pastoral communities have improved beef production and beef value chains along a selected number of transhumance sub routes through APFS.</p>			
3. Mainstreaming SLM into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programs	TA/Inv.	<p>3.1: Increased integration of SLM into policies and programmes and reinforcement of existing policies, regulations and applications.</p> <p><i>LD PMAT Indicator LD1.i)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Score 2 (SLM policy discussed and formally proposed) - Score 2 (Land tenure arrangements and use rights in place) - Decree 216/11 working platform established <p>3.2: Decision making is reinforced through the establishment of a sector wide discussion panel on LD (including civil society research, international agencies, and government) focusing on transhumance areas to reduce duplication and increase awareness and lessons learned and collaborations on SLM.</p> <p><i>Indicator: sector wide discussion panel on SLM established between at least 3 ongoing programmes implemented by government or international agencies, or civil society.</i></p>	<p>3.1.1: Policy reinforcing SLM application in pastoral areas is proposed for approval.</p> <p>3.1.2: Land Law is implemented and applied, facilitating SLM in pastoral project area.</p> <p>3.1.3: SLM is integrated into 7 CMA plans and/or programs.</p> <p>3.1.4: A working platform for the implementation of Decree 216/11 for rural communities is created.</p> <p>3.2.1: Mechanisms (forum/coordination mechanism) is in place for cross-sectoral coordination for SLM operating with the involvement of MA, MINANDER and local/provincial Governments.</p> <p>3.3.1: Draft governmental investment plan developed to support small credits for SLM and land rehabilitation complementing the existing National Environmental Management Plan.</p>	GEFTF	400,000	2,791,000

		3.3: Investments increased through specific budgetary provisions made by MA, MINANDER, and decentralized administrations for up-scaling SLM in agro-pastoral systems. <i>LD PMAT Indicator LD1.iv)</i> <i>Draft investment plan in place for direct SLM payments with a budget of US\$ 5 million.</i>				
4. Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation	TA	4.1: Project implementation based on results-based management.	4.1.1: Project monitoring system providing six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project output and outcome targets 4.1.2: Midterm review and final evaluation reports 4.1.3: Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via via publications, project website and others means.	GEFTF	140,000	400,000
Subtotal					2,832,942	16,941,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ¹					180,694	350,000
Total project costs					3,013,636	17,291,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

The letters confirming co-financing for the project are attached to this document.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
GEF agency	FAO	Cash	110,000
Gef agency	FAO	In-kind	440,000
Local government	MIMANDER	In-kind	9,641,000
Local government	MA	In-kind	300,000
Local government	Ministry of Commerce	Cash	5,000,000
Local government	Province of Namibe	In-kind	1,800,000
Total Co-financing			17,291,000

¹ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL, AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Angola	3,013,636	301,364	3,315,000
Total Grant Resources						

1 In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

2 Indicate fees related to this project

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	621,136	260,000	881,136
International consultants	731,000	0	731,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (NO)

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF²

Overall the project design is aligned with that of the original PIF in terms of project objective(s) and broader outcomes. However two adjustments were made to the targeted FA strategic framework during the project preparation phase to strengthen the project design: 1) FA Outcome 1.2, *Improved agricultural management* and corresponding Output 1.2, *types of innovative SLM practices introduced at field level* has been changed to FA Outcome 1.3, *Sustained flow of services in agro ecosystems* and corresponding Output 1.3, *Suitable SLM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems*, and 2) FA Outcome 3.2, *Integrated land management practices adopted by local communities* and corresponding Output 3.2, *INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested* has been added as part of the focal area of Objective LD-3. The modifications have been carried out in response to STAP comments (particular STAP Comment #8) in order to ensure the project’s main GEB; the increase in rangeland vegetation cover.

The project’s components remain the same in their content; however amendments to outcomes/outputs of the project framework have been considered necessary during the project preparation stage in order to strengthen the project’s design, logic and flow.

Component 1:

- National consultants have depicted a lack in awareness and capacity regarding planning and conflict management amongst the stakeholders. To address these constraints, an additional training process has been added with the inclusion of Output 1.1.2 to improve planning, negotiations and conflict management at the local level.
- The Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.2.3 have been merged into one sole output (1.1.3), as the difference between land management planning and the agreement thereof is regarded as not relevant in the context of the project area.

² For question A.1-A,7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

The changes above are mainly based on the experiences made by the FAO Terra Project which has been using a participatory territorial development approach in the country for the last 15 years and provided the necessary input during the PPG.

Component 2:

- An outcome focusing on the improvement of the livelihoods was added under Component 2 (Outcome 2.1) to ensure that the project meets its development objective. The outcome will be accompanied by Output 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 aiming at the improvement of livestock and non-livestock production systems, and the inclusion of ethno-veterinaries by using the APFS-approach.
- Two additional outputs (2.2.2 and 2.2.3) were included to support the rehabilitation of degraded areas and the sustainable management of new and/or rehabilitated water points.
- The establishment of *mise en defens* areas has been incorporated into Outcome 2.2.
- Output 2.1.4 has been modified to reflect the experimental and innovative nature of participatory rangeland biodiversity and vegetation monitoring. The activity will be carried out as part of a participatory and gender aggregated biodiversity vegetation assessment restricted to 20 locations.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Updates Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

(See introduction above)

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

N/A

A.4 The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address

N/A

A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

N/A

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks

Risk identified during the preparation of the PIF for the achievement of the project objective and results have been further analysed, additional risks have been identified and scrutinized during the design of the full Project Document. Mitigation measures have in each case been developed and incorporated into the project components. Please see below the Risk Matrix, that is also attached to the FAO project document in Appendix 4.

Risks	Rating (High, Medium, Low)	Mitigation Measures
Remote locations causing problems with personnel, logistics, maintenance, etc.	Low	Flexibility by using multidisciplinary teams and by building efficient project coordination structure on the ground which will be supported by the municipality infrastructure in the targeted project areas.
New practices might clash with local cultures, resulting in slow adaptation of actions (gender, new forms of management, more effective management, alternative use of resources...)	Medium	The project will address this risk by joint planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation in order to create project ownership from the start. New practices will carefully be introduced through the APFS/FFS network and therefore tested by communities themselves using a bottom-up approach. Only eligible practices with a high social acceptance that meet the stakeholders' needs and cultural habits will further be tested and classified as best practices for a wider introduction based on principles of trial and observation by other stakeholders.
Traditional rights are still in use in the area, particularly in Sengi and Chongorói hampering the introduction of modern rights (e.g. Land Law).	Medium	The local governments are already aware of this risk and are working on the acceptance of modern policies. The project will further sensitize the stakeholders by using the Terra Project approach which will introduce the PNTD scheme and the <i>Jango Pastoril</i> method into the FFS/APFS process.
Degradation of ecosystem due to droughts and climate shocks	Medium	Project level emergency actions will be discussed and planned with participatory methods (<i>Jang Pastoril</i>). A community based management plan that supports risk reduction through AFPS will be developed and implemented. Finally, appropriate linking with on-going emergency / post-emergency initiatives and with Governmental programs regularly supporting animal health will improve responses to those risks.
Difficulty in implementing discussion spaces have emerged with the actions of other projects.	Medium	Involvement of local leaders and entities that have participated in participatory processes in the PAPEFSA Project will facilitate moments of reflection around potential options for land management negotiation.
Transhumant routes are encroachment by smallholder farmers.	Medium	The project will seek awareness creation, documentation and sharing of evidences on the role of transhumanism in the national economy, mapping of the transhumant routes and signing of the reciprocal agreement for protection and rehabilitation of the transhumant route.
Lack of appropriate and adaptable forage seeds that are able to grow along the transhumant route or lack of economically important and adaptable fruit plants in the project area.	Medium	The project will conduct feasibility studies and undertake the testing of the various seeds for germination and adaptations in different agro-ecological zones. Furthermore, it will have arrangements with research stations and universities to conduct continuous studies on different forage and fruit trees.
The transhumant herders do not respect <i>mise en defense</i> areas and the community does not undertake guardianship.	Low	<i>Jango Pastoril</i> will support farmer/herders to reduce conflicts and will help support the establishment of <i>mise en defense</i> areas and the rehabilitation of vegetation and grazing land. The off-grid electricity systems will constitute an environmental service contributing to cover costs for guardianship time.
Poor implementation capacity by stakeholders, especially the government department and lack of synergy between MA and MINANDER.	High	The project's capacity development aspects will increase the knowledge of government stakeholders on LD and SLM aspects at the national and local level. The capacitated master trainers will provide continuous support to various project stakeholders at the local level. The MA and MINANDER will be responsible for their own mandate and have a direct interest in the successful implementation of the project. The collaboration between the two entities will be strengthened through the inter-sectoral coordination platform.

Changing Composition of local/national Governing institutions.	Medium	Advocacy and lobbying to support the importance of the SLM policy implementation and harmonization will sustain continuous support by government institutions.
Scarce project resource might limit project implementation.	High	The mobilization of several partnerships will improve available funds, especially funds from government.
Delay in Approval of Policy.	High	Advocacy and lobbying will support the policy approval.
Low institutional sensitivity towards SLM.	Medium	Increased awareness will be supported at a local level by APFS and <i>Jango Pastoril</i> . At a national level the collaboration with CMA and the creation of a mechanism for collaboration with various institutions will strengthen interest in the process.
Limited Sensitivity on the importance of policy reform.	Medium	Strengthening awareness, lobbying and advocacy will address sensitivity.
Difficulty of obtaining local funds.	High	Attracting external funding sources will be a key part of activities; lobbying and advocacy will help coordinating and raising interest at all levels.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1. Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

The preparatory phase of the project places strong emphasis on stakeholder participation. Consultations were undertaken with national and regional government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), donors, farmers and agro-pastoralists including indigenous groups in each of the targeted municipalities along the transhumance transit area. A total of 15 communities were visited and discussion groups were organized. A complementary APFS international mission visited six additional communities, including local administrations, IDF, and veterinary services. Local and national level consultation workshops were held in Namibe and Luanda including all identified stakeholders for the envisaged project ranging from key (Government of Angola), to primary (direct and indirect beneficiaries) and secondary stakeholders (service providers whom the projects seeks to establish LoAs with). The following will give an overview of each stakeholder's engagement in the project's implementation:

Primary stakeholders (benefitting communities): As described in the project components, activities will use participatory methods and on-field demonstrations in which participants will be actively developing and testing various SLM approaches. Particularly the FFS/APFS approach will ensure an active involvement of primary stakeholders and therefore contributing to the social acceptance of the jointly developed and tested SLM methods from the start. The approach will be complemented by traditional conflict resolution methods such as the *Jango Pastoril* which will naturally involve all parties and foster a common understanding of the participants' views and perceptions. Indigenous people such as Mukubal, Muhumbes, Mumuilas, Ndendelengo and Mucuis will form the majority of beneficiaries organized under the FFS/APFS. A gender sensitive approach will be taken into consideration in Component 1 by applying a Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) method and in Component 2 through APFS and the introduction of a participatory method for gender-disaggregated land and biodiversity use mapping.

Key stakeholder (GoA): The technical execution of the project will be carried out by the Government of Angola represented by the Ministry of Environment (MA) in close cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINANDER). Other executing partners include: the provincial governments (Namibe Huila and Benguela) and the municipal and communal administrations and their technical services. The Ministry of Environment (MA) will be the lead government counterpart and the main project executing partner FAO will act as GEF Agency and also be responsible for the financial and administrative execution of the project in close cooperation with the MA and the other project partners (see secondary stakeholders below). The MA will carry out its responsibilities to support project execution through its National Direction of Environment (MAE) which will also be the Project Technical Focal

Point. In particular, the ministry will support the project execution team in delivering Component 3 by providing guidance on the formulation of a SLM policy and acting as a platform for the cross-sectoral coordination thereof. Further, the MA will play a vital role in facilitating and guiding the establishment of potential SLM funding mechanisms. The provinces, in particular the Namibe Province, will facilitate in infrastructure development and will incorporate lessons learned from local planning exercises, as well as in provincial planning activities that contribute to Component 1. The municipalities will host the project technicians and provide administrative and political support to the implementation of the Integrated Municipal Program for Rural Development and Combat against Poverty (PMIDRCP).

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINANDER) will provide assistance through its network of Veterinary services (SV) including the Institute(s) for Veterinary Research (IIV) located in the project area which will support the training of APFS participants in animal health and vaccinations. The project will also involve research institutions to facilitate the implementation of Component 2 (Outcome 2.2) such as the Institute of Forestry Development (IDF), the Huambo Institute for Agricultural Research (IIA) and the IIV research stations at Caraculo and Cacanda which will support varietal and wild grassland shrub and grass selection.

Secondary stakeholders (temporary involved providing specific services to the project): The project will engage a number of civil society organizations that are active in the area to achieve various outputs, especially with regards to Components 2 and 3. For that purpose letters of agreement (LoAs) will be elaborated on and signed by the FAO and collaborating partners. The service providers will be administratively managed in Namibe, but funds will be made available through the FAO Luanda approval. Funds received under a LoA will be used to execute the project activities in conformity with the FAO's rules and procedures. The respective LoAs are listed under the "Contracts" budget line of the project budget. The envisaged LoAs are summarized in the table below:

Service provider	Activity
IIV research stations Caraculo and Cacanda	Support varietal and wild grassland shrub and grass selection
To be defined	Support fodder shrub and trees' management for livestock feeding
To be defined	Support solar energy establishment (local association) nearby <i>mise en defense</i> areas
COSPE and ADECO NGOs	Establish APFS and community action plan implementation
MA Provincial Direction Namibe	Support environmental sustainability of community action plans
COSPE and ADECO NGOs	Participatory rehabilitation through local fodder and wild species
GIS spin-off of the University of Cordoba-Spain	Integrate satellite analysis and participatory GIS data to support stakeholder decisions (NPP estimation)
To be defined	Rehabilitation through shrub and local tree species
COSPE	Participatory rehabilitation of water points
Liga 4 de Avril	Support water point rehabilitation training and community involvement
Mandume University	Study of non-livestock, local forest products
COSPE or contracting scientific partner	Support commercialization of non-livestock products
ADECO	Community mobilization for the production of local goods and their commercialization
IIV/ISV	Improve community based health services through training of APFS participants and vaccinations
COSPE or contracting scientific partners	Study to improve local technologies for production and packaging of non-livestock products
To be defined	Support improved fodder and natural grass production
CMA	Support to include CMA into SLM policy discussion

B. 2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Socio-economic Benefits (national): The project will generate national level socio-economic benefits by strengthening institutional capacity (e.g. knowledge, information, and policies) to reduce unsustainable management practices and their impacts. The project will strengthen the ability of key institutions to understand SLM and enable them to conduct informed decision making and implement community based planning. This will result in improved information driven planning and investments that increase resilience and reduce losses. FFSs will support land rehabilitation, reducing flood risks and will improve the diversification of livelihoods and sources of revenues will enable policy makers to strengthen SLM-focused development policies, leading to social betterment and reduce economic losses linked to LD that cause erosion, siltation and flooding. This will have significant socio-economic impacts as the May 2011 floods have caused damage to infrastructures such as bridges and roads estimated to be worth approximately US\$350 million.

Project support will increase the capacity of national level institutions to produce appropriate livestock related policies and to improve SLM related investment through appropriate budgetary provisions by government and partner programmes. This will improve the socio-economic situation of smallholders. The improvement of implementing land tenure policies will allow communities to improve and invest in their capital base, and to protect their local environment by accessing state investment funds. Other national level benefits include the integration of SLM into the APFS and into the university curricula, which will enable graduating professionals to be more familiar with LD challenges and better qualified for new and emerging jobs in the future.

Socio-economic benefits (local): The project will deliver direct quantifiable socio-economic benefits to poor and vulnerable communities in selected areas. Through baseline projects and related partners, these benefits will be extended to a larger population across the three provinces. Districts and provincial experts will enhance their knowledge and understanding of SLM, contributing to improved responses and reduced economic and livelihood losses. Based upon Jango Pastoral transhumance scale discussions, community based dialogues, and self-assessed LD (including climate related LD), local smallholders will be empowered to develop and apply participatory negotiated territorial development planning. APFS will include livelihood related trainings in livestock and non-livestock related production and market integration. Solar energy systems will economically sustain the guardianship system needed to preserve newly established grassland and mise en defens areas. The project will train livestock owners in SLM, the use of improved and local grass species, and in the use of mise en defens areas. These will contribute to the enhanced revenues and food security of the communities living in the area.

In addition the project will incorporate gender equality aspects in three manners: In Component 1, the Improving Gender Equality in Territorial Issues (IGETI) tool will allow for a gender sensitive stakeholder priorities' analysis to take place. The analysis is based on a Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach that places great emphasis on the importance of linkages between economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns that influence the context in which development activities are undertaken. Both tools form the basis for the usage of the Participatory Negotiated Territorial Development (PNTD) method. The PNTD is used to prepare and implement gender balanced land management plans. Further, in Component 2 an innovative method for gender disaggregated participatory biodiversity mapping will be implemented. The method that is studied in collaboration with the Italian Cooperation, takes women's dependencies on natural resources (needed for their daily lives) and gender-specific use of the land into consideration and incorporates the results in community based decision making. Efforts in rehabilitating degraded areas and the introduction of SLM approaches will therefore take women's needs into account ensuring substantial improvements in their well-being and livelihoods.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The cost of implementing an agro-pastoral project in Angola is considerably higher than in other African countries. Contributing factors are; the post-conflict infrastructure, high import and living costs and the remoteness of the project area.

In order to ensure cost-effectiveness the project has embedded its major activities on existing government investments and in key institutional structures such as the Multisectoral Commission for the Environment (CMA) at a national level, and the Veterinary Research Institute (IIV) and the Institute of Forestry Development (IDF) at a local level. Although the core approach to rehabilitate land through a network of APFS is new to the country, it will build upon the existing FAO FFS-network and largely benefit from the lessons learned and best practices from the FAOs APFS experiences in other regions (e.g. Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda). The participatory nature of the APFS/FFS approach allows for the identification and implementation of methods and techniques that are not only socially acceptable but are also most cost-effective, as locally available resources and knowledge are used. An example is participatory grassland selection and multiplication through APFS which has been successfully experimented in the HoA. The activity entails the identification and sustainable collection and seeding of highly suitable palatable grassland species by communities instead of creating a dependency on costly imported planting material and the risks of invasiveness. At the same time, the selection is based on traditional knowledge which creates a strong sense of project ownership. Another example is the introduction of an innovative and locally adapted guardianship system to protect the newly established *mise en defense* areas. The establishment of such a system is a more cost-effective and locally accepted solutions than to fence off these areas. By using traditionally accepted negotiation methods such as Jango Pastoril, the *mise en defense* rehabilitated areas will become an integral part of the native community grassland selection and restoration methods. In order to facilitate the replication of best practices, the project will build upon multi-stakeholder involvement using the institutional structures that are already in place (CMA).

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Framework (Appendix 1 and described in section 2.3 and 2.4). The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at US\$140 000. Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. Supported by Component 4, the project monitoring and evaluation system will also facilitate learning and mainstreaming of project outcomes and lessons learned in relation to SLM, pastoral and grassland areas improvement, and collaborative LM plans.

To monitor project outputs and outcomes including contributions to global environmental benefits, specific indicators have been established in the Results Framework (see Appendix 1). The framework's indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO's monitoring procedures and progress reporting format, data collected will be of sufficient detail to be able to track specific outputs and outcomes and flag project risks early on. The NPC will ensure that all AWP/B are related to the project's Result framework to ensure that project implementation maintains a focus on achieving the impact indicators as defined. The LD-PMAT will be used to monitor the project's overall impact on land degradation. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-month basis while outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis if possible or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

The project output and outcome indicators have been designed to monitor on-the-ground impacts and progress in building and consolidating SLM capacities. The baseline and target for these indicators are established in the Project Results Framework and will be fine-tuned and included in the M&E plan to be designed by the short-term M&E specialist in PY1. Key indicators at the outcome level include:

Increased vegetation cover in the targeted rangeland area

Outcome 2.2: Hectares with increased vegetative cover due to appropriate and sustainable livestock corridors management by transhumant herders, use of local or improved grassland and shrub species, community level seeding of wild grassland.

Increase in agro-pastoral productivity and community livelihoods

Outcome 2.1: Increase in livestock productivity (measured in live weight gain per cow per year).

Outcome 2.3: Number of households with an increase in revenue derived from livestock and non-livestock products.

The institutional strengthening and capacity building process indicators will capture:

Integrated planning and management tools developed and implemented

Outcome 1.1: The number of participatory developed territorial land management plans that are in place and the size of land they cover.

Levels of human capacity and awareness created

Outcome 1.1: The number of government officers and local PNTD advisers that are capacitated to use LD assessment and SLM-tools for a sector-wide land management planning process.

Outcome 2.1: The number of INRM methodologies that are applied by communities in the project area.

Policies on SLM developed and existing policies strengthened

Outcome 3.1: Introduction of Policy on SLM and submission for approval, reinforcement of existing Land Law in project area, establishment of working platform for implementation of Decree 216/11.

Cross-sectoral coordination

Outcome 3.2: Establishment of sector wide discussion panel on SLM between at least three ongoing programmes implemented by the government or international agencies, or civil society.

Increased investments in SLM

Outcome 3.3: Support in introducing draft investment plan for SLM in collaboration with at least two partners' policy schemes and/or governmental programmes.

The project will use the following activities and main sources of information to support the M&E program; (i) satellite images to measure NPP, (ii) participatory impact monitoring by selected FFS/AFPS members using SHARP tool, (iii) on-site monitoring of the implementation of the FFS/AFPS taught practices, (iv) project progress reports prepared by the NPC with inputs from CTA, MA, MINANDER, and service providers, (v) consultants reports, (vi) APFS training manuals and list of participants, (vii) mid-term review and final evaluation, as well as post project impact and evaluation studies completed by independent consultants, (viii) financial reports and budget revisions, (ix) Project Implementation Reviews prepared by the FAO Lead Technical Officer supported by the FAO Representation in Angola; and (xi) the FAO supervision mission reports on targets to be achieved, and PPRs which will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output targets. Specific inputs to the AWP/B and the PPRs will be prepared based on participatory planning and progress reviews with local stakeholders. An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be held with the participation of the PMO. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfilment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

The Reporting Schedule is detailed in section 4.5.3 of the project document.

The day-to-day monitoring of the Project implementation will be the responsibility of the NPC with support from the CTA and the M&E expert, driven by the preparation and implementation of an Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) followed up through six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPRs). The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the result of a unified planning process between the main project partners. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output targets. Specific inputs to the AWP/B and the PPRs will be prepared based on participatory planning and progress review with local stakeholders and coordinated through the NPC and service providers and facilitated through project planning and progress review workshops. These inputs would be consolidated by the respective Service Provider Managers before forwarding them to the CTA and to NPC who will consolidate the information into a draft AWP/B and PPRs. An annual project progress review and planning meeting will be held with the participation of all involved service providers. Subsequently, the AWP/B and PPRs are submitted to the local and national PSC for approval (AWP/B) and Review (PPRs) and to FAO for approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfilment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

Following the approval of the Project, the project's first year AWP/B will be adjusted (either reduced or expanded in time) to synchronize with an annual reporting calendar. In subsequent years, the FSP workplan and budget will follow an annual preparation and reporting cycle. The table below provides a summary of the main M&E reports, responsible parties and timeframe:

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	NPC, supported by the CTA, FAO LTO, BH, and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Within two months of project start up	USD 10,000
Project Inception Report	NPC, cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after workshop	-
Field based impact monitoring training	NPC, with support from CTA and M&E expert and service providers	At the beginning of the project and periodically (defined at the IW)	USD 4,000
Field based impact monitoring	NPC, PLOs, participating executing partners (including communities) and other relevant institutions; LTO and FAO supervision missions.	Continually	USD 14,000
Technical backstopping and supervision missions	LTO and other technical units supporting the project, TCI/GEF Coordination Unit	At least once per year	The visits of the FAO LTO and the GEF Coordination Unit will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the NPC/CTA will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	NPC, with inputs from the four local advisers working in the transhumance area and other partners; FAO LTO and BH; BH to submit PPR to GEF Coordination Unit for clearance and uploading on FPMIS	Six-monthly	USD 7,000
Technical Reports	NPC, CTA, LTO, LTU, BH	As appropriate	-
Project Implementation Review report	Inputs provided by the Project Coordinator. LTO and BH supported by the NPC and CTA. PIRs cleared and submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat and uploaded on the FPMIS	Annual	Covered by fees
GEF LD Tracking tool	LTO, NPC, and CTA	Updated at the time of the mid-term evaluation and final evaluation	Covered by fees
Co-financing Reports	NPC with support from CTA, BH	Annual (with PIR)	USD 2,000
Mid-term Evaluation	FAO Evaluation Office in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, the LTO, BH; external consultant(s)	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 The visits of the LTU will be paid from fees
Final evaluation	FAO Evaluation Office in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, the LTO, BH; external consultants	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 The visits of the LTU will be paid from fees

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget
Terminal Report	NPC,BH, LTO	At least two months before the ending date of the project	USD 5,600
Total			USD 132,600

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OPF endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Pedro SAMUEL	National Director for Studies and Planning	Ministry of Environment	OCTOBER 10, 2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org		January 16, 2014	Caterina Batello, Team leader AGPME, FAO Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection Rome, ITALY	+3906 5705 3643	Caterina.Batello@fao.org
Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5478					

ANNEX A:PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found)

Please refer to page 88 of the Project Document (Appendix 1: Results Matrix).

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF approval).

GEFSEC comments and responses from the project team:

GEFSEC comment at PIF to be responded at CEO endorsement	Responses
<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>	<p>A detailed risk analysis has been prepared and is available in Section A6.</p> <p>Analysis of risk related to behavior has been undertaken, including customary uses and customary society settings. To support a behavioral risk analysis, a detailed stakeholder analysis has been prepared and is available in Annex 8 of the project document.</p> <p>In addition, traditional rights and modern rights have been intensely analyzed. Traditional rights are still in use in the area, in particularly Sengi and Chongorói. These risks could potentially conflict with project development, causing disputes with modern rights. However, the local governments are already aware of the issue and are working on the acceptance of modern policies. At the same time, the sensitizing and participation of discussions held in the activity of Component 1 (based of the Terra Project approach) will support the mitigation of potential conflicts . Component 1 focuses on conflict management through the Jango Pastoril method. It also includes the capacity building of community leaders and organizations to manage; transhumance related conflicts, the use of appropriate (modern) policy tools, and the confrontation (intra-community and inter-community) with disparities of power through the PNTD method. A detailed description of traditional and modern rights is available in Annex 8 of the project document. Finally, modern rights will be negotiated and implemented as appropriate land delineation packages to be presented for approval by the local government. This will take place in selected communities under Output 3.1.2.</p>
<p>20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>Implementation arrangements and collaboration between the MA and MINANDER has been detailed in Section 4.2 of the FAO Prodoc. The MA will be the project leader and MINANDER will support the project through local technical services (e.g. veterinary, forest, etc.).</p>

STAP comments and responses from the project team:

STAP Comments:

STAP Comment # 1: *While several of the expected global environmental benefits are defined clearly, which is welcomed, STAP would suggest that others need to be framed more closely in terms of both UNCCD impact indicators and the GEF-5 Land Degradation Strategy. The problem statement accurately raises the complexity surrounding multiple land uses (rangeland management and agriculture management) amidst land degradation and socioeconomic challenges (food security, access to rural markets) in south-western Angola. The proposal identifies quite well the different ways it will build upon existing knowledge generated by previous and on-going projects in the region. It also has a commendable focus on farmer field schools and local participation. However, STAP believes the proposal - as it progresses to a full project document - could be strengthened by addressing the points below.*

Response: As suggested, the project proposal has been developed taking the STAP comments into consideration.

STAP Comment # 2: *Component 2 on rangeland rehabilitation through best management practices for small-scale agro-pastoralists' practice presents considerable challenges that cannot be met solely by a technical approach and promotion of specific techniques. The record of failure in southern Africa of technical fixes in rangeland management is legendary. Much of this record is the lack of recognition of non-equilibrium dynamics in rangeland use and practice, as well as the lack of understanding of pastoralist strategies (see the review by Scoones, I. 1999. *New ecology and the social sciences: what prospects for a fruitful engagement?* *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 28:479-507). The proponents are urged to build their approach carefully on the new thinking on range ecology that emerged in the 1990s - see example from Botswana at <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9529IIED.pdf> - paying particular attention to threats posed by privatising 'the commons'. STAP is pleased to see the explicit intention to include the issues of customary collective rights and the dangers of fencing off rangeland.*

Response: The project is based on an ecosystem approach, taking into account both biophysical and socio-economic dimensions in an equitable way. The project proposes a community and transhumance scale approach for the negotiation of customary rights and planning (Outcome 1.1), and a community land title concession (Outcome 3.1). Also, the project works to establish *mise en defens* areas (Outcome 2.1) that are negotiated on a community and transhumance scale and are "protected" by community involvement and not by fencing. Issues on the privatization of common livestock areas raised by Cullis (2005) are not an issue for Angolan pastoral communities, as private property is not allowed outside urban areas. However, temporary land concessions regulated by Decree 58/07 have resulted in the fencing of pastoral land, causing a lack of palatable grassland in certain areas and leading to conflicts. The project community management will use a rights-based approach; by establishing a procedure that recognizes communities to have rights on their land. The project will also advocate the disparities of power between different actors. Questions of complexities and uncertainties are also included in the project that goes well beyond the "static notions of carrying capacities and climax vegetation" mentioned by Scoones (1999). Also, policies' issues include significant complexities; for example, Sørbø (2003) argues that the scale of the analysis plays a key role in identifying the basic properties of pastoral ecosystems but is not appropriate when it comes to recommending policy measures to secure the continued viability of pastoral herding. These assumptions are taken into due consideration within the policy activities of the project. The present project is based on understanding the multiple uses of rangelands which includes; hunting and gathering, livestock keeping for meat and milk supply and also draught power. Therefore, as pointed out by Cullis (2005) the land should not to be considered as 'idle or vacant land'.

STAP Comment # 3: *Component 4 is critical in this proposal in that it will provide the monitoring for the impact of the project on global environmental benefits, as well as associated developmental benefits. It will need to be specified in terms of impact indicators used by both the UNCCD and the GEF-5 focal area strategy, and in terms of the methodologies that will be used for monitoring. It would also be good to include the incremental reasoning for component 4 in the full proposal. At the moment, it is missing in the proposal.*

Response: The project design has been strengthened by including specific LD-PMAT indicators at the project's outcome (see Section 2.3 in the project document). The main impact indicators will be monitored by using the following methods:

- Integrated territorial land management plans monitored by summing-up areas of communes involved in the project (LD PMAT Indicator LD-3. i): Eight integrated territorial land management plans introduced covering 3 000 ha. Baseline: 0 territorial land management plans in place, target: 8 plans).
- NPP assessment system designed and implemented based on statistical assumptions used in the G-LADA method (LD PMAT Indicator LD-1. iii): 13 500 ha of land area with increased vegetation cover; NPP increase by 5 percent. Baseline: G-LADA climate adjusted NDVI correlated to NPP: -0.03 kg C/ha in an average year). The NPP assessment corresponds with the UNCCD indicator IX "Land cover status" that monitors LD in terms of long-term loss of the ecosystem's primary productivity, taking into account the effects of rainfall on NPP.
- Livestock productivity monitored by live weight measurement (height, length, and width measured using Lydtin stick and tape measure on living cattle) undertaken once per year during the vaccination campaign (April to June) in 10% of the APFS members' herds (by random selection). LD PMAT Indicator LD-1. ii): Increase in livestock productivity by 5%, baseline score: 2, livestock productivity is low but stable; live weight gain of 35 kg per cow per year, target score: 5, livestock productivity with increases that are sustained over the long-term.
- Revenue of targeted community monitored through stakeholder interviews. The method adapted has been developed by the University of Florence (Italy) and tested in the Namibe area. The assessment will be used at the beginning of the project during the community dialogues to select FFS/APFS beneficiaries and at the end of the project (30% of the FFS/APFS participants randomly selected). Indicator: increase of revenues by 5% in up to 70 communities (total of 1 400 people). The smallholders' revenue assessment corresponds with the UNCCD Indicator III "Proportion of the population living above the relative poverty line".
- Draft SLM policy submitted for approval monitored through documentation and the actual policy document (LD PMAT Indicator LD 1.1, baseline score: 1, no sector policy in place, target score: 2 sector policy has been discussed and formally proposed).
- One law implemented in project pastoral areas, reinforcing tenure security which is monitored through documentation and the actual policy document (LD PMAT Indicator LD 1.1, baseline score: 1, no land tenure arrangements and use rights in place, target score: 2, Land tenure arrangements and use rights in place).
- Draft investment plan monitored through documentation related committed/available budget and fund flow (LD PMAT Indicator LD 1.iv, baseline: no investment plan for SLM in place, target: one SLM investment plan with USD 5 million budget allocation at end of project).

The incremental reasoning for Component 4 has been inserted in the proposal.

STAP Comment # 4: *Based on experiences from East Africa, the literature suggests the evidence base for success in using the farmer fields schools (FFS) model is somewhat limited, particularly on the impact on agricultural production and income (see Davis, K., Nkonya, E., Kato, E., Mekonnen, D.A., Odendo, M. Miro, R., Nkuba, J. (2011). Impact of Farmer Field Schools on Agricultural Productivity and Poverty in East Africa. World Development, 40, 402-413). STAP urges the proponents to adopt a more experimental and learning-centred approach to FFS to identify the model that best suits Angolan socioeconomic and environmental conditions (see also point 4 below).*

Response: The article mentioned proposes measurements that are mostly related to farm participation, as well as crop and livestock production. As a result, the article demonstrates the effectiveness of farmer groups in enhancing access to rural services, and improved income and productivity. However at the same time there are significant differences in effectiveness due to country, poverty, gender, fertility, and literacy rate levels. The FAO East Africa is adopting an M&E scheme depicting a wider spectrum of livelihood indicators that are not taken into consideration by the article. Furthermore, the article does not take into consideration conflict management and the building of community negotiation and consensus regarding innovation adoption. Instead, we consider APFS to be an experimental and learning-centered approach that bases its own success on community involvement through validation, adaptation and adoption of technologies and approaches. The disagreement in monitoring processes depends on the great differences existing between FFS approaches. For this we thank STAP for highlighting the importance of a more centered learning

approach. The project will use as example the successful APFS in East Africa which have a more holistic method and are now also being used in other areas. Findings from the article “Farmer Field Schools in rural Kenya: a transformative learning experience” (Duveskog et al., 2010) revealed significant impacts demonstrated by a personal transformation; changes in gender roles and relations, customs and traditions, community relations, and an increase in the economic development of households. Friis-Hansen et al., 2012, also suggested that the most significant impact of FFS could be viewed in terms of building the capacity of local people to make choices and make decisions that ultimately lead to an increased uptake of agricultural innovations, access to services and market access, as well as collective action. A major conclusion of the study is that agricultural development programs should focus more on the processes of empowering farmers as opposed to technical solutions that characterize most programs, in order to create an appropriate mix of technological and social advancements for a development process that is sustainable in the nature. The recent publication, “Supporting communities in building resilience through APFS” (<http://www.fao.org/docrep/019/i3512e/i3512e.pdf>), explores potentials for Uganda’s success story to be converted to a framework for policy recommendations. Gustafson (2002) commented that the ATIRI Project’s benefits include; improved farmers’ income, and food security. Also, the ATIRI Project supported farmers to take on new roles and responsibilities. These new roles contributed to improve local level relationship between farmers and public sector researchers and extension workers. Tola (Ethiopia) reports that, thanks to increased resiliency in DRR, the APFS became a community managed learning platform that shows a remarkable achievement from the pilot stage.

With the aim of discussing the impacts of FFS at a global arena and to confront opinions in future development of FFS, the FAO organized a FFS global review (<https://dgroups.org/fao/ffs-eforum2>). The results will soon be published reflecting a global consensus on the FFS success stories. The focus was not on “production” as the forum widely discussed the shift in the FFS’s concept to other expected impacts. One central comment describes that “A field school lies in the methodology of delivery for which there might be certain uniformity despite the subject in focus. This is characterizing the ongoing shift that FFS have taken from IPM/IPPM FFS, to poultry FFS, forestry FFS, climate change FFS, CMDRR FFS, pastoral FS. [...] Integration and holistic planning is the issue here”. That is, to deal with the success of ecosystem management, that can only be achieved through involving a wide range of stakeholders. In fact, while certain actions can only be handled by the communities, others require the government, local leaders and indigenous groups to be actively involved in the process to realize success and achieve wider impacts. Also, certain actions may require specialized institutions to tap into the cohesive strength of the FFS (i.e. land delimitation). For this, the method also has to build the capacities of different stakeholders to support certain activities (see Component 1 of the present project). The kind of information/training passed on to the different levels of stakeholders is different. What is appropriate and relevant to the farmer will differ from what is appropriate and relevant to government officials. With this expanded APFS concept, a forum member from Kenya reported that “livelihood improvement for the beneficiaries is enormous and sustainability aspects have been ensured while commercialization of most activities was achieved as farmers understood the science associated with each technology”. A comment from a post-socialist country, Kyrgyzstan, explains that the “FFS served the goal of facilitating the change from collectivity-based to private farming. However, when visiting FFS training programmes at that time, one got the distinct impression that they were of considerable value to farmers in increasing their self-confidence and self-reliance in coping with the new challenges”. This expanded FFS system is based on endogenous farmers’ and herders’ knowledge. It supports expanded community and decision makers’ capacity building, and harmonizes various approaches into a single tool and will be the foundation leading to the success of the present project.

STAP Comment # 5: *The proposal could be strengthened technically if FAO will provide literature references that support how “...FFS and APFS approach have proven to increase farmers' sustainable adoption of knowledge demanding technologies and practices such as SLM and herd management.”*

Please see reply to Comment 4.

STAP Comment # 6: *FAO also may wish to consider building experimental design into the proposal, given their significant experience with FFSs in Africa. By doing so, FAO would help strengthen evidence on the impact of FFSs on agricultural and rangeland management, and the socioeconomic conditions of small-herders and farmers. For further consultation on how to include experimental design in GEF projects, FAO may wish to consult STAP's advisory*

document "*Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility Designing projects to create evidence and catalyze investments to secure global environmental benefits, 2011*".

Response: It would be valuable to strengthen the evidence of the impact that FFSs have on agricultural and rangeland. Nonetheless we think there is not the possibility to apply an experimental design in view of the various M&E suggestions which are present in many of the STAP comments (see Comment 7). During the PIF review, the FAO was requested to decrease the quantity of knowledge related activities, as well as to reduce the amount of GEF funds for soft activities. Finally, the FAO was requested to assign more resources to activities on the ground. In this framework, the use of an elaborate monitoring scheme diverts resources and risks going against GEF reviewer requests.

Furthermore, Angola is one of the most expensive countries in Africa. The UN Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) in Luanda is one of the highest in the world, while DSA in the countryside is also considerable, and transportation expenditure is significant due to the long distances and petrol costs. As the project intervention will cover a wide transhumant area, an experimental monitoring scheme would be very costly. On the other hand, by using a typical M&E scheme those expenses are reduced and more resources could address LD and improve livelihoods. Nonetheless, even without an experimental monitoring scheme, a part of the co-financing has to be devoted to M&E activities.

Finally, we are doubtful regarding the cost-effectiveness of such an experimental scheme. The UNCCD and the (LADA based) TT indicators requests will be satisfied, also making use of advanced GIS analysis for NPP assessment and community based livestock productivity and revenue monitoring. However, a usual time frame to evaluate a large-scale intervention is defined as 10 years (i.e. as defined by the LADA Project). Can land rehabilitation treatments really be scientifically evaluated in such a short time at a landscape scale? Will it really be significant to design an experimental method to cover a 4 year intervention?

STAP Comment # 7: *The project aims to target women (25% of FFS recipients - project framework). To better reflect this output, STAP suggests strengthening the gender dimensions in the proposal (specifically in section B.3). The reference cited above (Davis, K et al), also provides compelling evidence on the impact of FFS on female-headed households ("At the project level, per capita agricultural (crop and livestock) income of female headed households increased by 187 %..."). Thus, STAP highly encourages FAO to further delineate the proposed FFS interventions by gender.*

Response: The project has a strong gender focus. In Component 1 the project will apply the *Improving Gender Equality in Territorial Issues* (IGETI) tool that allows for a gender sensitive, stakeholder priorities' analysis. The analysis is based on a Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) approach that places great emphasis on the importance of linkages between economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns that influence the context in which development activities are undertaken. The SEAGA focuses on understanding gender roles, responsibilities and relations, and how they are managed in different communities. The approach also analyses the influence exerted on economic and social opportunities by factors such as age, ethnicity, religion, etc. all of which are fundamental in understanding livelihood strategies. The approach addresses the plight of the poor, weak, marginalized and disadvantaged men and women of all ages who are considered a priority and are ensured a voice. The SEAGA considers the active participation of all actors essential for sustainable development, because it recognizes asymmetries of power within households and structures of power. This includes institutions and how they influence people's capacity to play an active role in development, ensuring that their voices are heard. All these methodologies will support the negotiations undertaken through PNTD and Jango Pastoral to prepare land management plans.

In Component 2 various activities have a gender focus. The Outcome 2.3 will include the training, the provision of technologies, and the market inclusion for various community activities with the aim of increasing revenue and increasing food security. The spectrum of activities that communities might potentially select includes various activities that are typically undertaken by women such as the small-scale production of non-livestock products. Finally, the biodiversity improvements under Output 2.2.1 will be monitored with an innovative method that disaggregates land use by gender and focuses on the gender-disaggregated use of local and wild species. This method will allow for input for the community based action plans that will be set in place at the end of the APFS cycle.

STAP Comment # 8: *On Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs), STAP recommends a careful elaboration of this section in the full proposal. First, the four cited GEBs in Section B2 are not, as currently worded, global benefits. It*

would be preferable to identify the global component of these hoped-for beneficial impacts. Secondly, it will be necessary to specify how the expected GEBs will be measured, and their progress tracked (see comment above on Component 4). For example, the proposal could indicate a measurement for land degradation and rangeland management. There has been very considerable experience in southern Africa on measuring soil erosion, for example. NDVI measures for land cover are also commonplace and would be very acceptable as impact measures of better land management. No mention is made in the proposal of increases in soil organic carbon (and hence C-sequestration), which should be expected on both rangeland and agricultural land. Protection of dryland biodiversity is mentioned ("33,000 local varieties of native species") in the rationale to the project, but no claims or methods are made to track the project's contribution. Other claimed benefits are in terms of ecosystem goods and service provision - again, there are measures that can track these, including agricultural production/productivity increase. In this regard, it would be useful if the participatory monitoring system for rangeland biodiversity and vegetation cover (output 2.1.4) could contribute to monitoring GEBs. The land degradation tracking tool also offers a number of possible measurements for GEBs that could be defined as the project is designed in its entirety.

Response: The measurements of GEB have been improved and are reported under reply to Comment 4 and in the appropriate section of the project document.

The impacts of SLM will be mainly assessed through a NDVI measurement as this is more cost effective than soil erosion measurements and soil C sequestration analysis. Detailed soil C analysis is not available in the area and PPG funds were not sufficient to cover them. The provision of ecosystem services will be covered by measuring livestock productivity and stakeholder's revenue. The project team chose to avoid the biodiversity and vegetation cover as an indicator because available PPG funds did not allow for experimenting with the proposed measurement method. Also, there was a strong interest by the government to undertake actions to improve smallholders' revenue that expanded Component 2 activities. The increased costs in M&E are partially co-financed, however available resources would not allow biodiversity monitoring to reach a significant level of the intervention result.

Germany's Comments:

Germany's Comment # 1: The full project proposal should make reference to existing land use and development planning approaches at regional and communal level. The envisaged land-use planning exercises by the project should be integrated in and based on these existing processes in order to facilitate the up scaling of the approach in other regions of Angola. In this sense the concept of the proposed integrated land management plans needs to be explained more in detail.

The identification of communal pastoral areas and transhumance corridors has to be done at a higher geographical level, such as province or region in order to assure coherency between the different municipalities and to avoid future conflicts. In this sense, the project proposal needs more explanations also referring to the FAO land delineation approach.

Response: There are no relevant land management plans for implementation in the project area; just a few small and weak agreements based on customary principles. However, identified conflicts and specific needs require land and natural resources management planning to address these conflicts and/or valorize, protect and rehabilitate resources. In this sense, already existing approaches (such as Jango Pastoril) will be valorized and strengthened through the PNTD methodology for participation and negotiation approaches in order to define and establish land management plans.

Regarding the FAO Land delineation (or delimitation) approach, it has to be clarified that the project will identify and map (delineate) selected rural communities, including pastoral communities and their movements at the District and Provincial levels (in the provinces that participate at the project activities). The concept of Rural Communities' Delimitation is referred to in the Land Law 9/04 and its regulations. It is the procedure to identify the natural resources belonging to the community and to identify their territorial structure rules in order to safeguard the community rights on these natural resources through the emission of a Recognition Diploma.

When talking about delimitation it has to be considered that all the land used and that belonging to the community, specifically, transhumance corridors have to be respected as indicated in the Land Law. In this way, the delimitation process does not only recognize the rights of the communities on their land but also informs and makes the communities

sensible about the importance of respecting the transhumance corridors. This is an important fact in order to prevent and solve conflicts related to land and transhumance issues.

The Participatory land delimitation approach proposed by the FAO (which is already adopted by the Government of Angola) forms part of Component 3 (output 3.1.2) seeking to support community tenure security. The approach is published in the document “Participatory land delimitation: An innovative development model based upon securing rights acquired through customary and other forms of occupation” Land Tenure Working Paper 13, FAO, 2009. The method is strongly related to the actual policy environment. The FAO approach is based on participation and raising awareness on people’s rights and their local customary use of natural resources. The method includes an initial sensibilization process on people’s rights to land and other resources and what their territory is. The sensitization takes vulnerable groups’ (women, youth elderly) point of view into consideration through their participation in creating maps. These maps are later socialized and discussed for coherence of information given by the different groups and a final map is jointly created. Then the consultation process begins by confirming the communal land’s boundary (neighbors, national register). Once all these activities are approved, a series of letters of agreement are produced. With these materials a “land delimitation package” is prepared for the approval of i) local administrations, ii) the provincial directorate of Urbanism and Environment; iii) the provincial directorate of Agriculture iv) the IGCA, and v) the provincial Governor. The process ends with the full land diploma for recognition of customary land rights. The entire process might take between 3 to 4 weeks. If the area delimited is between 1 000 and 10 000 hectares then the approval is given by the Ministry of Urbanism (with declaration of the Ministry of Agriculture); a longer procedure. If the area to be legalized is bigger than 10 000 hectares it is the responsibility of the Ministry Assembly to legalize the community request.

The entire process is extremely important as a basis for the project’s rangeland management planning (Component 1), though not essential, especially because the point is not to “produce” land concession titles everywhere but to create a process where rights (the rights-holders to be precise) are recognized. These rights will be therefore valuable in the Jango Pastoril process and will be available at the local land use planning level.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS³

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: \$133,700					
	SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)			GEFTF/NPIF Amount (\$)133,700		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
1. Local stakeholders analysis and capacities needs assessments for the design of the planning component				30,720	30,720	
2. Technical study and assessment of existing activities for the design of the rangeland rehabilitation component				41,710	41,710	
3. Detailed baseline analysis for mainstreaming SLM into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programmes				32,340	32,340	
4. Stakeholder consultations				22,190	22,190	
5. Analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards				6,740	6,740	
Total				133,700	133,700	

³ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent funds, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A