

# Sudan, National Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini- grid Programme

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10827

**Countries**

Sudan

**Project Name**

Sudan, National Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grid Programme

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

6/19/2021

**Review completed by PM**

11/5/2021

**Program Manager**

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I ? Project Information

**1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No. Please address the following comments:**

- Total M&E cost as per the excel budget is \$234.722 which is the same cost of Component 4. However, some outputs as such for instance Output 1.4.1 "A Digital Strategy is developed and implemented, including linkages to a following guidance from the regional project" does not fall under the M&E activity. Please clarify whether all activities are under Component 4 are considered under the M&E Plan, and if need be update the budget accordingly.

- The excel budget template provided is fine. However, if available the review team will benefit from a more detailed budget which includes a breakdown by outcome (in addition to by component and year). Many GEF agencies require detailed budgets by outcome. If already available within UNDP please attach it to the next submission.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- Budget for Component 4 is still USD 234,722 in both Table B "Project Description Summary" and Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request (Portal Entry). Please update accordingly.

- The M&E costs as per the table in section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" of the CEO Endorsement Request (Portal Entry) is USD 125,138, which does not match the amount provided in your response below, i.e. **184,304 USD**. Please update accordingly.

- Please note that "Miscellaneous expenses" are not covered by the GEF (see last row of the budget table under Annex E"). Please remove them or provide more detailed information on the type of expenses.

**PM 11/6/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**PM 11/12/2021:**

**No.** On Project information, the CEO endorsement is missing the "Other Executing Partner(s)". Please add *Ministry of Energy and Petroleum*.

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_Oct 7, 2021

- Indeed the **total M&E cost should not match the total cost of Component 4**. Component 4 is not only M&E but also Knowledge Management. Additionally there was a typo in the total budget of Component 4 that has been fixed. **Budget for Component 4 is 184,304 USD** (not 234,722 USD as stated in the earlier version)

A breakdown of each of these 2 sub-categories of the budget with clarifications is provided below. It is also available in the Prodoc and CEO ER.

**Monitoring and Evaluation Budget**

Item	Cost	Clarification Comment
Inception Workshop	5,000	This cost is included in Component 4, under Budget note 21
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, gender action plan, fuel displaced by project pilots and corresponding management plans as relevant (M&E officer at IP)	45,138	<i>This cost is not included in Component 4 but in Component ?Project Management Cost? along with all the staff that will have to be hired by the Implementing Partner</i>
Audiovisual content (contractual services ? companies)	5,000	This cost is included in Component 4, under Budget note 21
<i>Independent Mid-term Review (MTR)</i>	35,000	This cost is included in Component 4, under Budget note 21
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	35,000	This cost is included in Component 4, under Budget note 21
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b>	<b>125,138</b>	

#### Component 4, GEF funded

Type	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Total	Budget Note	Comment
International Consultants	-	27,324	27,324	14,657	69,304	19	<i>An international consultant that helps MoEP put together the monitoring framework for the 2 pilot projects and minigrids in general</i>
Local Consultants	-	35,000	-	35,000	70,000	20	<i>This corresponds to the mid-term review (MTR) and Terminal Evaluation (TE) in the M&amp;E budget</i>
Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs	-	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000	21	<i>The inception workshop (5,000) and audio-visual content (5,000 USD) in the M&amp;E budget are included here, but other expenses too</i>
<b>sub-total GEF</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>77,324</b>	<b>42,324</b>	<b>64,657</b>	<b>184,304</b>		

- On the request for a detailed budget including a breakdown by outcome and by year, kindly note that it was already there, as an annex to the UNDP Prodoc (Annex 1). The Annex is updated to reflect the latest changes in the budget.

Reference:

CEO ER, Part 1, Sec. B, page 2

ST 26/10/2021

**Response:**

- The **M&E has now been presented under a separate subtotal under Component 4 at an amount of USD 87,417**. Component 4 is not only M&E but also Digital Knowledge Management. This is now presented under different sub-totals
- The corrected M&E amount is now reflected across all tables.
- Our Programming and financial system platform (ATLAS) has limitations to accommodate the output level/sub-component level budgeting, thus the ProDoc/TBWP is created to mirror the ATLAS budget system at outcome/Component level. Therefore, we are resubmitting the budget as it is at this point in time.
- The Miscellaneous expense budget line has been removed.

ST 11/16/2021

**Response:**

The project information is updated to list "Other Executing Partner(s)": Ministry of Energy and Petroleum.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request **PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- The total co-financing for this project is extremely low (even below GEF financing) and decreased compared to the PIF levels. While we understand the difficulties in raising extra-financing in a LDC and fragile country, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic, we would very much appreciate if you can document/justify in the proposal the efforts done to date to come up with co-financing, as well as potential co-financing sources that are being explored/under discussion. We would be grateful if the agency can provide further explanation on why co-financing levels are so low, and detail the efforts made to identify additional sources of co-financing.

- Please note that if co-financing amount were to be revised and increased, PMCs shall also be updated in line with the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy which states there should be "proportionality" between the PMC covered by co-financing amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF\\_Guidelines\\_Project\\_Program\\_Cycle\\_Policy\\_20200731.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf)),

- Please attach the evidence of the co-financing letters into the CEO Endorsement Request (in addition to upload the evidences in the GEF Operational Portal).

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No.** We noted, with many thanks, your efforts in increasing the co-financing of the project. This is great news for the project and the country. Please address the following remaining comments:

- Please upload the co-financing letters under the "Evidence" column in Section "C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type"

- Under the table in Section C "Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type" include an explanation on how the investment mobilized was identified. The current description includes the objective of the project, which is not the purpose of this section.

**PM 11/6/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7,2021

After discussions with the different project partners, it was agreed to follow the GEFSec recommendation and to increase the co-financing amounts. More co-financing letters have been obtained, now totaling USD 5,550,000. Details of the new co-financing are as follows:

Entity	Co-finance amount USD	Date received	Letter received
ERA	1,000,000	07/09/2021	Yes
NERC	3,000,000	05/09/2021	Yes
SEHC	500,000	23/05/2021	Yes
UNDP	300,000	20/05/2021	Yes
<i>MoEP</i>	<i>500,000</i>	22/09/2021	Yes
HCENR	250,000	09/05/2021	Yes
Total	5,550,000		

- The PMC follows the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy. Both the GEF and co-financing PMCs are proportional, representing approximately 5% of their respective total budgets.

- Cofinancing letters are attached to the CEO endorsement request document. However, this makes the document heavier. This was the reason why it was provided as a separate annex at the first time.

Reference:

CEO ER, Part 1, Sec. C, page 4

**ST 26/10/2021**

**Response:**

- The co-financing letters have now been uploaded under the "Evidence" column in Section "C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type"
- UNDP Sudan will support the project with USD 300,000 from its annual core resources, including USD 167,000 for contribution to the pilot projects. This is an

investment mobilized. In addition, the UNDP CO screened the ongoing projects by other Recipient Government in Sudan and identified projects by the Ministry of Energy and Petroleum; the Sudan Electricity Holding Company; the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources and the Electricity Regulatory Authority. These are recurrent expenditures.

In addition to recurrent expenditures, investments were also mobilized through partnerships with the Energy Research Centre and the Electricity Regulatory Authority. The Energy Research Centre will invest USD 3 million on local assembling of solar modules that reduce the cost of solar panels by 30%. The Electricity Regulatory Authority committed USD 1 million to work on regulatory issues related to electrification in Sudan.

**5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

**PM 11/12/2021:**

**No.** On Table D, there is 1 USD discrepancy between the figures provided in the PFD (2,637,246 and 237,353) and the CEO endorsement (2,637,247 and 237,352) on the project amount and agency fee. Please adjust using the figures of the PFD.

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**No.** Please note the fee amount shall be 237,353 instead of 237,352. Please update accordingly.

Agency Response

**ST 11/16/2021**

**Response:**

Thank you, the correction has been made.

**STAR allocation?**



Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response  
**SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No, with request for clarifications.** PPG has not been requested for this national child project. However, in the Letter of Endorsement issued by Sudan's Operational Focal Point (OFP) in September 2019, it was initially envisioned a PPG of \$100,000. Kindly confirm that the PPG is not needed and that Sudan's OFP has been informed accordingly.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7, 2021

The agency confirms that PPG was not requested for this PPG. Although the letter of endorsement from the GEF OFP indicated an allocation for PPG, this was no longer available at the time of submission. The STAR allocation of Sudan was completely used up. Therefore, the UNDP Sudan Country Office used its own resources to conduct the PPG activities.

**7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- The CEO Endorsement has reported on Core Indicator 6.4. Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology, but has not reported on Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU. This information has been provided under the Global Environmental Benefits section of the report ( direct GHG emission mitigation of about 61,932 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. During the 20 years following project closure, the project is expected to result in 1,944,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of consequential GHG emission mitigation)but not under the Core Indicator section. Please update the CEO Endorsement accordingly (the Agency ProDoc does contain the information on emissions avoided in Annex 11).

- GHG calculations have been thoroughly described in the agency project document. However, the agency has not provided the GEF team with a calculation spreadsheet to easily trace the calculations. For instance, it is not clear from the text whether the GHG estimated comes from the GEF financing only or from the GEF+co-financing. Please clarify and provide a GHG calculation sheet.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_Oct 7, 2021

? **CEO Endorsement reporting on Core Indicator 6.4.** The CEO Endorsement Request has been updated accordingly and is now consistent with the Agency ProDoc and its information on emissions avoided in Annex 11. As a summary these are the figures:

- o Direct GHG avoided emissions: 61,932 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq
- o Indirect GHG avoided emissions: 1,944,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq

- ? **GHG calculations.** A GHG calculation spreadsheet has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.
- ? **GHG estimates and co-financing.** The GHG emissions reductions estimates are based on the total renewable power generation of the minigrid pilots receiving project support. Project funding (GEF INV) will be used to provide a CAPEX subsidy to cover part (not all) of the capital expenditures required to deploy the minigrid investments. That means that the pilots will require additional contributions to cover the remaining portion of CAPEX costs not covered by project funds, reach financial close and deliver the intended results in terms of GHG emission reductions.

GEF INV budget allocated to the Sudan minigrid pilot (USD 1,676,000) will be used to provide a portion of the pilots' CAPEX needs. The actual level of CAPEX subsidy will be defined during project implementation by the respective Executing Agency. Nevertheless, and for the purpose of calculating GHG emission reductions from the pilots, a CAPEX subsidy contribution of 37.4% and 43.4% for pilots 1 and 2 respectively has been estimated for Sudan to allow the hybridized Solar PV minigrids to reach LCOE parity with a diesel-only baseline minigrid.

For Sudan, the additional sources of funding for the pilots are expected to come from the private companies that will be awarded a concession agreement or similar type of contract. For clarity, these additional sources of funding for pilots are not included in the CEO ER list of co-financing. To identify these co-financiers at the PPG stage would compromise the future competitive tender processes.

Reference:

CEO ER, Part 1, Sec. C, page 5

**9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request **PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes, with suggestions.** The project states that in 2016 (five years ago) only 38.5% of the population had access to electricity. Please, if available provide with a more updated data.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No.** Please update this information on the CEO Endorsement Request (GEF Portal Entry), specifically under section "1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)".

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

The CEO ER has been updated with a more recent data from the World Bank. The latest figure of electrification rate is 54% in 2019:

Source: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS?locations=SD>

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 1a Project Description, page 8

**ST 26/10/2021**

**Response:**

The CEO ER has been updated with a more recent data from the World Bank. The latest figure of electrification rate is 54% in 2019:

Source: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS?locations=SD>

**2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please elaborate further on how the project will ensure replacing batteries and converters as well as O&M of the whole system during the lifetime. Please also provide detailed plan to ensure environmentally sound management of such equipment after their usage.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_Oct 7th 2021

- Equipment replacement: through the proposed *Build, Own, Operate and Transfer (BOOT) minigrid delivery model (via a concession agreement or similar arrangement)* the private sector will have both, (i) the financial capabilities and the time horizon to plan and replace batteries, converters, other hardware as well as to perform any preventive and corrective O&M activities as required, and (ii) the incentives (i.e. obligations) to do it as per the agreement. Through the revenues the private sector will be receiving from the Sudanese Electricity companies (the off-takers), the private sector will be capable of carrying out any O&M activity, including the purchase and replacement of major hardware. Failure to comply with equipment replacement or O&M activities within the concession terms will result in penalties (or lack of payment as per the final details of agreement) or contract termination, details will and should be developed in the concession agreement in

this regard. The revenues will allow the private sector to obtain reasonable returns on their investment while also sparing some funds for equipment replacement and O&M. Additionally, due to the proposed nature of the pilots, a *phased-approach* to the pilots will be taken, where initially the diesel mini-grids will only be retrofitted with a solar PV component in a first phase, and then in a second phase will be retrofitted with additional solar PV and batteries. This is described in the section ***Component 2. Business Model Innovation with Private Sector Participation*** of the CEO ER. This will ensure that the pilots are successfully implementing phase 1 before proceeding, and battery lifetimes and replacement can be carefully incorporated.

- Environmentally sound management; Pilots receiving GEF INV must comply with the Program's Environmental Safeguards Management Framework (ESMF) for the responsible handling of waste with recycling of batteries and other recyclable equipment ? including via clear documentation, budgeting and monitoring in compliance with national and UNDP safeguards requirements. Awareness campaigns among stakeholders and involvement of recycling companies are activities planned in this project that the IP will benefit from and will use to tackle the dimension of a sustainable waste management plan. During the PPG phase and through the various consultations, no current national applicable waste management law, requirements or guidelines has been identified. However, the project will piggyback on another GEF funded project: *?PIMS 5674 - UNDP-GEF ProDoc for Leapfrogging EE?*, in particular to its *? Component 5 ? Enhancing environmentally sound management of lighting products and air conditioners?* and to the *?Outcome 5.1: Reduction/minimization of leakage of hazardous materials to the environment by reducing the input?*

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 7) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up., page 17

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please in addition to explaining the rationale for this project, include further information on how the project is aligned with the GEF Climate Change Mitigation Focal Area, specifically with entry point "Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for decentralized power with energy usage".

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

This project is a Child project under the PFD (Program Framework Document) Africa Mini-Grid Program. The whole program is aligned with Objective 1 of the Climate Change Focal Area to "Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs", through CCM1-1 - Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for de-centralized power with energy usage.

It also contributes to points 113, 118, and 119 of the GEF-7 Programming Directions to accelerate "the speed and scale of sustainable energy investment in developing countries", to develop "innovative business models that go beyond business as usual" and to foster innovation. The overall contribution towards supporting "transformational shifts towards low emission and climate-resilient development pathways" is particularly important given access to affordable renewable energy is unavoidable for sustainable development, particularly in a context where countries are struggling to extend national grids to secure energy access to off-grid communities.

In addition to the program, the child project in Sudan is also aligned with the objective to focus "on the demonstration and early deployment of innovative technologies to deliver sustainable energy solutions that control, reduce or prevent GHG emissions" (117).

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, section 4 "alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies

**5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request



**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** The information included under this section does not correspond to the information requested. Please refer the GEF guidelines to fill in this section accordingly.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No.** In addition to the information provided, please provide a paragraph explaining why the additional GEF resources are required (i.e. there is a cheaper but most pollutant way of providing the service).

GEF funds the "incremental" or additional costs associated with transforming a project with national benefits into one with global environmental benefits; for example, choosing solar energy technology over coal or diesel fuel meets the same national development goal (power generation), but is more costly. GEF grants cover the difference or "increment" between a less costly, more polluting option and a costlier, more environmentally friendly option.

**PM 11/6/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th, 2021

Please provide more details. It seems the right information was correctly entered for this section.

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 1a Project Description, page 15

**ST 26/10/2021**

**Response:**

The below text has been added in section 5 of the CEO ER.

The main objective of the AMP in Sudan is to ?supporting access to clean energy by increasing the financial viability, and promoting scaled-up commercial investment, in

low carbon mini grids in Sudan, with a focus on cost reduction levers and innovative business models?. The development challenge which the project aims to address is the need to increase the profitability of the solar based mini-grid systems to encourage private sector engagement, while maintaining the end-user tariff in a range that is presently paid by communities residing in social housing complexes and peri-urban areas for grid-connected electricity. The business-as-usual scenario is the continuity of the utility's monopoly of the off-grid energy market, slowing down the Government's ability to achieve its renewable energy development and energy access goals and maintaining high levels of GHG emissions due to continuing use of diesel generators by off-grid users.

The project follows the theory of change developed in the AMP PFD. More specifically for Sudan, the project aims to support the Government to create an enabling environment for innovative business models centered on cost reduction and demand simulation. The incremental reasoning underlying the project is that the implementation of de-risking (policy and financial) instruments will reduce, eliminate or transfer the risks faced by private investors in mini-grids in Sudan, hence, reduce the costs of capital. This will reduce overall project costs and allow for profitable operation at a reduced tariff. In parallel, the project will also use levers to support the private sector to self-organize and become an active partner in the development of the mini-grid sector in the coming years, and promote regional collaboration through continuous interaction with the AMP Regional Project.

The GEF funds allocated for implementing demonstration projects under the AMP in Sudan is USD 1,676,000 which will server to hybridize at least 2 existing diesel mini-grids with participation and cofinancing from the private sector. Based on the current regulatory framework and low market visibility and international private sector participation in Sudan, the disbursement of these GEF funds will happen in a phased-approach in which in Year 2 around USD 1,250,000 will be disbursed to enable the procurement and execution of solar PV power plants without battery storage and in Year 4 around USD 426,000 will be disbursed to enable the second phased of the hybridization which will consist in incremental solar PV capacity and electrical batteries for storage. More information on these modality to be used by the UNDP for the release of the GEF investment fund to Ministry of Energy and Petroleum will be based on the outcome of the DREI techno economic analyses to be performed at project start. Nonetheless, the following requirements and criteria are suggested:

- ? The solar PV power plant pilots will be implemented through a Built, Own, Operate and Transfer model in which the Government of Sudan will grant a concession of at least 10 years for the solar PV power plant
- ? The solar PV power plants will require a co-finance from the private sector in between 50% (preferred) to 30%

- ? The private sector selected to operate the BOOT will recoup the co-investment through an agreed tariff or monthly payment (take-or-pay structure) that will result into savings to the Government of Sudan compared to the existing cost of electricity through diesel
- ? A small portion of the grant, yet to be determined, will be dedicated to the upgrading of the meters of some clients, aiming to contribute to the digital transformation objective of the programme across its components

Using the GEF investment, the project will implement pilot projects with a total solar PV capacity of 2,500 kW (1,500kW in one location and 1,000kW in a second location), resulting in direct GHG emission mitigation of about 61,934 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. During the 20 years following project closure, the project is expected to result in 1,944,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of consequential GHG emission reduction.

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarifications.** The project mentions that out of the 5 sites initially identified two have been selected. One of this site is Kadugli, please clarify

whether the second one is Al-Junaynah or Al-Geneina, since the name in the coordinates table does not match the name in the map.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7, 2021

Out of the 5 sites that have been identified during the PPG preparation, two of them have been pre-selected as best sites for the pilot project implementation:

1. Kadugli with the following coordinates 11.00554, 29.7119
2. Al-Geneina or Al-Junaynah is the same town in West Darfur, just different names with the following coordinates: 13.4442, 22.4421

In the following link one can see the different names Al-Geneina is given:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geneina>

However, for clarity purposes the updated document uses only the term ?Al-Geneina?

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 1b, page 19

**9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** This section shall be further elaborated, since from the parent project we understand further coordination is expected. Please coordinate with other national child projects to ensure consistency.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

## Agency Response

ST\_Oct 7th 2021

Sudan's child project is a unique opportunity to the overall programme to:

- (i) Deploy MW-scale off-grid projects unlike in many other child projects and markets, thus having a greater impact on emissions and economics on project basis.
- (ii) Become a pioneer in a stagnant market that is need of improving its energy landscape and move away from fossil fuel in off-grid settings through funding the pilots, programme dissemination and consultation with stakeholders, policy and regulation work and working with financiers
- (iii) Data sharing through continuous remote monitoring. Sudan lacks data in the energy space, through the interventions proposed in Sudan's child project and in particular through the implementation of remote monitoring, a large amount of useful data will be gathered. This data will not only be useful for Sudan, but for the regional project to examine in detail technical patterns and issues on MW-scale solar PV diesel hybrid mini-grids
- (iv) Regulation and policy; unlike other African nations where mini-grid regulations have been developed over the past years, in Sudan no off-grid regulations or laws have been established or drafted. This represents a unique opportunity for the regional programme to put its best efforts, state-of-the-art regulations and policy practices, lessons learned and best practices to ensure Sudan embraces a set of adequate regulations for its context and unique challenges.

### reference :

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 1c, page 23

**10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- This project provides information on how stakeholders will be engaged during project implementation but it does not provided sufficient information on the consultations that have taken place during the preparation of the proposal. Please provide further information on how stakeholders have been engaged during the design phase.

- Also, please provide further information on how the financial sector will be engaged as their participation is key to ensure the sustainability and replicability of the business model for this project.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**PM 11/12/2021:**

**No.** In addition to the explanation provided below on October 7, please include in the CEO Endorsement Request a summary of the consultations which took place during the preparation of the projects (detailing stakeholders consulted, date, means of consultation, etc.).

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

Different stakeholders were identified and involved in all stage of project document development. The identification process includes the review of the three GEF funded CCM energy projects in Sudan which include:

- Promoting utility scale power generation from wind energy
- Promoting the use of electric water pumps for irrigation in Sudan
- Leapfrogging Sudan's markets to more efficient lighting and air conditioners

The review results show that, the project has many stakeholders from public sector, private sector, NGOs (national and international) and government entities. These diverse stakeholders were systematically approached and engaged in during the various stages of the project development including:

- Inception workshop in which the main concept of the project and targeted objectives were defined.
- Bilateral meetings with private sector companies, NGOs, the World Bank ? energy sector in Sudan and Practical Action, Commercial Banks, research institutions and academia. The bilateral meetings were organized and supported by both international and national consultants into two groups. One group for technical issues and another group for gender issues.
- Validation workshop in which the project logical framework, project components and budget breakdown were presented to stakeholders for review, comments and recommendations.

Through these consultative processes stakeholders fully engaged, informed and their views and suggestion were considered in drafting the full-fledged project document.

There are three initiatives by financial institutions supporting the finance of solar energy technologies in Sudan which serve as basis for engaging financial institution in the project activities:

- The national PV fund which is the consortium of seven banks providing finance to farmers to install solar pumping system for irrigation. This fund is currently active in two States: North State and River Nile State and started expanding to other states.

- Bank of Khartoum's Sukuk initiative launched a SDG 4.75 billion (USD 11.3 million) green Sukuk.
- *Kahrabtak Indak* which literally means (own your Electricity). Is launched by the Chamber of Commerce to support financing roof top and standalone solar home system.

The above three initiators are potential financier for mini-grid developers. The business model brings together financial institutions as money lenders, solar companies as service providers and community as users to ensure scale up and sustainability of the mini-grid.

**ST 11/16/2021**

**Response:**

As requested, the below text and attached document is provided on stakeholders consultation during PPG phase. The text is also included in the CEO ER, section 2 ? Stakeholders.

**Sudan AMP: Stakeholder Consultation and**

**Engagement during PPG Development**

As part of the PPG development, and in addition to the desk review and data collection exercise, the PPG team composed three International Consultants (Technical, Gender and Safeguard consultants) and two national consultants (Technical Consultant and Gender consultants). Different Key stakeholders were identified and engaged (See attached complete list of invitees). The following represent the key stakeholders with them the PPG consultants led series of in-person and online meetings and discussions:

- ? Ministry of Energy and Petroleum (MoEP)
- ? National Energy Research Center (NERC)
- ? Ministry of Finance & National Economy (MoF)
- ? Sudan Standards and Metrology Organization (SSMO)
- ? Renewable Energy Directorate (MoP)
- ? Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR)
- ? Sudan Electricity Holding Company
- ? Public Electricity Companies
- ? Commercial Banks
- ? Private Solar Companies
- ? Practical Actions
- ? World Bank



- 1) AMP Mini-Grid Sudan project: Sudan PPG inception meeting 08th September 2020. In this meeting the project concept and strategy were presented by the International Consultants. Participants in meetings discussed the project idea, opportunities, and possible challenges.
- 2) Bilateral Meetings with representatives of all different types of stakeholders mentioned above. In these meetings roles and responsibilities of stakeholders were discussed and how these roles can contribute to the successful implementation of the project.
- 3) AMP Mini-Grid Sudan project: Validation workshop 19-April 2021. In this workshop the project's components, logical framework and the proposed project budget were presented. Participants in meetings discussed project components and provided input to the budget allocation, institutional structure and assessment of assumptions that is being proposed as part of the project theory of change.

For preparation of data collection, virtual meetings with above stakeholders were besides in-person meeting conducted by the national consultants. Comments and feedback from participants in these meetings and workshops led the project design. The comments and recommendations from stakeholders and the UNDP review team shaped the updated project strategy which has been presented to stakeholders in the validation workshop to obtain final comments on the design and validate the overall project strategy before submission to GEFSEC.

Type of information disclosed along the PPG phase is as follows:

Table 1 - Stakeholder engagement during project development

Interaction type	Type of information disclosed	Location and dates	Individuals, groups and/or organizations consulted	Key issues discussed and concerns raised	F i
------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	--	--	--------

<p><b>Inception Workshop</b></p>	<p>Introduction to the scope of AMP program and national project, priorities, next steps (stakeholder bilateral meeting)</p>	<p>Stakeholders gathered in UNDP premises to facilitate the online communications with the Internationals consultants (PPG team Lead) held on 8th of Sept. 2020</p> <p>-Alberto Rodriguez -TTA- <a href="mailto:alberto.rodriguez@tta.com.es">alberto.rodriguez@tta.com.es</a></p> <p>-Heran Tadesse <a href="mailto:herantadesse4@gmail.com">herantadesse4@gmail.com</a></p> <p>and face to face consultation between stakeholders and the National Consultants during 10 September to 20 October 2020 to collect data.</p> <p>-Samah Hashim <a href="mailto:samah_hashim@hotmail.com">samah_hashim@hotmail.com</a> -</p> <p>Mawahib Ahmed <a href="mailto:ahmed.mawahib@gmail.com">ahmed.mawahib@gmail.com</a></p>	<p>All types of stakeholders were represented (24 participants), including government, agencies, private sector, academia and research centers see list of attendees in the attached annex</p>	<p>Interactive sessions focusing on</p> <p>(i) After the introductions, AMP Sudan PPG Team Leader and the Gender Expert presented the main chapters and sections of the project document.</p> <p>(ii) definition of mini-grid and to link with productive use of electricity identified by the participants (specific value chains ? commercial and social</p> <p>(iii) Involvement of mini-grid developer</p> <p>(iv)The approach to gender and social and environmental safeguards was shared with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Stakeholder interviews</b></p>	<p>Obtaining input from stakeholders regarding priorities and needs, as well as challenges to overcome barriers and to structure the project frame and design.</p>	<p>Conducted online and face to face between September 2020 to February 2021, including via focus groups, virtual meetings and bilateral interviews.</p>	<p>All the ones listed above in addition bilateral meetings were also held with international organization:</p> <p>-World Bank on 2nd Nov. 2021.</p> <p>-Practical Action on 15th Dec. 20202.</p> <p>(Minutes of meetings attached)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Community based models and their capacities</li> <li>o Private sector barriers to participate in the project scale up plan and scaling-up potential of the minigrid.</li> <li>o Sustainability of post-project</li> <li>o Align with stakeholders? current mini-grid or similar energy access projects.</li> </ul>

<b>Sharing of project information with workshop invitation</b>	Project result framework up to activities level, preliminary budget allocated per component and funding source (GEF/UNDP and others) for preparation.	March 2021	Invitations across all stakeholder categories	Allocations of budgets among the different activities.	E a r a
--	---	------------	---	--	------------------

<p><b>Validation Workshop</b></p>	<p>Overview of project design and</p>	<p>The validation workshop was held on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021 from 11:00-2:00 pm in Corinthia Hotel</p> <p>Face to face participation with the local consultants and the international consultants virtually participated.</p>	<p>24 participants from all stakeholder categories participated in this meeting ( list of participants attached)</p>	<p>Highlights of the proposed project?s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Co-finance commitments by the project and endorsement.</li> <li>o Climate change impact, mitigation options and activities</li> <li>o Climate change mitigation measures and interventions</li> <li>o Potential market for a minigrid constraints and opportunities.</li> <li>o The role of the line ministries and government entities in the project implementation</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

**11. Gender equality and women?s empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes, with suggestions.** The table under this section if off-margins. Please correct.

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**Yes, with suggestions.** Please add in the GEF Portal Entry (CEO Endorsement) a reference to the Annex on Gender.

Agency Response

ST\_Nov 22 2021

Annex 10: Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan available in Prodoc.

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

Tables have been carefully reviewed in both documents, the CEO ER and the project document, and have been adjusted to fit within the document margins.

Reference:

CERDoc: Annexes B-6 & H

**12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** The proposal has provided a opportunity analysis on the COVID-19 impact under the section "Potential for scaling up". However, an risk analysis of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic is missing.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_Oct 7th 2021

A risk analysis of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic is provided in the CEO ER document, the title has been modified for clarity.

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 5, page 49

**14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Kindly note that as per the GEF jargon, the Ministry of Energy is the executing agency not the implementing partner as described in section 6 "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination". Please update throughout the project proposal to avoid confusion with the implementing agency of the AMP, i.e. UNDP.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No.** We note that the legal term used by UNDP for the GEF executing agency is "Implementing Partner". Since this creates confusion between the Executing and Implementing roles as required by the GEF, our proposal would be to keep the term "Implementing Partner" in the UNDP ProDoc, and update the GEF CEO Endorsement Request (i.e. Portal Entry) to reflect that the Minister is the Executing Agency and UNDP is the Implementing Agency. This approach would avoid confusion and be in line with other national AMP projects reviewed so far.

**PM 11/6/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

The terminology used is in line with all other AMP projects and all UNDP supported projects. We understand that it might be confusing for the GEF. This clarify things further, a chapeau text as below has been added in both the Prodoc and CEO ER in the Management Arrangement and Coordination section.

In this section, the terminology used are in line with UNDP POPP (Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures). We understand that other organizations might have different terminology. This box is provided to avoid any clarification.

<b>UNDP Terminology</b>	<b>GEF Terminology</b>
Implementing Partner	Executing Agency
Development Partner	Implementing Agency

ST 26/10/2021

**Response:**

OK, this is noted. CEO ER is revised to include the required changes.

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** This section is missing in the CEO Endorsement request.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

The project is aligned with NDC (Paris agreement) to the UNFCCC, national communications (to UNFCCC) and the national energy policy.

- ? Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC, May 2021): Sudan is committed to pursue a low emission and resilient sustainable development in the energy sector. The first objective of the NDC is to transform the electricity sector towards low emission power generation through among others, mini grids. In this commitments Sudan wants to achieve 796MW of installed capacity by 2030 via minigrids and decentralized, off-grid technologies
- ? National Communications: Sudan's Second National communications (2013) also pointed out that Energy is the most promising sector to reduce GHG emissions. Development of Solar PV is at the core of the CC Mitigation strategies.
- ? National Energy Policy: annexed to this file we are attaching a summary of the 'ENARA Lighting', which can be considered as the Government of Sudan energy plan that was submitted to Paris Conference on April 2021.

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed 'Knowledge Management Approach' for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** This section is too short and lacks a detailed analysis including for instance: overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform project concept; plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives& evaluations; proposed processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice& expertise generated during implementation; proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning& collaboration; plans for strategic communications, etc.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7 2021

More information has been provided in the CEO ER.



Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 8, page 34

**17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** There is an inconsistency in the budget for the M&E activities. In this section the M&E budget is \$125,138 while in the excel sheet budget M&E activities amount is \$234,722. Please clarify and update accordingly.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**No,** please see comment above on budget inconsistencies.

Agency Response

ST \_ Oct 7th 2021

- **The total M&E Budget is \$125,138**
- Indeed the **total M&E cost should not match the total cost of Component 4.** Component 4 is not only M&E but also Knowledge Management
- Additionally there was a typo in the total budget of Component 4 that has been fixed. **Budget for Component 4 is 184,304 USD** (not 234,722 USD as stated in the earlier version)

**18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

**PM 11/12/2021:**

**No.** The budget in ProDoc includes a miscellaneous budget line that ?even is not significantly high? cannot be covered bay GEF Resources ? this has to be covered by co-financing resources. Most importantly, this budget line is not publicly disclosed in the Budget Table in Annex E of Portal. Please make both budgets, CEO Endorsement and ProDoc consistency by deleting the miscellaneous line in the ProDoc, since these expenses cannot be covered by the GEF.

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**Cleared.** The miscellaneous budget line has been removed in the latest version of the Agency ProDoc of Nov 15 (compared to the version of Oct 8).

Agency Response

**ST 11/16/2021**

**Response:**

**Thank you for this remark, however, we couldn't find Miscellaneous budget line in the Prodoc nor in the CEO ER.**

**20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please include a table listing all comments provided by Council at PFD approval stage. For those no relevant to this child project, please clearly indicate so. Council comments are available here: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-programdocuments/GEF\\_C.57\\_compilation\\_council\\_comments.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-programdocuments/GEF_C.57_compilation_council_comments.pdf)

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response  
ST\_Oct 7 2021

There were no council members comments for this project at PIF stage. There were only comments at the PFD level, which have also been reflected in this child project.

**STAP comments**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No.** Please address STAP comments provided at the PFD stage, in particular:

1. The proposal presents an adequate list of stakeholders. However, the diesel generator industry is quite widespread in Africa and the project proponents need to consider how to ensure that they do not hinder project success. The project also need to consider incentives for alternative livelihoods for people involved in diesel generator industry.
2. What are the backups to prevent diesel generators from still being frequently used?

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

## Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

1. Unlike in other mini-grid markets in Africa (e.g. Somalia) where the diesel generators are operated by private sector actors, in Sudan AMP the proposed pilot project intervention will deal with government agencies (Sudanese Electricity Companies) which over the years have realized how expensive is to operate this ?off-grid stations? with diesel. One of the main reasons for the wide spread of diesel generators is fuel subsidies which provide wrong market signals disfavoring renewable energies. Sudan started its gradual removal of subsidies on fossil-fuels in 2018 and has completely removed them in 2020. This subsidy removal has resulted in fuel prices increasing from 0.07USD/liter to 0.79USD/liter. This is more than a 10 times increase, making it difficult for most families and city councils to afford such increased cost to use diesel power generation systems. Additionally, during the PPG phase of the project the diesel generator industry has been consulted, as the PPG teams understand that the diesel generator industry is represented by the private sector industry indirectly
2. Minigrids are generally characterized by a very high service availability. A recent report by the Africa Minigrad Developers Association ([Benchmarking Africa's Minigrads](#)) shows that uptime of all monitored minigrads is 99% on average, which is significantly higher than all national interconnected grids in Africa. When power outages occur in minigrads, it is rarely due to inverter failure, but rather because the system shuts down due to overload or low battery state-of-charge (if there is no diesel generator), or because the diesel generator fails. Recent evidence is revealing that diesel generators are now more prone to failure than the renewable energy components. Moreover, ensuring that the diesel generator is adequately maintained (change of oils,

filters, etc.) or that there is fuel availability is a challenge in some rural, remote areas of Africa, thus undermining a diesel generator as a backup asset.

To prevent power outages, a minigrd should be adequately size. This can lead to larger amounts of excess energy being available at non-peak times, which normally cannot be used (unless there are deferrable loads) and reduce the overall performance ratio. Currently, new approaches are being developed that take advantage of artificial intelligence to manage loads, based on machine learning and stochastic optimization. Examples include intelligent control of diesel generators to minimize fuel consumption, demand side management to precisely control deferrable loads (e.g. water pumps) that can consume excess energy. All this leads to minimizing outages and the need to use diesel generators.

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**No, with request for clarifications.** PPG has not been requested for this national child project. However, in the Letter of Endorsement issued by Sudan's Operational Focal Point (OFP) in September 2019, it was initially envisioned a PPG of \$100,000. Kindly confirm that the PPG is not needed and that Sudan's OFP has been informed accordingly.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

Due to fact that Sudan STAR allocation, was completely used up for the GEF 7 cycle, there was no fund available for the initially requested PPG amount. One option provided by the GEFSec was to use co-financing source, e.g., UNDP TRAC or Gov. to fund the PPG. UNDP choose to provide TRAC resources to finance the following PPG activities:

- International consultant
- National consultants
- Consultative and validation workshops

All these activities were fully finance from UNDP TRAC resources and the Sudan's Operational Focal Point (OFP) was informed, agreed and accordingly implemented. .

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes, with request for clarifications.** The project mentions that out of the 5 sites initially identified two have been selected. One of this site is Kadugli, please clarify whether the second one is Al-Junaynah or Al-Geneina, since the name in the coordinates table does not match the name in the map.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

**Cleared.**

Agency Response

ST\_ Oct 7th 2021

Out of the 5 sites that have been identified during the PPG preparation, two of them have been pre-selected as best sites for the pilot project implementation:

1. Kadugli with the following coordinates 11.00554, 29.7119
2. Al-Geneina or Al-Junaynah is the same town in West Darfur, just different names with the following coordinates: 13.4442, 22.4421

In the following link one can see the different names Al-Geneina is given:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geneina>

Reference:

CEO ER, Part II, Sec. 1b, page 19

### **Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements**

**1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

N/A.

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM 7/27/2021:**

The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address further comments.

**PM 10/16/2021:**

The GEF Sec is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address further comments.



**PM 11/12/2021:**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- On Project information, the CEO endorsement is missing the "Other Executing Partner(s)". Please add *Ministry of Energy and Petroleum*.
- On Table D, there is 1 USD discrepancy between the figures provided in the PFD (2,637,246 and 237,353) and the CEO endorsement (2,637,247 and 237,352) on the project amount and agency fee. Please adjust using the figures of the PFD.
- The budget in ProDoc includes a miscellaneous budget line that ?even is not significantly high? cannot be covered bay GEF Resources ? this has to be covered by co-financing resources. Most importantly, this budget line is not publicly disclosed in the Budget Table in Annex E of Portal. Please make both budgets, CEO Endorsement and ProDoc consistency by deleting the miscellaneous line in the ProDoc, since these expenses cannot be covered by the GEF.
- In addition to the explanation provided below on October 7, please include in the CEO Endorsement Request a summary of the consultations which took place during the preparation of the projects (detailing stakeholders consulted, date, means of consultation, etc.).

**PM 11/17/2021:**

**No.** On Table D, there is still 1 USD discrepancy between the fee figures provided in the PFD (237,353) and the CEO endorsement (237,352) on the project amount and agency fee. Please adjust using the figures of the PFD. The fee amount shall be 237,353 instead of 237,352.

Also, please add in the GEF Portal Entry (CEO Endorsement) a reference to the Annex on Gender.

**PM 11/23/2021:**

**Cleared.**

**Review Dates**

**1SMSP CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

**1SMSP CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**