

Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10159

Countries

Sudan

Project Name

Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/17/2021

Review completed by PM

10/28/2021

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project remains aligned with LDCF strategy.

Agency Response Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request

The project design is fine. Please address following comments:

- The output 3.1 is very generic and reads more like a long term outcome. It isn't clear what output will be delivered.

- Please also specify which component of the project will address social protection and how.

October 18, GEFSEC

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

- Output 3.1 was revised to detail more clearly specific outputs. This includes the delivery of project inputs and results within key regulatory and policy frameworks, e.g., National Drought Resilience Initiative (NDRI), the National Agriculture Investment Programme (NAIP), and perhaps most importantly the NAP currently under preparation.

- Social protection will be a cross-cutting issue across each of the project's three components. The process was initiated through many of the PPG actions and reflected within the project design. This includes the completion of Annex II: Environmental and Social Risk Certification which includes evaluation of many social protection/safeguard issues. During project implementation, social protection will be further integrated and reflected in the LUP and Climate Vulnerability assessment work under Component 1. Within Component 2, social protection will be reflected in the approaches taken to build on-the-ground capacity for more climate change resilient practices. This will be particularly important and integrated within the project's approach towards FFS and extension services that will acknowledge and address social protection elements. Finally, under Component 3, the project will monitor, track and capture lessons relevant to social protection to make certain these issues are being addressed successfully. Lessons learned will be integrated within foreseen regulatory and policy improvements, particularly informing the on-going NAP process and North Darfur specific policy and investment frameworks.

October 22

Noted

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response Noted

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response Noted

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please upload the updated LDCF core indicator and metadata sheet of CEO ER stage.

Also, please remove entry of core indicator 11 in the portal. This is for GEF Trust Fund projects only.

GEFSEC October 18,

Thanks. Please provide targets for sub-indicators also. Currently only core indicators targets are provided. If possible, please also enter the data in the portal.

Also, the meta-information of sectoral distribution is too diverse. Please allocate the percentages on core focus areas only. For example, we suggest to remove percentage allocation for health and DRM as the project components do not have explicit focus on these.

GEFSEC October 26

Thanks. Comment cleared now.

Agency Response

The updated LDCF core indicator and metadata sheet has been uploaded.

Core indicator 11 was removed from the portal.

October 22

Noted with thanks.

Targets were provided for sub-indicators. The meta-data sheet was revised focusing on core areas. Data is now captured in the portal as well.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Please elaborate more on the climate related risks and impacts on the "target landscapes" and target sectors of "Agriculture and Livestock". Please also provide information on future trends that the project will factor in to ensure long term resilience.

GEFSEC October 18,

Thanks for further clarification and details. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

As noted throughout the project document and particularly in the "context", "threats", and "climate risks" sections, both the agriculture and livestock sectors are facing substantial climate risks in the target landscapes. Climate change projections indicate future trends such as increased temperatures, less reliable and more variable rainfall events, and short and long-term desertification. These impacts are exacerbated in part by the shifting land use patterns, e.g., increased amount of lands used for agriculture and

decreased availability of pastureland. This is very much the root cause of conflict in the North Darfur region. It is a climate change induced social and ecological challenge. This challenge is specifically what the project sets out to help alleviate through the implementation of a series of innovative approaches.

October 22

Noted

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

The alternate scenario is elaborated well. However, a key question is how the project will factor in climate vulnerability in planning and identifying solutions under outcome 2. A range of activities are proposed but it is not clear how they will be informed by climate risks and vulnerability of communities. Will the project conduct a vulnerability assessment to ensure that interventions are addressing specific climate hazards related to drought, flooding, etc.?

GEFSEC October 18,

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This is well-noted. The activities to be undertaken under Component 2 will be based upon and informed by the climate change vulnerability assessments to be carried out under Component 1. The results of Component 2 will be monitored throughout the project period to make certain activities implemented are successfully addressing vulnerabilities. This information will be captured under Component 3 and used to inform on-going VA work and subsequent programming as initiated under Component 2. The objective will be to set in place a "circular" pattern of monitoring, assessment, practice, learning and adaptation to strengthen the on-the-ground approaches supported by capacitated extension and carried forward through on-going and future FFS actions.

October 22

Noted

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response Noted

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

The STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MATRIX can't be read on the portal. Also, it seems there are double entries of stakeholder tables. The entire section is too long.

GEFSEC October 18,

It is still not readable. Please upload again.

GEFSEC October 26

Thanks. Although SEM is still not uploaded well in the portal, the supporting document is fine. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This is well noted, the SEM has been updated and properly uploaded into the portal.

October 22

Noted with thanks, the SEM was re-uploaded again, and also uploaded as a supporting document in the portal.

Nov 9

Noted, the table was rebuilt and re-inserted and it is now correctly displayed in the portal.

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes. Given the intensive community engagement need in project implementation, the project will benefit from more direct engagement of credible CSOs as executing partners on the ground. Will the project engage them in project delivery or just as stakeholders for consultation?

GEFSEC October 18,

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Noted. The project intends to engage CSO's both as "stakeholders" and to support aspects of project delivery" based upon inputs from the Government of Sudan.

October 22

Noted

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

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

Yes.

Agency Response Noted

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please upload the LDCF indicator tracking sheet.

Thanks. Please note the comments to be addressed in the indicator tracking sheet.

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This is well noted, the LDCF indicator tracking sheet is now uploaded into the portal.

October 22

Noted with thanks, an updated version of the LDCF indicator tracking sheet was uploaded into the portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response Noted

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please address the following comments and resubmit the project with adjustments and responses in the box below:

1. On Project Information: the Focal Area outcomes are missing. Please include.
2. Stakeholder engagement: The "STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT MATRIX" in the portal is unreadable. This has been indicated earlier also. Please fix the table. All agencies are able to do it.
3. The Budget stipulates the purchase of vehicles and motorbikes. Per Guidelines, the preferred practice is to cover motorized vehicles with the co-financing funds. Also, for a project of this size, it may be better to utilize the LDCF funding for more substantial purposes.
4. The budget line (impact monitoring and reporting, implementation of monitoring framework to support informed decision making across components) is charged to the 3 components but due to the name of the activities, it should entirely be charged to the M&E Budget.
5. On the status of utilization of PPG: please fill in the missing fields

6. The agency response to a comment provided by the Council Member from Germany couldn't be located.

7. Co-financing: Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources \$700,000 grant: It is not clear if this amount will be provided in the form of grant. Please request the agency to confirm. IF confirmed as grant then this should be categorized as Investment Mobilized and not as recurrent expenditure and be described how it was identified in the paragraph below the table. No need to revise the co-financing letter.

November 11, 2021

Thanks for the responses and adjustments. Most of the comments are addressed well. Regarding comment 3, the current political situation in Sudan and thereby the limitations of HCENR for providing co-finance for vehicle purchase is well noted. However, we would suggest that the project utilize other co-financing particularly the \$10 million investment from the FAO to cover the cost of vehicles and transport.

November 15, 2021

Thanks for your response. However, given strong local presence of FAO and its ongoing projects, we would like the Agency to utilize the existing vehicles for effective delivery of the project. While, we agree that Sudan is an LDC, there are other LDCs also supported by the LDCF where projects do not request for vehicles even with a wider geographic coverage. As mentioned earlier, the LDCF grant is relatively small for this project and we would like it to be used in the most cost-effective manner, particularly by avoiding covering cost for vehicles.

November 29, 2021

Thanks for the additional justification and the revised budget. The comment is cleared now.

Agency Response

Noted

Nov 9

1. Noted, FA outcomes are now included

2. Noted, the SEM was rebuilt and re-inserted and it is now correctly displayed in the portal

3. Noted. The preferred practice was highlighted during exchanges with national partners.

In light of the ongoing budget restrictions in Sudan, the Higher Council of Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR), the North Darfur State Ministry of Production and Economic Resources, and other Government entities and partners on the ground are unable to provide cofinancing to buy vehicles and motorbikes to enable the implementation of field interventions. Transportation means are needed to implement project interventions mainly demonstrative practices under Component 2.

Given the large areas covered by the project along the livestock routes in Northern Darfur, the existing fleet of vehicles is largely insufficient and therefore at least 2 vehicles and 5 motorbikes (as the necessary minimum) will be needed for the project to reasonably deliver sound interventions across the target landscapes.

Based on the above, two vehicles are included to cover a wide geographical area spanning the 20 target villages along livestock corridors in North Darfur, and 5 motorbikes were also included to enable the technical project assistants located in each of the 5 target localities in North Darfur to provide technical backstopping and tailored support to project interventions at local level on a daily basis.

4. Noted. This budget line is now charged to the M&E budget and the budget revised accordingly.

5. Noted, the missing information was provided.

6. Noted with thanks, the agency response to the comments made by council members were added under Annex B (Response to Project Reviews)

7. Noted with thanks. This was corrected as an in-kind contribution through the recurrent expenditures of the HCENR across the target landscapes. The investments mobilized through other partners were described.

Nov 15

Noted with thanks.

The Cofinancing provided by FAO in-kind will be mainly through technical and logistical backstopping through its offices in the capital Khartoum and in El Fasher/North Darfur to support the implementation of project interventions including in kind staff time, office space, and meeting facilities.

While mutual supportiveness and economies of scales will be sought with the other investments mobilized through the GUMS, FN-REPRO and EULGP projects with regards to the use of the existing fleet of vehicles whenever possible, at least 2 pick-up type vehicles and 5 three-wheel pick-up motorbikes are still needed for the project to transport project's materials and inputs and reasonably deliver sound interventions in the 20 target villages and related landscapes along the 680 km livestock routes in Northern Darfur given the large areas covered by the project.

This is a critical investment in light of Sudan's status as an LDC, where transportation means are limited at technical institutions to achieving project core objectives and results, as well as the current economic situation in Sudan.

Nov 23

Noted with thanks. Please see the uploaded letter justifying the need for purchasing Vehicles. As explained in the letter, in order to reduce the investment related to purchasing vehicles, and maximize to the extent possible the amount of the GEF grant used to finance project interventions, the budget line for vehicles/unit was revised from 45k to 33K.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response Noted

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. Comments have been addressed well.

Agency Response Noted
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response Noted
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response Noted
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response Noted
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response Noted
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response Noted
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
NA
Agency Response
Noted

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 NA

Agency Response Noted

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 NA

Agency Response Noted

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not yet. The agency is requested to address a few additional comments.

November 7 2021

Please address additional comments provided under the GEFSEC comments section in the review sheet.

November 11, 2021

Please address the additional comment related to vehicle purchase and resubmit the project.

November 15, 2021

The project is returned again to the Agency to reconsider the purchase of vehicles using LDCF resources. Please see detailed comment above under GEFSEC Comments section.

November 29, 2021

The additional justification and revisions in the vehicle budget is fine. The project is technically cleared for CEO Endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/5/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This project "Sudan: Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur" aims to reduce climate vulnerability of pastoral and farming communities along the migratory routes in North Darfur and improve their social protection, food security and nutritional status.

It will enhance resilience by systematically addressing the prevailing conflicts over use of diminishing resources which is exacerbated by frequent droughts, climate variability and water shortages. The project is aligned with Sudan's NAP and Darfur specific policies to tackle climate change and build peace. It is in line with the LDCF objectives on adaptation technology transfer and climate mainstreaming and will contribute directly to addressing the climate risk and security agenda.

The project will strengthen planning and decision-making capacity of communities and government by setting up a comprehensive conflict resolution mechanism and developing integrated land-use and sustainable livelihood plans. Through the agro-pastoral field schools, the project will enhance capacity of extension workers and other government service providers to support small holder farmers implement climate resilient agriculture and livestock management approaches and assist private producers identify, prioritize, and implement innovative climate resilient practices and businesses.

The project also seeks to mainstream best practices and decision-making tools through a comprehensive knowledge management approach in key national and regional policy frameworks for uptake and impact at scale.

With an LDCF grant of 2.77 million USD and co-finance of 11.3 million USD, the project will directly benefit 50,000 people with 50 percent women beneficiaries and improve land management for climate resilience in 200,000 hectares. The project has a unique focus on women-headed households and local small and medium enterprises in conflict affected areas as it aims to engage with them to develop and implement adaptation solutions.

The project will be implemented at a time when the country is facing COVID-19 risk and is in the recovery process. The project at inception will integrate COVID-19 considerations within the implementation strategy and action framework. This will include prioritizing implementation activities and adjusting the timing of these activities to address existing and potential COVID-19 considerations and concerns. It will integrate COVID-19 related concerns within associated risk analysis, taking into consideration issues such as availability of technical expertise, impacts to stakeholder engagement, effects upon enabling environments, and financing issues.

At the same time, the project will consider opportunities for this GEF investment to support building back better. This may include opportunities to lower environmental impacts and associated health risk exposures to limit the potential impacts of COVID-19. This is particularly pertinent to this project since it is designed to focus upon improving sustainable agriculture across productive landscapes with a direct linkage to improving environmental and human health. The project will also consider and integrate methodologies to monitor and evaluate COVID-19 related impacts to project design and implementation. In this way, the program will contribute to overall GEF capacity to innovate pro-active and effective responses to COVID-19 issues within existing and future programming.