



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

GEF ID:	4720		
Country/Region:	Angola		
Project Title:	Land Rehabilitation and Rangelands Management in Small Holders Agropastoral Production Systems in Soutwestern Angola		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-1; LD-1; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,013,636
Co-financing:	\$12,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,263,636
PIF Approval:	January 09, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Caterina Batello

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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Date of Signature of the UNCCD: Oct 14 1994</li> <li>- Date of Ratification: Jun 30 1997</li> <li>- Date of Entry into Force: Sep 28 1997</li> </ul>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>There is a letter of endorsement in date of October 10, 2011.</p> <p>At this period, the OFP was Pedro Samuel who actually signed the letter.</p> <p>The total GEF resources mentioned are compatible with what is included in the PIF.</p> <p>There is a mistake in the fee calculation. However, we do not consider this error as eliminatory.</p> <p>Adressed.</p>	

Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	FAO has a comparative advantage on Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Agropastoral Field School (APFS) approaches. Addressed.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FAO currently has a significant portfolio in the country.</li> <li>- The project fits into the FAO's strategic objectives.</li> <li>- FAO has an office in Luanda with permanent technical staff and project staff. The representation can also count on complementary expertise from other projects in Angola or in the region.</li> </ul>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Angola has a STAR allocation of \$3,480,000 for LD (corresponding to the requested resources for the project, the PPG, and the fees). Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The table D is aligned with the LD focal area strategy framework. However, we wonder if there is an interest to spread	

		<p>(e.g. for LDD-1, outcomes 1.1 to 1.4), notably the outcomes 1.3 (\$356,818) and 1.4 (\$200,000).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are the \$200,000 assigned to the 1.4. being instrumental in catalyzing investments in SLM? It seems that \$290 million are already planned for agriculture by various donors.</li> <li>- Same question for the \$356,818 proposed under the outcome 1.3.</li> </ul> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The project is developed under LD-1 and LD3.	
	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?	Addressed. cf. p4.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough. please, develop the sustainability of the approach and how the capacities that will be developed through this project will be maintained.</li> <li>- Develop how the outcomes will be maintained after the project (how will the agreements between farmers and herders be managed and financed? How will the rehabilitated ecosystems be managed?).</li> </ul> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This project is welcome under the framework provided by the National Long Term Development Strategy 2025. The current situation is well described. However, if there is an extensive list of</li> </ul>	

Project Design		<p>financing?), it is not completely clear which of these projects will constitute a real baseline to build the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>- Please, shorten the text, revise its structure, revise the reasoning to show how the GEF will be incremental on the top of selected projects. Justify the use of the GEF resources in addition of the real baseline projects that can be considered part of the whole approach.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</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?		<p>No. \$3.5 million are proposed to be spent for the following outcomes: 2000 persons trained to improve herd management on 7,500 ha, 500 ha of ecosystem rehabilitated, and 600 ha "mises en defenses". Please demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the approach and the value for money.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>See cel. 11. Please revise the reasoning, the description of the baseline projects and the incremental use of GEF resources.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project is welcome if it is field result oriented. Depending on the changes in the incremental reasoning, we suggest some changes and ask for confirmation on the following issues:</p> <p>- The general structure of the project could be simplified or at least re-organized. The number of outcomes and</p>	

		<p>of each component have to be simplified and focused.</p> <p>- We welcome that more than half of the resources seem allocated to field oriented activities (component 2). However, once the other comments will have been included, it seems that it will be possible and better to increase the resources spent for field activities (probably around 2/3). We invite the Agency to explore the ways to assign more resources to activities on the ground.</p> <p>- Some studies or assessments should be developed over the PPG and should not be included in this result framework. Please remove all studies and assessments: output 1.1.1 initial assessment of LD causes and LD impacts on ecosystem services; 3.1.1 Knowledge and understanding of LD induced threats; 3.1.3. Gaps and opportunities for mainstreaming rangeland/transhumance policy approaches identified.</p> <p>- The component 2 is field oriented and welcome. However, all activities/outputs are training or awareness oriented. We do not see how this "knowledge" will be concretely applied on the ground. Please explain and confirm that herd management will be improved on 7,500 ha of rangeland. Explain the cost effectiveness of the approach.</p> <p>- We do not understand the distinction</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>devoted to capacity building, strategies, planning and tools. The component 1 proposes an outcome on capacities (1.1) as well as the component 2 (3.1 increased capacities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please bring together elements of same nature (capacity building), reduce the resources spent for planning, and remove the outputs linked to knowledge management and studies.</li> <li>- Output 2.1.2 (Education and awareness): Please develop the approach, the methodology, and the indicators of success for this output related to awareness.</li> <li>- The output 2.1.4. on participatory monitoring does not seem in the right component, as there is a component for monitoring.</li> <li>- We do not understand the added value or the role of the GEF in the output 3.1.4 (at least two partner projects and/or national/provincial governmental programs involved in mechanisms to mainstream SLM...). Actually, we do not understand the output itself. Please, explain, revise, and/or remove.</li> <li>- A component 4 on monitoring and evaluation is potentially eligible. However, we would like to be sure that the activities are distinct than those provided by the agency (with the fees) or the management costs.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>output 4.1.1 (the formulation is not clear) and justify the costs. Please remind that all oversight activities on the project implementation should be covered by the management costs. Activities such periodic progress reporting of the project, consultations with stakeholders, financial audits, should not be financed under the M&amp;E budget.</p> <p>- The activities 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 cannot be covered by a budget devoted to monitoring and evaluation. These activities seem related to Knowledge Management. Please explain the strategic thinking, the sustainability of the outputs 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 (a publication and a website). Detail the costs.</p> <p>- The budget for the whole component 4 has to be justified. If we only take the activities related to M&amp;E (apparently 4.1.1 and 4.1.2), the budget might seriously be reduced.</p> <p>- Please note there are different activities (and probably too much) related to knowledge management that are spread in the different components (3.1.1., 4.1.3, 4.1.4). We understand the potential added value of Knowledge management activities, but we do not want to finance a KM project. Please give ballpark costs for the activities related to KM.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 We thank the Agency for the thorough</p>	
--	--	--

		Cleared.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	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>- The project aims to improve socio-economic conditions of agropastoralists, small scale farmers, rural families, and subsistence economies. The project will also improve capacities of different level of governance.</p> <p>- However, there is no information about the local and professional stakeholders and partners (professional organizations, farmer organizations, NGOs, etc.). We understand that a stakeholder analysis will be undertaken in the PPG. However, as these interlinkages will be instrumental for the success, please provide further information.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>- There is an output involving indigenous people without further information. Please develop their role and how they will be committed in the project.</p> <p>- Please explain how the traditional collective rights will be considered under the project in application of the principles of the Land Law and the Law of Territorial and Urban Management.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 Addressed.</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)	Yes. However, at CEO endorsement, please provide a detailed risk analysis, notably to include the risks encountered at local level (behavior, traditional rights vs modern rights, etc.).	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The Executing partners are the "Ministerio do Ambiente", the "Ministerio da Agricultura", the different provincial government. At CEO endorsement, please detail the implementation arrangements.	
	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?	No. Management costs should be under 5 percent (\$143,181). Please reduce. And confirm that no management costs are included in the component 4 or elsewhere.  December 28, 2011 Addressed.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Depending on the revisions brought to the result framework, the funding per component and the cofinancing should be revised. We expect to find a maximum of resources for activities on the ground. We expect to find less resources on capacity building and planning. We expect to not find assessments or	

		<p>the PPG. Here the cofinancing is 1:2 for every component, probably reflecting a problem of reasoning and a misuse of GEF resources. Please use more cofinancing for soft activities (capacity building, training, planning, mechanisms, knowledge) and reduce the GEF contribution.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 The reasoning has been updated. However, in regards to the importance of the issues and the presence of various agriculture project, the cofinancing stays relatively low (1:3) and always between 1:2.8 or 1:3.2 for each component. See Cell. 25.</p> <p>January 6, 2012 The cofinancing has evolved, notably for soft activities. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>- With all projects mentioned in the baseline (for around \$290 million), we might expect a better cofinancing ratio (here 1:2). - We invite the Agency to revise the incremental reasoning, to update the text on the baseline project, and to revise accordingly the cofinancing. A much higher cofinancing ratio is expected. We remind that in the last work program, the average cofinancing ratio was 1:9.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 We thank the Agency for the improvement of the cofinancing ratio. But with all these agriculture projects in the area, we will expect a much higher</p>	

		<p>partnerships on the same issues and in the same area. Please, revise.</p> <p>January 6, 2012 The cofinancing has been improved to 1:4. It is an excellent signal while the area is a remote region with limited investments, especially for livestock and rangeland management.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>See cell. 24 and 25.</p> <p>December 28, 2011 The cofinancing is coming from various projects either developed by the government or implemented with the support of FAO (EU, Japan, Spain). The amounts brought up by the Agency stays modest, but are in line with its role. Addressed.</p>	
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>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>December 28, 2011</p>	

		<p>We thank the Agency for the thorough revisions. Please, increase the cofinancing (see comments, cell. 25 and 26) and check the items to consider at CEO endorsement (cell 31).</p> <p>January 6, 2012 The PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please include a better analysis of local stakeholders, including traditional authorities and professional organizations.</li> <li>- Please explain how traditional rights will be balanced with "modern rights",</li> <li>- Explain the sustainability of the approach.</li> <li>- Include a solid risk analysis.</li> <li>- Develop the implementation arrangements and notably the partnerships on the ground.</li> <li>- Confirm the cofinancing.</li> <li>- Include a monitoring plan.</li> <li>- Include the Tracking tools under Excel.</li> </ul>	
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*	November 30, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 06, 2012	
	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?	<p>Most of the activities are in line with what a PPG is supposed to finance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical data analysis and studies (policy and institutional analysis, identification of traditional and current options for land rehabilitation in the agro-pastoral sector, assessment and identification of options of transhumance routes and agreements, institution analysis, search for synergies and partnerships),</li> <li>- Stakeholder consultations and participatory processes.</li> </ul> <p>- However, it must be clear that the PPG is devoted to finance some of the activities necessary to prepare the project, mainly the baseline data, but not the final consolidation of the project.</p> <p>- Please, confirm that the PPG is only used to develop the GEF project. The other cofinancing projects should play their role, notably for all market related activities (improvement of beef production value, improvement of the value chain).</p> <p>- There is a reference in different sections to FAO and GEF materials ("documentation"). Please confirm that GEF PPG resources are focused on GEF information. Any specific document for the Agency should be financed by the Agency.</p> <p>- We are not sure to figure out the nature of activities included in (e) identification of topics for the preparation of Agropastoral field Schools modules on SLM and (f) exact definition of opportunities for collaboration and synergies with ongoing programs and activities. Please, take note that the development of training modules should not be included in the PPG.</p> <p>- We agree that the outputs should provide relevant baseline data and information, workshop reports (however the number of workshops might need to be reduced), and various tools and reports that will be used to fuel the project document. But the GEF and FAO project documentation, including the final design of project components should be financed by the Agency, the cofinancing, but not by the PPG. Please, revise accordingly.</p> <p>April 6, 2012</p> <p>We take point of the explanations and clarifications that are given. We thank the agency for the thorough adjustments.</p>

- The cofinancing seem pretty high for a PPG and will deserve to be better use to complete the PPG.
- Most of the PPG should be used for activities 1, 2, and 3 (local stakeholder analysis, technical study and assessments, detailed baseline analysis).
- The budget for consultations (\$26,000) need to be justified. Is there a real need for this budget while an impressive cofinancing of \$140,000 is mentioned for consultations?
- We do not understand the use of PPG for the activity 5 "analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards" and the sub-activities "5.1 agreement on cost effective institutional arrangements" and "5.2 Assessment of fiduciary standards of the executing agencies and agreed plan for mitigation of eventual fiduciary risks". Please explain or reduce the amount and increase the use of cofinancing.
- The activity 6 "final design of project components including results framework, detailed budget and financial mobilization" should not be financed by the GEF, and certainly not for \$48,500. We can understand the use of GEF resources to prepare some basic project components (tracking tools, ME plan, financing plan...), but the final project consolidation should be financed by the Agency and/or the cofinancing. One option might be to use more cofinancing for this activity.

All in all, the budget should be seriously reassigned and reduced down to \$100,000. There is a room for discussion, notably if the Agency can justify the activities under "4. stakeholder consultations" and "5. analysis of execution options and assessment of fiduciary standards".

#### Table E: PPG Budget

- The budget needs to be streamlined and reduced.
- We have difficulties to see a third of the PPG budget used for international consultants (\$47,700). The number of consultants has to be reduced, it will also be a way to reduce associated travel costs.
- Same comment for the travel budget: it is hard to justify 1/3 of the budget spent for travels.
- The budget for workshops needs to be justified.

Please revise the budget following the lines above, reducing the budget around \$100,000 (maybe up to \$120,000 if justification requested above is given).

#### Annex A: Consultants

- The number of international consultants is too high for too short periods. There

		<p>- The Project design technical specialist should not fully be covered by the PPG (see last page of the PPG). Many activities should be financed by the Agency or the cofinancing, notably all activities related to supervision and project finalization (a, b, f, and h). Some activities should be shared between the GEF and FAO (e, g).</p> <p>- Any work related to beef market related activities should be financed by the cofinancing. Please remove these elements from the Agropastoral specialist's tasks (improvement of beef production value, improvement of the value chain).</p> <p>ANNEX B</p> <p>All comments made above will impact the annex B, notably activities 1.6, 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 3.4, 4.2, 5.2, and 6.</p> <p>Please, revise according to comments above.</p> <p>April 6,</p> <p>We thank the Agency for the revisions and explanations.</p> <p>We are sorry if there is a misunderstanding on the activities 1.6, 2.8, and 3.4. These activities are fully or at least partially assimilated to the project compilation.</p> <p>Moreover, these activities are repeated under the item 6 for a budget of \$16,700(table B) while they should be addressed by the GEF Agency.</p> <p>We take note of the explanations given by the Agency and we understand the high costs of consultants and travels. However, we cannot be supportive of a PPG of \$450,000 with \$150,000 from the GEF for a GEF project grant of \$3 million.</p> <p>April 19, 2012</p> <p>- The budget has been reduced.</p> <p>- The component 6 has been removed to avoid duplication with activities 1.6, 2.8, and 3.4.</p> <p>- Clarifications have been provided to explain the ToR of consultants and the role of FAO staff.</p>
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>	<p><b>3.Is PPG approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>The PPG cannot be recommended. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>April 6, 2012</p> <p>Removing the item 6 (\$16,700) from the table A, please submit a revised PPG for a maximum of \$133,700. Upon receipt of document with a revised amount and without this component 6, the PPG will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>April 19, 2012</p> <p>The last pending point has been solved. The PPG is recommended for clearance.</p>

		in the letter of endorsement. For a GEF total grant of \$3,480,000, the fees will reach \$316,364. The difference (\$3,163,636) will cover the project grant plus the PPG.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 06, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 19, 2012

\* 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.