

# Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project -AF

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10083

**Countries**

Sudan

**Project Name**

Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project -AF

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

3/11/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/14/2020

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement**

#### **Part I – Project Information**

##### **Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project outcomes remains aligned with LD focal area of GEF Trust Fund and climate change adaptation objectives of LDCF. However, the proposed activities particularly on climate change adaptation need to be aligned with the outcomes more directly. Please refer to comments in the next section.

April 9, 2020

Please see comments in the next section.

April 13: Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**April 10, 2020:** Relevant revisions made.

**April 1, 2020:** Noted and addressed in the PP and datasheet as relevant based on the comments below.

### **Project description summary**

**2. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project components and activities as related to LD objectives of the trust fund looks fine.

However, as pointed by the GEFSEC and by a number of Council members at PIF stage, the adaptation aspects of the project especially on using innovative approaches, use of non-resilient technologies such as boreholes for groundwater extraction, significant fund allocation for CC mitigation (clean energy technologies) and low number of beneficiaries still remain key gaps in the full proposal.

More specifically, the component 2 (a) in Table B which proposes to use \$3.66 million of LDCF does not provide a clear indication of adaptation related activities to be implemented under the project. The output indicates clean energy solutions only and engagement of private sector and women in this. The details in the supportive documents also do not indicate what activities will be undertaken to address vulnerability challenges of the targeted regions. The incremental reasoning in Annex 6 do not sufficiently elaborate resilience benefits and is limited to benefits attributable to Trust Fund GEBs linked to Land Degradation. Annex 5 describes climate stressors in Sudan but does not specify how the project will address adaptation priorities identified under Sudan's NAP. For example, the proposal outlines NAP adaptation priority for Gadarif (page 65). However, it is not clear if the project will address these. The vulnerability of Khartoum is described more related to access to drinking water, health challenges and climate induced migration. It is not apparent how the project will address these challenges directly.

Therefore, the agency is requested to make the adaptation activities more explicit for a stronger justification of LDCF.

April 9, 2020

Thanks for including adaptation specific outputs in component 2. Under this, please rephrase the term GHG technologies (also in other relevant sections in the document) to either GHG reduction technologies or clean technologies.

April 13: Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**April 10, 2020:** Noted and revisions made.

### **April 1, 2020:**

The reviewer may be informed that details were available in the project paper and for easy reference, the following has been added in GEF datasheet from the project paper. In addition clarifications below to better emphasize the links with NAP.

- Support innovative climate-resilient technologies and finance community-based natural resources management, among them:

(i) establishing multiple water harvesting structures, including with the application of GHG technologies (solar panels), (ii) strengthening the asset base of rural farmers including natural and financial capital, (iii) increasing the diversity of smallholder farming systems through the promotion of mixed cropping-livestock systems and diversification of crops; (iv) enhancing household food security and wellbeing through the introduction and improvement of home gardens; (v) promoting equity and inclusion of vulnerable and marginal groups especially women; (vi) diversifying access to alternative sources of energy, and (vii) improving the availability of/and smallholder access to climate information. Demand for biogas technologies, which convert biological waste into energy, will be explored.

To further highlight focus on climate adaptation targeted initiatives that are tailored to the climate vulnerability needs of the two states, Khartoum was selected by the client through an interactive and inclusive process to help scale-up the climate resilient interventions for further replication. Khartoum State falls within the Great Green Wall of SSA and due to the climate induced displacement, many vulnerable communities took refuge and have voluntarily resettled in camps around the city's outskirts.

The provision of safe and clean drinking water is a challenge. Even more challenging is the deterioration of the health environment that leads to disease outbreaks especially malaria. These issues are expected to further intensify in severity due to the impacts of climate change. Major climate change adaptation initiatives needed in Khartoum, as per the country's official NAP, include:

- *Agriculture:* cultivation of early maturing crop varieties, research activities on drought-resistant seed varieties, and awareness-raising among farmers.
- *Water:* capacity strengthening, adoption of water saving irrigation techniques, integrated water planning, awareness-raising among farmers about climate change.

- *Public health*: ensuring adequate treatment supplies for vector-borne diseases and improving health awareness among rural communities.
- *Urban areas*: development of a comprehensive strategy for mitigation of health impacts in urban areas, transportation planning, and community participation in addressing urban environmental issues.

Similarly, for Gadarif, an estimated population of 1.4 million largely rely on a mixture of land use combinations for their economic wellbeing and daily livelihood – mainly rain-fed agriculture and livestock rearing. Having to rely on the unimodal rainfall, Gadarif’s agricultural economy which is 90% rain-fed is susceptible to rain-fall induced local food shortages and overall food security. Crop data analysis indicates 25% decrease in sorghum production following 20% reduction in annual rainfall. Significant vegetation cover changes has severely reduced ability of the state to produce gum Arabic. Major adaptation initiatives needed in Gadarif, as per the country’s official NAP (2016), include:

- *Agriculture*: introducing practices that reflect the ecological zones. In the northern part of the state, measures focus on land set-asides for grazing and animal production only. In the semi-arid southern part of the state, measures focus on the introduction of animals into agricultural rotations and the cultivation of sorghum alongside other crops for animal production. Across entire state, improved plant and animal breeds should be introduced, early warning systems should be put in place, as well as capacity building and awareness raising programs developed.
- *Forests*: implementing legislation, planting trees inside reserved forests, and cultivating courses of seasonal streams with trees and annuals to prevent soil deterioration.

**Incremental reasoning** has been better clarified and text better highlighted in Annex 6 : The project is expected to enhance resilience to climatic impacts that increasingly affect the livelihoods of the most vulnerable communities. Refer to Section 2 above which clearly outline tailored climate-resilient interventions to boost economic wellbeing and daily livelihoods of beneficiaries, reduce vulnerability to climate induced stress, improve access to basic drinking water through improved water harvesting techniques and address incidence of climate-induced disease vectors. The following nature -based solutions will specifically support the livestock productive capacity of the two states, boost non-timber forest products with emphasis on gum Arabic, improve ecosystem services with a focus on the agriculture sector and cumulate in increased income generating potential of beneficiaries:

- gazetting of additional forest and rangeland areas will help protect the existing native woodland, savanna, and grassland habitats.
- restoration of native vegetation—through reforestation (with local and indigenous species), enrichment planting, natural regeneration, sand dune stabilization, and effective management plans to ensure that grazing and wood collection activities are sustainable—is expected to create and enhance the habitats for many wild species. Rehabilitating ecosystems is expected to create suitable conditions for the return of wildlife.
- increase in both forest cover and quality should create and/or increase ecological niches for ecologically important species.

See explanation above on links to NAP in the PP. ANNEXES 5 and 6 revisions are below and respond to the reviewers comments and highlight areas which were presented earlier.

#### **ANNEX 5 (Revised IN PP)**

In Khartoum State, project activities will support range and pasture development in Sharg Elneel locality (Sayal Elfaki Saad area). Establishing water harvesting structures and improving water management will be essential for enrichment planting and natural resources regeneration in the new project areas and, therefore, instrumental to increasing the resilience of the rural communities. Community level project activities may include rehabilitation of existing hafirs and water sources, using other water harvesting techniques to utilize the water from wadis and khors (seasonal streams). Even though the rainwater harvesting structures hold a small

amount of water, due diligence will be applied to make sure rainwater would not be blocked from flowing down stream. Groundwater recharge capacity will be assessed before operations are put in place. The project will support the preparation of natural resource management plans for the gazetted Om Seraig reserve in the Butana area in the Central Gadarif. In addition, the proposed AF will support the Khartoum Green Belt Project which is being implemented by the Khartoum Higher Council of Environment, Urban and Rural Promotion (HCE). The AF will cover an area of 50 ha from the overall planned area of the Khartoum Green Belt Project. The support will include land preparation, trees plantation, introduction of water harvesting techniques, and livelihood activities aiming to scale- up the model to other states. These activities will be important to contribute to offsetting negative effects from climate induced migration that tends to adversely affect natural resources and environment. In addition, both states are expected to benefit from anti-malaria studies supported by this project.

#### **ANNEX 6 (Revised IN PP)**

As Annex 5 paragraph mentions, major adaptation initiatives needed in Gadarif, as per the country's official NAP (2016), are to be implemented in the areas of agriculture and forests. The AF2 addresses LD and CCA challenges in Khartoum and Gadarif States by promoting a landscape approach to natural resources management. In addition, development of locality extension approaches based on incentive structures will be established. The key elements of the extension approach are: (a) establishment of demonstration plots for select SLWM technologies in target communities, and (b) supporting formation of farmer groups or individuals interested in applying similar technologies. In Khartoum State, the project will gazette and rehabilitate 3 Sharg Elneel Forest Reserve & Khartoum shelter belt, while in Gadarif State, Om Seraig reserve in the Butana area will be rehabilitated. The project will expand efforts in these two new states to strengthen select policy and regulatory frameworks, remove critical knowledge barriers, and develop institutional capacities to add to the ongoing program focus, and thus creating a stronger enabling environment for the on-the ground activities in these two new states. GEF/LDCF resources add value to achieve global environmental benefits (GEBs) through facilitating a variety of SLWM practices such as soil conservation techniques, crop and rangeland management, agroforestry practices, water harvesting and improved livestock management activities, with a focus on enhancing climate resilience.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

#### **Agency Response**

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The co-financing by government appears to be more of in-kind than grant or investment based on the description. Please review and adjust accordingly.

The IFAD co-finance is also mentioned in an IFAD LDCF project for Sudan and therefore including this will be double counting of their funds. Please consult with them and revise or remove this co-finance.

April 9 2020

The co-financing from State of Khartoum and Ministry of Finance and National Economy is classified as public investment and grant respectively. Based on the explanation in the response, these co-financing are more suited to in-kind. Public investments and grants are more relevant for new investment mobilized for a project instead of recurrent expenditure. The Agency is therefore requested to revise the type of co-financing for these two sources as in-kind.

Thanks for clarifying on IFAD's co-finance. The explanation is fine. However, IFAD's co-finance is tagged as Loan instead of Grant. Please revise.

April 13: Comment cleared.

May 4: Additional comment on co-finance cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**May 4, 2020**

Co-financing type for State of Khartoum has been revised as "public investments", as advised. Table C explanation text is provided accordingly.

**April 10, 2020:** Relevant revisions made to cofinancing tagging.

**April 1, 2020:**

The contribution of the Government of Sudan in the project is in-kind and includes their support to public investments. This has been corrected in the GEF data sheet. It needs to be emphasized that Sudan is experiencing massive economic crisis as the country embarks on the path of broad systemic economic reforms, along with political transition. Despite difficult socio-economic conditions, the government has been consistent in its ownership and commitment to the project and contributed in-kind support to the extent possible.

IFAD issued a letter on co-financing in October 2019 and was submitted to GEF at the time of the decision review meeting. To clarify, the SSNRMP funds activities in the states of Gadarif and Khartoum and this co-financing in the amount of \$14 million (out of 63 million IFAD project) is related strictly to these two states. Following bilateral discussions with GEFSEC PM, discussions with IFAD have been done to reconfirm the US\$14M. IFAD will consider using the remaining amount

of \$49 million to the other project as co-financing. The team would also like to thank GEFSEC to confirm that the provided letter from IFAD at decision meeting stage in December as is, will be part of the CEO package.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

On cost-effectiveness, please refer to comments above regarding use of LDCF particularly for component 2 a. The project's number of beneficiaries (core adaptation indicator) is still very low 45,150 for the amount of LDCF financing of 5 million USD. The other core-indicators have been significantly reduced from the PIF stage. This indicates that there is potential for the project to focus on activities which could effectively provide benefit to more vulnerable communities.

Therefore, the agency is requested to consider how the project could be more effective to deliver large scale GEBs and adaptation benefits.

April 9, 2020

Please note that LDCF also records only direct beneficiaries who benefit from investments related to infrastructure, climate services, livelihoods support, business support and targeted policy support. While the upward revision is welcome, the agency is requested to review the proposed activities to assess if the project will support more number of beneficiaries.

For example, under component 1 (institutional and **policy framework**) the following activities proposed are likely to support beneficiaries directly- (ii) assist communities in preparing and implementing investments under integrated land management plans; and (iii) manage, monitor, and maintain infrastructures by VDCs. It is assumed that these activities will integrate climate adaptation and therefore will support resilience of communities. Further, under this component it is not clear what policy framework related to climate change adaptation will be supported. The core indicator sheet suggest that 24 policies and plans for climate resilience will be supported. It is likely to benefit a number of people.

April 13: Comment cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**April 10, 2020:** A bilateral discussion was held with GEFSEC to discuss the attribution of impacts of activities on the beneficiaries. As is a conservative estimate has been provided based on the expected beneficiaries. As explained during project implementation of the capacity building and planning activities the project expects to see an increase in the beneficiaries impacted. This can only be assessed as the planning process and consultations begin on the ground. For example, number of



communities participating will be confirmed during community consultations and number of people actually using the plans or being consulted within the stakeholder groups will become evident during the planning process. These will be updated during the course of the project and are expected to result in higher number of beneficiaries. Please refer to Annex 6 of the Project Paper.

**April 1, 2020:**

For clarity purposes it may be pointed out that the LDCF records overall beneficiaries, while the WB M&E guidance defines the focus on reporting direct beneficiaries from SLM activities at the PDO level. Following bilateral discussions with GEFSEC PM, where it was clarified that given the context of Sudan and the definition of direct beneficiaries the number for Sudan is low. At concept stage early estimates were provided, though not ground truthed. However, the project team reengaged with the counterparts to discuss the attribution of beneficiaries to discuss consolidation on other beneficiaries and present a holistic number under the 'direct beneficiaries' category for LDCF reporting purposes. On that basis the numbers have been upwardly revised to the extent possible (52,500) in a realistic manner. Given the COVID context ground truthing and further consultative assessments are not possible in this time frame to estimate far reaching indirect beneficiaries. Once again, the government has clarified and requested the Bank to emphasize that that the ratio of direct beneficiaries per state has grown substantially by the last phase of SSNRMP. For Phase 1 it was 16.7 thousand per state, Phase 2 – 11.7 thousand per state, and Phase 3 – 26.25 thousand per state.

Breakdown is presented in Annex 6 (52,500 (at least 38 percent female), including 25,000 due to SLM practices, climate information services – 8,750, diversified livelihoods – 5,700, supported private entrepreneurs - 5,700, Citizen Engagement participants – 7,350). Significantly, cumulatively for three SSNRMP phases the estimate is 137,500 direct beneficiaries (of them females 58,435 or 43 percent). During the first year of implementation, as recommended the other potential indirect beneficiaries linked to other project component output level indicators will be revisited.

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA**

**Agency Response**

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/ adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please refer to cost-effectiveness section for comments related to core-indicators.

The change in indicators from the PIF is noted and comments are below:

- The number of beneficiaries has been revised from 25,000 to 45,150 which is still low for \$5 million LDCF funding in two comparatively densely populated regions. In Page 28, of the Project paper (Results Framework), the number of beneficiaries is mentioned as 110,000. Please ensure consistency in result indicators. The later seems more appropriate from value for money perspective.
- The area of land managed for climate resilience has been reduced more than thrice from the PIF stage i.e. 21950 ha to 6000 ha. For a project which focuses on natural resource management, this does not seem very plausible. Please elaborate and revise.
- Please note that the Trust Fund related indicators should be mutually exclusive with the LDCF numbers to avoid double counting at institutional level. Therefore, it is recommended to include all number of beneficiaries as LDCF core indicator only. For hectares of land also, the numbers need to be mutually exclusive. The Agency may like to segregate the numbers if possible or report it under TF indicator only.

9 April, 2020

Thanks for clarifying the land related indicators. No further comments on that. For beneficiaries, please see above.

April 13: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

#### **April 1 2020:**

For LDCF reporting purposes the team discussed consolidation with the counterparts to report on beneficiaries according to the LDCF Tracking Tool method in Annex 6 of the PP. The number of beneficiaries is 52,500 which includes the following groups: (a) 25,000 direct beneficiaries from improved SLM practices, (b) 5,700 direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical and natural assets; (c) 8,750 direct beneficiaries from the new/improved climate information systems; (d) 5,700 entrepreneurs supported, and (e) 7,350 of direct beneficiaries who will participated in planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation of landscape management activities. Cumulatively for three SSNRMP phases – 137,500 direct beneficiaries (of which females comprise 58,435 or 43 percent).

At the outset it should also be emphasized, that since concept stage approval, the political context in Sudan has been unstable and therefore the government has ensured that the indicator numbers be adjusted to reflect the reality on the ground and its measurability during the project. This was discussed during the decision review meeting of the project. The total area under landscape management is now 57,000 split between Core indicator 3 which increased from 12,000 Ha to 27,650 Ha

and, Core Indicator 4 which was adjusted down to 29,250 Ha. This reduction in half is based on ground truthing by the government team and M&E guidance received during project preparation on attribution. It is also clarified that the number 21,950 ha included targets of two activities (a) IR indicator 2.1. Forest areas reforested and rehabilitated as a result of the project – 15,950 ha and (b) IR indicator 2.4. Total rangeland areas to be rehabilitated by the project – 6,000 ha. Therefore, the number 21,950 ha remains relevant as a composite target contributing to the resilience and adaptation aspects of the project.

As recommended by the GEFSEC PM, beneficiaries are attributed to LDCF core indicator only and not the GEF LD. It should however be reminded that the project contributes to both ecosystem and peoples' resilience. And takes a holistic landscape approach with cross cutting impacts including adaptation benefits. Therefore it is unreasonable and unrealistic to separate each land use intervention by TF for the Core indicators on land and landscapes. The presentation is in line with the approved concept stage core indicators.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please refer to comments in the previous part. The agency is requested to elaborate how and what adaptation related activities will address the climate vulnerability challenges of the target regions. While the vulnerability context (Annex 5) very well outlines how the project could potentially address vulnerability of farmers and pastoralists through resilient agriculture, water management and natural resource management, the project components (particularly component 2) do not include specific activities or outputs contributing to this objective.

The Rio Marker of the project is tagged as Adaptation 1. Given that Adaptation is the principal objective of the project, it has to be Adaptation 2. Please revise.

9 April 2020:

No additional comments.

#### **Agency Response**

**April 1, 2020:**

See responses under item 2. Specific project activities are listed in detail under Component 2 in Table B in Annex 1 to Project Paper.

Rio Market has been revised.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The agency is requested to briefly describe baseline projects in the project document beyond just the SSNRMP phase 1. This may include policies and programs of Sudan government and any other donor funded (e.g. UK- as mentioned in their comment) projects.

9 April 2020: Thank you. No additional comments.

**Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

**April 1, 2020:**

Noted. the issue was bilaterally discussed with GEFSEc PM and the following paragraph has been added to PP

**Baseline Projects and Aid Coordination.** During project appraisal, consultations were conducted with the ongoing relevant projects in the targeted areas to ensure effective coordination and harmonization of activities. These projects include the Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Program in the Horn of Africa (DRSLP) in Gadarif state implemented by the African Development Bank and IGAD since 2015. The DRSLP aims to address the root causes of drought in the targeted areas focusing on water management, rangeland development and rehabilitation and improvement of crops and livestock production through its four components: (i) natural resources management, (ii) market access and trade, (iii) livelihoods support, and (iv) project management and capacity building. In addition, Phase 3 will take into account the well proven interventions by IFAD's project "Butana Integrated Rural Development Project, BIRDP" which has covered five states including Khartoum and Gadarif states. The BIRDP aims to strengthen the resilience of the targeted communities to drought and to sustainably improve their livelihoods through four components: (i) policy and institution building, (ii) natural resources management, (iii) livestock and marketing development, and (iv) community development, business options. The outputs of the DRSLP's and BIRDP's components provide key guidelines for Phase 3 implementation. Furthermore, implementation of Phase 3, in particular water management practices, will benefit from the recommendations and lessons learnt from the recent UN Environment's report on the Integrated Water Resources Management; Good Practices in Sudan. On the wider scope, the UK Department of International Development (DFID), and under the guidance of the UN Environment, has been supporting the government of Sudan through its ADAPT project which aims to increase the understanding of climate resilience and environmental management in Sudan and ensuring the integration of best practices throughout delivery, planning and policy. Under the ADAPT project, the first Sudan's State of Environment Report is being developed while an Environment Background Paper to support the development of Sudan's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper is produced. Accordingly, and beyond the best practices of SSNRMP Phase 1, the project design of SSNRMP Phase 3 is considering the

lessons learnt from the implementation of these projects. The project will continue its regular consultations and dialogue with the relevant partners and donors to avoid any overlaps among the different activities and interventions as well as to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts. It is noteworthy to mention that SSNRMP is part of Sudan's Natural Resources Management Network which is a coordination platform that involves all the governmental institutions, NGOs, INGOs, donors, and projects that are working in NRM. The network provides a good platform to exchange lessons learnt and ensure that the different projects' interventions complement each other.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

As mentioned previously, the key gap is under component 2 which does not elaborate the adaptation related activities and outputs well to link with the outcome of improved resilience of communities. Please describe this in Project description section and Table B.

9 April 2020: Thank you. Component 2 is well elaborated and clearly linked with adaptation benefits.

April 13: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

### **April 1, 2020:**

See responses under item 2. Expanded description of project activities is now included in Table B of data sheet.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

A brief description outlining the project's linkage with each LDCF objectives (CCA 1 and CCA 2) and the GEF trust fund objective is recommended. This will help in comprehending the alignment better and also the importance of this multi-trust fund project to deliver both adaptation and global environmental benefits.

9 April 2020: The added description is fine. No more comments.

### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

### **April 1, 2020:**

LDCF reasoning has been revised. Alignment with CCA and LD objectives has been added in paragraph 3 of Annex 6.

The project contributes to CCA and LD objectives in the following ways:

- CCA-1: Project activities on increasing resilience through innovation and technology transfer are laid out in Annex 1, Component 2, in “Strengthening resilience of communities” and “Engaging the private sector” paragraphs.
- 

CCA-2: Project activities on mainstreaming climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact are laid out in Annex 1, Component 1 in “Information and Communication Plan” and Component 2, “Strengthening resilience of communities” paragraphs.

- 

LD-1-1: Project activities on maintaining or improving flow of agroecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through SLM are laid out in Annex 1, Component 2 in “Development of locality extension approaches” and “Adoption of community-based SLWM practices” paragraphs.

LD-1-4: Project activities on reducing pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increasing resilience in the wider landscape are laid out in Annex 1, Component 2, in “Rangeland management”, “Protection and use of water resources”, and “Forest ecosystem rehabilitation and restoration” paragraphs.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please see comments above. The agency is requested to briefly describe how each co-finance and the current baseline projects/policies are linked with project components.

9 April 2020: No additional comments

### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

**April 1, 2020:** See responses above . The data sheet already included the description of the cofinancing contributions. Additional information has also been provided on the baseline.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

An elaboration of alignment with the CCA and LD objectives will be useful. The Theory of Change provides the logical framework of how the project will contribute to GEBs and Adaptation benefits.

9 April 2020: Thanks. No more comments.

#### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

**April 1, 2020:** See responses above (pt 4). Annex 6 has been revised to highlight better the CCA and LD objectives.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

While the technologies and solutions are more traditional, the Secretariat acknowledges the project's focus on private sector engagement as an innovative approach. However, the focus of engagement with private sector seems limited to clean energy solutions such as solar and biogas and not much on core activities such as water harvesting, livestock management or land management. A brief description on this will strengthen the innovation aspect of the project.

The significant co-finance commitment by national government is expected to scale up the impact of project. The capacity building components of the project is critical too in ensuring potential scaling up.

9 April 2020: Thank you. No additional comments.

## Agency Response

**April 10 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

**April 1, 2020:** “Engaging the private sector” has been added to complement “Strengthening resilience of communities” to Annex 1, Component 2 description.

**Strengthening resilience of communities** through establishing multiple water harvesting structures, including with the application of GHG technologies (solar panels), strengthening the asset base of rural farmers including natural and financial capital, increasing the diversity of smallholder farming systems through the promotion of mixed cropping-livestock systems and diversification of crops; enhancing household food security and wellbeing through the introduction and improvement of home gardens; promoting equity and inclusion of vulnerable and marginal groups especially women; enhancing local institutions through support to VDCs; diversifying access to alternative sources of energy, and improving the availability of/and smallholder access to climate information. Phase 3 will explore the demand for biogas technologies, which convert biological waste into energy. In addition to having a clean renewable energy provide gas for household needs, many families make extensive use of the fertilizer by-product that biogas digesters provide.

**Engaging the private sector.** Since the beginning of SSNRMP, the project has linked public agencies, private sector and financial institutions through workshops, conferences and trainings to exchange perspectives and understand the role of private and public actors in community resilience activities. Component 1’s focus on regulatory frameworks and policies has facilitated market entry of climate resilience technologies. Some of these include: (i) solar panels to replace diesel pumps for remote village communities; (ii) gas cylinders to replace firewood for village cooking; (iii) non-forest product marketing to reduce transactional costs to market; and (iv) a piloting of biogas technology in SSNRMP3. The introduction of environmentally sound technologies is encouraging communities to establish further micro-finance capacities and the local private sector to further invest in commercializing these same technologies. Private sector engagement in the context of this project will relate to exploring the potential for adopting clean energy technologies and plan for empowering the role of private sector in climate resilient interventions; i.e. SLWM by developing the capacity of the relevant groups, individuals, and companies to implement their natural resources enterprises in a sustainable manner. One of the main responsibilities of the SLM consultant, who will be hired under SSNRMP phase 2, is to identify opportunities for private sector participation and partnership in SLM interventions in the targeted areas, to apply and incorporate them as relevant in the implementation of phase 3. The project will support participation of entrepreneurs in solutions that increase resilience to climate change impacts. The main challenges in this area include limited opportunities for entrepreneurship, lack of enabling environments to devise solutions to address climate change, and limited support for climate innovation activities. To address these gaps, the project will create partnerships with the relevant authorities to open opportunities for entrepreneurship, especially for youth and women, through training and adoption, open sources of financing and benefit from the opportunities of the Sudanese microfinance law. These activities will be monitored through a dedicated indicator “Entrepreneurs supported to enhance climate resilience”. Finally, recommendations from a private sector study carried out under the REDD+ Readiness project will provide useful insights for consultations with beneficiary communities to help derive priority climate resilient project activities. The study maps all the major companies in the private sector that are engaged in natural resources activities. This will support the project to identify potential partners and the strategic options for involvement, particularly companies that showed interest and/ or willingness to engage in interventions that promote environmental sustainability.

## Project Map and Coordinates

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, gender issues are factored in well throughout the project design.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please refer to the comments under innovation question.

April 13: Comment cleared.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** See responses above. .

**Risks**

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Risks are elaborated well.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The implementation arrangement is elaborated well under Annex 2.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The link with NAP of Sudan is described well.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The information and knowledge management plan along with communication plan is robust.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

M&E plan is elaborated well and budget is also set aside for the same.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The proposal alludes well to job creation and rural income improvement through various project activities around improved forest and rangeland management, infrastructure development and training and capacity building.

April 13: Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Annexes**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes

**Agency Response**

## **Project Results Framework**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Project results framework is provided. The Agency is requested to review the overlap of target indicators between GEF Trust Fund and LDCF.

April 13: Comment cleared.

**Agency Response April 1, 2020:** Noted. Clarifications have been provided in the responses above. Thank you  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The comments made at PIF stage and a pre-ER submission have been responded. Additional comments are provided through this review on the portal.

April 13: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**April 10 2020:** Given the emerging context shaped by the COVID-19 pandemic, the project stipulates flexibility to address relevant requests of the Government of Sudan to support activities to fight coronavirus that align with project's general focus on building up resilience, including at the community level. Per the project objective "to increase adoption of sustainable land and water management practices in targeted states", interventions will support improved water harvesting techniques and access to water. Access to potable water is key to meeting basic hygiene needs critical to containing the spread of the virus. The project will also support alternative livelihood interventions as well efforts to improve food security. Under the component to support research work on climate-induced vector borne studies, the project could contribute to relevant epidemiological studies around climate and environmental factors and viral diseases. This was discussed bilaterally with the GEFSEC to align with both the WB and GEF's efforts towards the COVID-19 response.

**April 1, 2020:** Noted. These were the third set of comments and all have been addressed. We look forward to technical clearance to allow timely delivery of the project to the Banks Board. Thank you.

**Council comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** The Agency has responded to Council Members' comments. The ER will be shared with them prior to CE approval for their assessment of responses.

**Agency Response**

STAP comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** NA

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** Provided.

**Agency Response**

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response**

**May 1, 2020 :** Responses to comments below in the absence of a response box.

1. Revised the attribution. This was likely a portal glitch as the earlier CC entry was perhaps not saved earlier.

2. As per process and usual procedure the comment response matrix is submitted with the package. While the comments and responses were cleared by PM , they have yet again been further revised to elaborate the contexts. It is important to mention that the Agency was not informed of any pending STAP comments in the multiple reviews since Dec 2019, and were received by the agency on April 24 2020, . Nevertheless those have been addressed and included in the response matrix.
3. On Co-financing, the in-kind option was included based on GEF PMs recommendation to revise. Also noting that there is no drop down option for selecting cash. It is now selected as other.
4. The gender context in the project is captured in the GEF data sheet, and is integrated within the component design relative to its scope, and was cleared by the PM for adequacy. Nevertheless further information has been included. Please also refer to section in the GEF data sheet and related Annex.

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The Agency is requested to address additional comments provided.

9 April 2020: The Agency is requested to address additional comments.

April 13: All comments have been addressed and the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement

April 24: The agency is requested to address following additional comments and re-submit the endorsement request

1. On Programming of LDCE Fund: Focal Area should be Climate Change

2. On Council Comments: Although the agency has adequate responses to Council comments, it would have been good if the response itself is entered in the Portal rather than referring to a document. This is true for responses to Canada and to Germany as highlighted below. If this is the case, it is necessary to include the Project Document being referenced to when circulating to Council. In the case of WB's responses to UK, it was correctly done by referring their response to a page in the



document while at the same time quoting it as part of the Portal entry. Also, please review whether responses to STAP are there too. Attached is STAP's comments: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Revised\\_Copy%20of%2010083\\_screen\\_2CW.PDF](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Revised_Copy%20of%2010083_screen_2CW.PDF)

3. On Co-financing: The letter from the State of Khartoum mentions cash, not in-kind. Please modify the co-finance type accordingly.

4. Gender information is provided in section that a gender gap analysis was conducted during preparation. The information provided is scant. In addition, indication of planned activities to address gaps is provided but again without any details. Please attach the gender gap analysis and or provide additional information on the findings of the analysis and planned activities in section 4.

May 4, 2020

1. Focal area is tagged correctly as climate change.

2. STAP comments have been responded well.

3. Co-financing type for State of Khartoum has been revised as "unknown at this stage". However, the description below the co-finance Table C says the following:

- Consultations with the Government of the State of Khartoum about this project helped develop its willingness to contribute to the project. The committed funds will support project activities through seconded specialists, office premises, vehicles and other in-kind contributions and their support to public investments. In the absence of option for cash it is relabeled as Other

The Agency is requested to make this consistent with the typology in the table. Please also add a sentence for IFAD co-finance mentioning that \$14 million of their full SNRLP program will be utilized as co-finance for this project.

- The Gender information is adequately provided.

MAY 4, 2020

As commented earlier, please make the co-financing type for State of Khartoum co-finance consistent in the table and in the text below. The explanation indicates the co-financing as other. The table says Unknown at this stage. "Unknown at this stage" co-finance type is not acceptable at CEO ER stage. You may like to make it public investment mobilized or other.

May 4, 2020

All comments have been cleared and the CEO endorsement is recommended.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<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**

The Sudan's Multi-Trust Fund project (GEFTF+LDCF) aligns with the GEF 7 LDCF-SCCF programming strategy and LD focal area strategy of the GEF Trust Fund. The full scale proposal for CEO Endorsement has addressed all the comments provided by GEF Secretariat and Council Members at the PIF stage satisfactorily and has been strengthened to deliver adaptation and global environmental benefits in Sudan.

The project is built on GEF 5 GGW-SSNRMP project in Sudan and aims to advance the best practices from this project in two important districts Khartoum and Gadarif. It will do so with a new focus of climate resilience of vulnerable communities through sustainable land management, climate resilient agriculture and alternate livelihoods for improved adaptive capacity. The project has also given due consideration to the COVID-19 pandemic in Sudan and has proposed flexibility to address relevant requests by Government of Sudan to support activities to fight coronavirus that align with project's focus on strengthening resilience of communities.

In line with GEF 7's integrated approach, the multi-trust funding allowed the project to take a holistic and integrated natural resources management approach to link climate change adaptation activities in support of combating land degradation in the target sites. The joint

programming allowed the project to improve management of more than 90,000 hectares of land to reduce land degradation and managed for climate resilience and also directly benefit 52,500 climate vulnerable people in the target districts. The number of direct beneficiaries is likely to be more during the project who will benefit from improved land use planning and policy frameworks in addition to capacity building, asset development, access to climate services, alternate livelihoods and business development support by the project.

The project proposes a sound implementation strategy having implementation units both at national level as well as at state level. To ensure stronger local community engagement the state level project implementation units will involve village development committees (VDCs) which were formed in the previous phase of the project. Involving these committees will not only ensure locally led adaptation and natural resource management but also ensure long term institutional sustainability of the project outcomes. To ensure project's alignment with Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI) in Sudan, the proposed Technical Committee of the project will be chaired by the Focal Point of Sudan GGWI.

Based on the feedback provided at the PIF stage by GEF Secretariat and Council, the project has strengthened its climate change adaptation rationale and innovation aspects with specific activities such as supporting access to climate information, scaling up innovative and best practices on land management and supporting entrepreneurs to set up climate resilient alternative livelihoods. It has also leveraged \$14 million co-finance from IFAD's sustainable natural resources and livelihood project which will complement the project to strengthen focus on community based planning and adoption of best practices. Together the project is likely to have transformational impact on climate resilient natural resource management in the country to protect vulnerable landscapes and improve resilience of communities.

Based on the above, the CEO is recommended to endorse the project.