

Strengthening Climate-Smart Agribusiness and Natural Resource Management for Adaptation and Resilient Livelihoods in Sudan's River Nile and Northern States (SCAN-2N)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12075

Countries

Sudan

Project Name

Strengthening Climate-Smart Agribusiness and Natural Resource Management for Adaptation and Resilient Livelihoods in Sudan's River Nile and Northern States (SCAN-2N)

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

9/18/2025

Review completed by PM

2/11/2026

Program Manager

Katsumasa Tanaka

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2026

a-b) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comment.

April 20, 2026

a-b) Not yet.

- GEF appreciates overall adjustment of the PIF.
- Please kindly capitalize the project title properly.

Jan 14, 2025

a-b) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) Yes.

b) Please unselect "SGP".

Agency's CommentsSGP has been unselected

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025:

a-b) Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2026

Yes. Thank you for increasing the female beneficiary ratio.

April 20, 2026

•GEF notes that the % for women for LDCF Core Indicator 1 and 4 is lowered back to 30%. GEF requests the Agency to consider aiming higher than 40%, trying to ensure a parity, as women between 49% to 57% of the farmers in Sudan.

Jan 14, 2026

Yes. Thank you for addressing the comment.

Sep 25, 2025:

•GEF appreciates various mechanism to enhance participation of women, youth, and other marginalized groups in the project. However, the % for women for LDCF Core Indicator 1 and 4 is as low as 30%. GEF requests the Agency to aim higher than 40%, trying to ensure a parity, as women between 49% to 57% of the farmers in Sudan.

Agency's CommentsThank you, Core Indicator 1 now states that > 40% women beneficiaries will be targeted, and the proportions for Core Indicator 4 have been adjusted to 40% men; 40% women, 20% youth. During the PPG phase, the figures will be further verified and confirmed.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-c) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comment.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) Yes.

b) The current ratio of PMC is 4.1%, while the cap is set at 5%. A country like Sudan requires lots of support, and the cost of executing a project in this country can be high. Please consider increasing the level up to the cap of 5%.

Agency's Comments Thank you, the PMC ratio has been updated from \$721,945 to 859,458, reflecting the 5% ratio cap.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-b) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comment.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) According to IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), the targeted states host a large number of internally displaced populations (IDPs). Does it have a significant impact on the objective of the project? If so, please include a brief explanation on the context and impact. A detailed analysis is not required at the PIF stage.

b) Yes.

Agency's Comments The PIF has been updated to acknowledge that the target states host significant IDP populations (Section A; Root causes). Additional notes on how the project's objectives will contribute to addressing the vulnerabilities of IDPs have been added to Outputs 1.1.1; 1.1.2; 3.1.3; and 4.2.1.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-d) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comment.

Sep 25, 2025:

a-b) and d) Yes.

c) GEF appreciates UNIDO's efforts to create synergies with the ongoing UNIDO project in Sudan mentioned in the "Project Description" and "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" sections. Please include the project in Table 2.

Agency's Comments Thank you, ongoing UNIDO initiatives in Sudan now included in Table 2.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-b) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) Yes.

b) GEF appreciates well-designed project activities. Please see below a few comments:

- Component 2 and 3: Please make sure to utilize, leverage, and capacitate existing mechanism and institutions such as ARC, agricultural research stations, water harvesting research institute, and various local committees as much as possible, to reduce local communities' burden and secure sustainability of project outcomes beyond project completion.
- Component 4: Please make sure that proposed intervention contributes to inclusive DDRM, with specific attention to women, youth, and other marginalized populations such as persons with disabilities, IDPs, and foreign nationals.

Agency's Comments Thank you. The PIF has been updated to specify collaboration with existing national and state institutions to enhance sustainability and reduce community burden

in Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 3.1.3, as well as to strengthen inclusivity in DDRM activities under Output 4.2.2.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's Comments N/A

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-d) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) Yes. This project has a strong focus on agriculture, along with other relevant sectors such as water and land degradation. During the PPG phase, please make to secure buy-in from relevant key ministries both at the national and state levels, particularly Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR), Ministry of Agriculture, and equivalent ministry/institution at the state level. (No need to revise the relevant part of the PIF.)

b) N/A

c) Yes. Please make sure to coordinate well with past and ongoing projects and initiatives by UNIDO and other agencies to create synergies and avoid duplication. (No need to revise the relevant part of the PIF.)

d) This project has a significant communication value. In line with the GEF Policy on Communication and Visibility, please consider including a communication activity that ensures GEF visibility.

Agency's Comments

5.3 a) Thank you and acknowledged. The PPG phase will prioritize securing formal buy-in from HCENR, the Ministry of Agriculture, and corresponding state-level institutions, as well as other key partners at national and state levels.

5.3 c) Thank you and acknowledged. The PPG phase will engage ongoing UNIDO, GEF, and other agency initiatives to ensure complementary and avoid duplication during project development and implementation.

5.3 d) Thank you. The PIF has been updated to include a commitment to enhancing communication and visibility measures in line with the GEF's Policy. This has been added under the project's Knowledge management Outcome (4.1), Section B.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-b) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Sep 25, 2025:

a)

- Please respond to the comment in the gender section above and revise the Core Indicator 1 and 4 as relevant.
- Several activities under Component 3 support private sector engagement. Is it possible/relevant to capture the results in Core Indicator 5?

b) Yes.

Agency's Comments

? Kindly see response in 3.2 above.

? Core Indicator 5 has been added to capture private sector engagement outcomes under Component 3, including the number of enterprises and value-chain actors adopting climate-smart and resilient practices.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments
April 22, 2026

a-c) Yes - all comments addressed.

April 21, 2026

a-c) Not yet. Please align the description.

Overall Risk Rating	High	The overall risk rating is Moderate reflecting Sudan's fragile political and economic context combined with the project's complexity across three sta Key risks include extreme climate variability, localised insecurity, coordination gaps, and market/value chain uncertainties that may affect up of CSA, EbA, and green agribusiness. Macroeconomic instability could f challenge private-sector engagement and financial services, while structur barriers may limit participation of women and youth. Despite these factor strong national alignment, institutional support, and built-in measures for participatory governance, capacity building, and gender inclusion reduce t likelihood of severe impacts, with comprehensive mitigation and adaptive management essential to address emerging challenges.
---------------------	------	---

April 20, 2026

a-c) Not yet.

- GEF acknowledges the tightened risk ratings. Given them, please consider raising the overall risk rating to High.

Feb 10, 2025

a-c) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Jan 14, 2025

a-c) Thank you for addressing the comment on the technological risk. However, it appears that the change in the environmental and social risk is not properly reflected. Please double-check.

Sep 25, 2025:

a-c)

- Technological risk field is left blank. Please provide the rating and explanation.
- While this has been partially addressed in "Environmental and Social", "Political and Governance", and "Stakeholder" risk sections, the project interventions, Component 2 in particular, may cause unintended adverse impacts such as increased tension among local communities. Please consider this risk and incorporate conflict-sensitive design and implementation as a mitigation measure, which could also help maximize the project impacts.

Agency's Comments

22.04.26

Thank you. This has been addressed.

20.04.26

Thank you. Risk Level has been increased

14 Jan 2026

a-c) Thank you and this is acknowledged. The 3 environmental and social risks are all now reflected under **B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION subsections (Project Description & Key Risks)** and stated below:

Environment and Social risk 1 (Moderate): Limited community buy-in or health/safety risks from water and agribusiness infrastructure could undermine implementation.

Mitigation 1 : continuous sensitization, participatory design, conflict-sensitive project implementation strategy, planning, and safeguards including a Gender Action Plan (GAP) and ESMP.

Environment and Social risk 2 (Low): The introduction of new resource management systems (e.g., grazing controls, water allocation, or reforestation) could exacerbate tensions between user groups (farmers, pastoralists, IDPs/returnees), particularly in fragile contexts where land and water are contested. Risks of elite capture of project benefits or exclusion of women and youth could undermine equitable outcomes.

Mitigation 2: establish village environmental committees, designating opinion leaders as project champions, conflict-sensitive planning, participatory land/resource mapping, and inclusive governance structures (with quotas for women/youth). Transparent benefit-sharing and grievance mechanisms will be put in place.

Environment and Social risk 3 (Moderate): Restoration and resource management activities under Component 2 may inadvertently cause or increase tensions among local groups (with potential conflict between host and IDP communities) if access to land or water resources is perceived as unequal.

Mitigation 3: conflict-sensitive design and implementation will ensure equitable access for all groups, including host and displaced populations, and through participatory governance mechanisms that foster transparency and inclusive dialogue.

Please note that in the Key Risks table, all three environmental and social risks are, on average, rated ?Moderate,? underscoring the need for effective mitigation measures. This is particularly important given the sensitive context in Sudan.

XX
XX

5.6 a) Thank you, technological risk has been added to the project risks table. The rating is Low, and it will be mitigated through pilot testing, capacity building, and technical backstopping from technical partners.

5.6 c) Thank you. A Moderate environmental and social risk regarding potential community tensions under Component 2 has been added to the project risks table. Mitigation measures will include incorporating conflict-sensitive design and implementation to ensure equitable resource access for all groups.

Further consultations and conflict risk analyses will inform project design and implementation, ensuring that the project mitigates risks for increased conflict among stakeholders.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

Jan 14, 2026

a-c) Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Sep 25, 2025:

a) Yes. GEF greatly appreciates the well-integrated, holistic approach of the project, addressing the complex climate challenges in Sudan.

b) It is innovative in that it combines conventional resilience building activities with the support for private sector driven climate smart agribusiness approach. Please elaborate more on 1) the exist strategy and sustainability of the project outcomes and 2) scaling and replication of the practices of the project.

c) Yes. Component 1 contributes to strengthened policy, institution, and governance in line with NAP and other national policies.

Agency's Comments Thank you. Two subsections have been added under Section B Project Description: ?Project sustainability and exit strategy? and ?Project scaling-up and replication?, which elaborate on institutional, financial, and policy mechanisms to sustain project outcomes beyond GEF financing and to enable replication of successful results of the project.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

Feb 10, 2026

Yes. Thank you for addressing the comments.

Jan 14, 2026

Thank you for addressing the comments related to consultations in White Nile state as well as further consultation during the PPG phase. However, if no consultation was made specifically for IPLC during the project identification phase (=PIF preparation phase), please unselect the checkbox.

ities: Yes

ties: Yes

f names and dates of consultations

Stakeholder Consultations

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Consultation Date</u>
Federal Government Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources	Aug. 14 2025

Sep 25, 2025:

- GEF appreciates the insights provided in the "Summary of the Stakeholders Consultation Findings".
- Has the Agency conducted stakeholder consultations in the White Nile state? If so, please make sure to include them in the list. Otherwise, please make sure to do so during the PPG phase.
- In the stakeholder engagement section said "Yes" for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) consulted during project identification phase. However, consultations with IPLCs are not a part of the list of consultations. Please elaborate further on IPLCs consulted during project identification phase.
- In the "Stakeholder Engagement" section of the "B. Project Description", please elaborate a bit further on the plan to consult relevant stakeholders, including IPLCs, relevant CBOs/farmer associations, and women and youth groups, during the PPG phase, to ensure that their interests and knowledge inform project components and outputs. In particular, there are indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities in the targeted states, such as Nubians. Please elaborate on a plan for meaningful consultation, social risk management, and capacity building to avoid potential risks for IPLCs, such as increased marginalization, loss of land and livelihoods, and erosion of cultural identity.

Agency's Comments

Jan 14 2026

7.2. Thank you and this is acknowledged. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) is now unselected in the GEF Portal.

```
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
```

Thank you, kindly see relevant responses below:

1. Yes, the list under "Stakeholder Engagement" in Section B has been updated to include apologies for the earlier omission. Further consultations will take place in all target states during the PPG phase
2. Now noted in under "Stakeholder Engagement" in Section B that during the PPG phase, targeted consultations will also be undertaken with Indigenous Peoples and ethnic minority groups in the target states. These consultations will apply culturally appropriate and participatory approaches, consistent with free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) principles, to ensure that traditional knowledge and local priorities inform the project's components and outputs.

3. Now noted in under 'Stakeholder Engagement' in Section B that a participatory social assessment will also be carried out to identify and manage potential risks to IPLCs and to inform equitable access and benefit-sharing mechanisms. Capacity-building activities under Components 1 and 2 will strengthen IPLCs' roles in adaptation planning, sustainable resource management, and local governance to ensure their full and effective participation throughout implementation.

4. *Elaborated under 'Stakeholder Engagement' in Section B* During the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, targeted consultations will be conducted with Indigenous Peoples and ethnic minority groups in the target states. These consultations will employ culturally appropriate, participatory approaches consistent with the principles of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), ensuring that traditional knowledge and community priorities shape project design and outputs. A participatory social assessment will identify and mitigate potential risks to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including risks of marginalization, loss of land or livelihoods, or erosion of cultural identity, and will inform equitable access and benefit-sharing mechanisms. Capacity-building activities under Components 1 and 2 will further strengthen the roles of these groups in adaptation planning, sustainable resource management, and local governance, ensuring their full and effective participation throughout project implementation. Collaboration with civil society, traditional and religious authorities, and women's and youth groups will promote equitable benefit-sharing, uphold cultural values, and enhance community adaptive capacity.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsSep 25, 2025: Yes

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's CommentsSep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's CommentsSep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's CommentsSep 25, 2025: Yes.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's CommentsN/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
April 22, 2026

Yes. All comments addressed - this PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

April 21, 2026

Not yet. Please address a minor comment regarding the risks.

April 20, 2026

Not yet.

- GEF highly appreciates Agency's swift response in adjusting the PIF.
- Please kindly address three comments on the project title, gender (core indicators), and risk analysis.

April 14, 2026

- Based on the discussion among the OFP, UNIDO, and GEF, please kindly revise and resubmit the PIF.

Feb 11, 2026

- Thank you for fixing the formatting issues. This project is ready for technical clearance.

Feb 10, 2026

- All the comments have been addressed.
- There are a few minor formatting issues. Please remove the remaining yellow highlights in p.6, 31, 53-54 (in PDF version) and unbold narratives in p.37-39.

Jan 14, 2026

- A few minor comments are yet to be addressed. Please address these comments.
- For finalization, please remove the yellow highlights.

Sep 25, 2025:

Not yet. Please address several comments above.

Agency's Comments

Apr 22, 2026

Thank you. The raised comment has been addressed.

Apr 17, 2026

Thank you. The PIF has been revised.

Feb 11, 2026

Thank you for your observation on the formatting. We have reviewed the PIF and removed all remaining highlights and bold text on p. 37-39. We trust that this addresses the comment.

Jan 14 2026

Thank you, kindly see relevant responses to all comments above:

1. Please see responses to #1, and #2 of the Response Report.
2. All highlights (yellow) are removed.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Sep 25, 2025:

- This project has a strong focus on agriculture, along with other relevant sectors such as water and land degradation. During the PPG phase, please make to secure buy-in from relevant key ministries both at the national and state levels, particularly Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR), Ministry of Agriculture, and equivalent ministry/institution at the state level.
- It has many activities on the ground. Please identify relevant and capable execution agencies at the state level. Please also conduct further consultations with stakeholders and CSOs on the ground during the PPG phase.
- According to IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), the targeted states host a large number of internally displaced populations (IDPs). Please analyze whether and how targeted communities and planned activities of the project are affected by the influx of the IDPs. If relevant, please incorporate measures to prevent the maladaptation by both host communities and displaced populations, and promote social cohesion. Please also analyze associated social risks and reflect them in the risk management plan.
- The planned activities, Component 2 in particular, may cause unintended adverse impacts such as increased tension among local communities, while they have significant potential to reduce tension and competition over scarce natural resources, if successfully designed and implemented. In the CEO endorsement, please not only focuses on "do no harm", but also articulate how the project can positively and proactively contribute to stability, co-existence, and peacebuilding of local communities and IDPs.
- Please conduct further consultation with local communities and reflect the findings in the project design. If relevant, please consider conducting conflict-sensitivity analysis.
(Ref: Guidance Note on Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations:
<https://www.thegef.org/documents/guidance-note-fragile-and-conflict-affected-situations>).
- When the Agency conducts further stakeholder consultation, please engage with a broad range of stakeholders, including IPLCs, relevant CBOs/farmer associations, and women and youth groups to ensure that their interests and knowledge inform project components and outputs and avoid potential social risks.
- Once the gender analysis has been conducted and the Gender Action Plan (GAP) developed, the Agency is requested to incorporate the findings and identified actions/interventions in the GAP in the project components, outputs and activities. The agency is also requested to provide some indicative budget for the GAP and related gender-specific activities/outputs. Under M&E, please reflect the reports submitted (MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the GAP.

Agency's Comments

Thank you, kindly see relevant responses below:

1. Please see response to 5.3 a) above.
2. Thank you, additional consultations will be carried out in preparation for and during PPG phase for identifying relevant executing partners.
3. Please see responses to 4.1 a) and 5.6 c) above. The project's activities will be sensitive to the vulnerability of IDPs and the relevant social dynamics in host communities, ensuring benefits for all groups and mitigating potential conflicts.
4. Please see response to 5.6 a&b above.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/30/2025	10/22/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/12/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/11/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2026	