



# Climate Adaptation and Resilience Enhancement for South Sudan (CARES)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11322

**Countries**

South Sudan

**Project Name**

Climate Adaptation and Resilience Enhancement for South Sudan (CARES)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

9/23/2023

**Review completed by PM**

11/21/2023

**Program Manager**

Ladu David Morris Lemi

**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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

### **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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

### **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

GEFSEC, October 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes, however, given the multidimensional nature of climate change impacts, output 1.1.1 should include all relevant sectors instead of limiting it to agriculture sector only.

Agency's Comments 2023.10.18 - Output 1.1.1 has been revised to further highlight the project's multidisciplinary approach.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, November 16, 2023

Although the Agency has noted adjustment of component 3 to reflect gender responsive dimension, all outputs do not have any gender-specific references. Please reflect gender perspectives in the relevant outputs in Outcome 3

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Outcome 3 has very important gender dimensions. Please reflect gender-responsiveness/gender perspectives in Component 3. Please ensure that Output 4.1.2 include project results and lessons learned on gender equality/gender mainstreaming.

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

Knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation have been included particularly in component 4 of the project. However, there are no specific activities identified in any of the components where women are expected to play a key role in specially in the decision making processes envisioned.

Please ensure a clear elaboration of gender specific roles in the project implementation process in either component 2, 3 or component 4.

### Agency's Comments

2023.10.18 - The updated Component 2 explicitly outlines activities involving women and youth, thereby enhancing the project's inclusivity and reinforcing its overall objectives.

2023.11.06 - The description of Component 3 has been adjusted to reflect the gender-responsive dimension of Outcome 3. Output 4.1.2 has been adjusted accordingly.

2023.11.16 - Outcomes 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 have been modified to explicitly incorporate an approach that prioritizes both inclusivity and gender sensitivity.

**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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

### Agency's Comments

#### **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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

#### 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

GEFSEC, October 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) No. Although a list of other ongoing or pipeline projects has been identified, there is no analysis or presentation of what lessons were learned from either previous initiatives or the ongoing interventions. Since there obviously previous intervention in the areas where the CARES project is targeting, there is need to provide an analysis of those previous projects and lessons learned.

d) The stakeholders have been inadequately described. The project will be implemented in 7 states. However, consultations were only conducted in two states (i.e. Greenbelt area). Could you provide details on how the views of the pastoral communities in Jonglei, Warrap and Lake states were captured including a list of those consulted and the relevant dates for the State consultations. Additionally, youth constitute the largest proportion of the pastoral as well as crop farmers' communities. However, there is limited information on youth involvement in this project. Please provide details on youth engagement in the project that would contribute to Outcome 3.2 and others.

Okay noted

Agency's Comments 2023.10.18 - At this initial stage, the design of the project incorporates essential lessons learned from past initiatives and significant insights from key informants. These elements are integrated into the project's activities as catalysts for innovation, reinforcing its credibility, relevance, and anticipated impact. A comprehensive evaluation of past lessons, an assessment of ongoing initiatives for potential synergies, and a detailed stakeholder analysis and engagement plan are all scheduled for the PPG stage. This approach reflects our conviction that dedicating adequate time and resources to these assessments is fundamental to the project's long-term success. This is especially pertinent for stakeholder engagement, which is integral to the project's participatory and inclusive nature.

## **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  
GEFSEC, October 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes, however, some elements have not been clearly stated.

Output 1.1.1.

(A). "a specialized unit has been setup for climate prediction and data collection..... and a multidisciplinary expert panel formed". Is this arrangement part of the CARES project? Which national or state institutions are involved in the specialized unit and the expert panel?

Output 1.1.2.

(A). On paragraph 2 (page 18) regarding policy for forest conservation, it is not clear which aspects of the project contribute to that policy or if the project intends to develop the stated policy.

(C) page 18. "Develop policy to strengthen extension services". South Sudan's ministry of Agriculture and Food Security has an existing policy on extension. Does the project intend to develop a new extension policy?

Output 2.1.1.

"National and state-level research institutes are established" page 19. Is it practically possible to establish these institutes within the project timeframe and have the required capacity in place to start generating the knowledge needed? How about strengthening the existing ones like Yei, Palataka and Halima Agricultural Research Centres instead of establishing new ones?

Output 2.2.2

(C). There are probably many cooperatives already existing in the targeted areas specially in the greenbelt region. There seems to be no need to form new ones instead of working with those already established within the project location.

Okay noted

Agency's Comments 2023.10.18 - Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.1.1, and 2.2.2 have been updated to address the insightful observations provided by the reviewer for which we are grateful. The revisions aim to clarify how the project components align with existing institutions / policies.

## **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  
GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments  
**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

GEFSEC, October 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) No. Please provide details on the current institutional arrangement and the project executing agency/ies. Although the LoE states that the Ministry of Environment is the executing entity, there is no clear outline of this in the proposal document (PIF) as well as the role of the GEF Agency in the project implementation.

b) N/A

c) Yes

d)Yes

Okay noted

Agency's Comments 2023.10.18 - The section on "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" now details the project's institutional arrangements.

**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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023



a) Yes

b) Yes

#### Agency's Comments

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

N/A

#### Agency's Comments

##### **5.6 RISKS**

**a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**

**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

GEFSEC, November 13, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Although the overall ESS risk is rated as low, the project mentioned about the communal conflict, displacement, and the growth of armed groups. However, the checklist did not recognize any social risk related to local conflicts. Please provide information or plan of assessing local conflict and potential impacts on the project.

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes,

Agency's Comments 2023.11.06 - Output 2.1.3 and the 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation' section have been updated.

#### **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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

A) Yes, it integrates forest management with crop and livestock production as well as agricultural markets linkages.

B) Yes, the project has elements of innovation and up-scaling such as, establishing functional information systems for weather-informed agricultural advisories, introduction of agro-business climate insurance coverage in the agriculture sector

C) Yes, the project intends to establish coordination mechanisms and will streamline relevant policies in the agriculture sector

#### Agency's Comments

### **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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

Yes, CCA-1-1

#### Agency's Comments

**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

GEFSEC, October 14, 2023

Yes, its aligned with national policies, plans, and commitments such as National Adaptation Plan, the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC), the Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC, UNDAF, CBD, UNCCD as well as other national and regional policies and strategies.

Agency's Comments

**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 Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes. But as stated in 4.2d above, the stakeholder consultation has not been comprehensively conducted as there is no indication on how the views of the stakeholders in 5/7 of the target states were done.

Please provide more details on the consultations in the other 5 states.

#### Agency's Comments

2023.10.18 - The Stakeholder Engagement section has been updated to clarify that a stakeholder assessment and an engagement plan will be developed and implemented at PPG. This deliberate allocation of time and resources aims to guarantee robust stakeholder involvement, thereby aligning with the project's commitment to inclusivity and meaningful engagement.

The engagement plan will address continued participation from a diverse range of stakeholders, including local communities, state administrations, decentralized and central government agencies, as well as NGOs and CSOs. The project will also actively seek partnerships with local and national NGOs and private sector entities in the project locations. This comprehensive approach will further reinforce the project's participatory strategy and foster sustained involvement and input from stakeholders across all states involved in the project.

## 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 Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes, CCA-1-1

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

No

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

No

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments  
GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

No

Agency's Comments

**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  
GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**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  
GEFSEC, November 13, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

In addition to comment below, also, please change all sources of co-financing from GEF Agency to Donor Agency.

GEFSEC, October 15, 2023

Yes. However, the description of how the co-financing was mobilized (page 44) is not clear. Please clear clarify.

Agency's Comments 2023.11.06 - Annex A has been revised to include updated co-financing methods and sourcing as advised.

**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  
GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments  
GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments  
GEFSEC, November 13, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

No. The template utilized for the LoE removed the footnote. As a general rule, all Agencies were previously advised that LoE with modifications are not acceptable. Please submit a new LoE with the footnote in place or ask OFP to email GEF that he accepts original footnote to be part of the LoE.

Agency's Comments 2023.11.06 - A new LoE has been uploaded.

**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 Comments  
GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments  
**Annex C: Project Location**

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

Secretariat's Comments  
GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**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  
GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex E: Rio Markers**



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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

**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 Comments

GEFSEC, October 17, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 13, 2023

Following the review of the Agency's response to GEFSEC's comments, the PIF and the requested PPG are recommended for technical clearance

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 22, 2023

In the targeted project location states in South Sudan, it is important to clearly describe the specific targeted counties and Payams where the project will be implemented. This is important to avoid duplication of project activities by different Agencies within the same project locations.

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/17/2023</b>	<b>10/18/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/22/2023</b>	<b>11/6/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/13/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		