

# Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Project ? North (SNRLP- North)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
12295  
**Countries**  
Sudan  
**Project Name**  
Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Project ? North (SNRLP-North)  
**Agencies**  
IFAD  
**Date received by PM**  
3/4/2026  
**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**  
Jonky Tenou  
**Focal Area**  
Multi Focal Area  
**Project Type**  
FSP

## 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(3/10/2026) Yes.The project meets GEF funding criteria, with Sudan eligible for support. It qualifies as a Full-Sized Project (FSP) under a Multi-Focal Area strategy targeting Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation. Funded by the GEF Trust Fund and aligned with GEF-8 priorities, the requested grant of \$8,257,766.00 is within Sudan's STAR allocation.

Agency's CommentsNoted with thanks.

**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

(3/10/2026)Yes. The summary provides valuable information but exceeds the recommended length of 250 words, currently comprising approximately 400 words. Please, keep the Project Summary within 250 words by focusing on the core problem, objective, main components, and key results, moving detailed information to Section B. Clearly define beneficiaries as ?8,000 direct beneficiaries (individuals)? to ensure consistency with core indicators. Explicitly highlight one or two transformational elements, such as anticipatory drought management or integrated landscape restoration to strengthen the project?s transformative narrative.

Agency's CommentsThe comment is noted with thanks ? as recommended, the word count has been reduced to 250 words. The summary includes the key aspects that were recommended for inclusion (p.3).

**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

(3/10/2026) Yes.The project objective is presented clearly and concisely in the PIF. However, the results framework would benefit from further clarification and standardization. Outputs should be consistently formulated as tangible deliverables (nouns) rather than activities.

In addition, the PIF should clearly reconcile the land restoration targets by explaining the relationship between the 10,000-ha indicated under Component 2 and the 20,000-ha reported in the project summary and core indicators. Finally, aligning output wording more closely with GEF Core Indicator definitions (e.g. using ?landscapes under improved practices? rather than alternative phrasing) would improve consistency and avoid ambiguity across sections.

The PIF should also consider including **Core Indicator 4.3**, reflecting the **area of production landscapes under sustainable land management**.

Agency's Comments

The comment is well noted. Core Indicator 4.3 will be considered at PPG. At PIF stage, and in alignment with GEF PIF template, the project will specifically contribute to four GEF core indicators at PIF. These are in the table below:

Where possible, the phrasing to reflect GEF Core Indicator definitions has been done, particularly related to the four Core Indicators in the table above.

Project Core Indicators		Expected at PIF
3	Area of land and ecosystems under restoration (hectare)	20,000
4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectare)	8,000
6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e)	3,063,142
11	People benefiting from GEF-financed investments disaggregated by sex (count)	8,000 persons (3,200 women, and 4,800 men) Youth represent 2,400 persons out of 8,000

The technical team has also made efforts to rephrase the outputs; reformulating them as tangible deliverables (nouns) rather than activities (p.5-6 and p.22-26)

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

Secretariat's Comments

(3/10/2026) Yes. While gender is well mainstreamed across components, the PIF does not yet specify a dedicated gender action plan and budget, which is acceptable at the PIF stage but should be developed by CEO Endorsement. Similarly, youth considerations could be strengthened through a clearer articulation of a youth engagement strategy, including pathways for entrepreneurship and participation in decision-making.

Regarding the M&E robustness, although the M&E framework is appropriately consistent at this stage, attention should be given to ensuring full alignment with GEF core indicator reporting requirements. Methodological notes should clearly explain how indicator targets are derived, and minor inconsistencies in beneficiary numbers and land area targets should be resolved in the final results framework.

Agency's Comments

The comments are well noted. In response:

i) Youth involvement: The stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) will be developed at PPG. The SEP will articulate youth engagement strategy, including pathways for entrepreneurship and participation in decision-making.

ii) M&E The recommendation is well noted, and raised issues will be resolved in the final results framework that will be developed during the PPG phase.

**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

(3/10/2026) Yes. GEF funds are primarily allocated to on-ground restoration and livelihoods (Component 2: \$6.19M, 84%), with sufficient support for enabling environment (Component 1: \$0.5M) and M&E/knowledge (Component 3: \$0.3M). Co-financing totals about \$30M (4:1 ratio), including government, UN, and private sector contributions. Project management costs are 5% of the GEF grant, within the 5% FSP cap, reflecting policy compliance and effective resource allocation. However, the co-financing is entirely in-kind and largely drawn from parallel projects and government recurrent expenditures, which, while valuable, may raise concerns about certainty and the share of new investment. Greater clarity on the status, funding security, and specific allocations of the cited FAO and WFP initiatives, particularly what is incremental versus baseline, would strengthen transparency. Given the project's ambitious restoration and livelihood targets in a high-risk context, exploring additional and more diversified co-financing sources could further reduce the risk of funding gaps if costs increase or planned contributions do not fully materialize.

**Co-financing** resources allocated to PMC represent 4.7% while GEF resources represent 5.0%. For a cofinancing of \$28,629,902, \$1,431,455 will represent 5.0% - please amend.

	Sub Total (\$)	6,991,751.00	28,629,092.00
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b>			
	GET	349,588.00	1,370,908.00
	Sub Total(\$)	349,588.00	1,370,908.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	7,341,339.00	30,000,000.00

At CEO Endorsement, secure and document firm co-financing commitments through formal letters that clearly specify the nature of contributions (cash or in-kind), timeframes, and any conditions, with particular attention to clarifying the concrete role of the Sudan Microfinance Development Company.

Agency's Comments

i) Co-financing: The comments on co-financing levels and the in-kind contributions are well noted and appreciated. Information has been provided on the current proposed sources (p.42-46). The team will continue engaging different partners in an effort to raise the co-financing levels. These will be confirmed at PPG during which stakeholder consultations will continue, including engaging with development partners as potential sources of additional co-financing.

ii) PMC: As advised, the amount has been adjusted to 349,588, consistent with PMC allocation standard practice (p.6).

iii) Co-financing commitments: It is noted with thanks that the team will work towards securing co-financing letters.

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(3/10/2026) Yes. The Project Rationale is generally strong but could be more concise by streamlining background information and relocating detailed climate data or baseline project lists to annexes. Clearer differentiation between baseline activities and GEF-funded interventions, for example through a simple summary table, would strengthen the incremental reasoning. The rationale would also benefit from a more explicit explanation of how named FAO and WFP initiatives will complement and coordinate with the GEF project to ensure synergies and avoid duplication. Finally, more directly acknowledging Sudan's broader conflict and security context, and its implications for land management and project feasibility, would provide a more realistic and robust baseline narrative.

**Agency's Comments**

Comment is well noted, and in response, additional information has been included that shows how FAO and WFP named initiatives will complement and coordinate with the project ? including the coordination mechanism (p.28).

Also, a section, "Socio-environmental linkages and conflict" in the document has been updated - explicitly acknowledging Sudan's broader conflict and security context. With more baseline studies and stakeholder consultations at PPG, additional information will be provided to elucidate the conflict implications on natural resources management (p.11).

**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(3/10/2026)Yes. The justification for GEF intervention is well articulated. The PIF explains that existing efforts, while important for humanitarian relief and basic livelihood support, do not address the underlying drivers of land degradation and climate vulnerability in an integrated or anticipatory manner. The GEF grant fills this gap by enabling integrated landscape management and policy reforms (Component 1) and by scaling up innovative nature-based solutions and climate smart practices (Component 2) that would not be realized under a business-as-usual scenario.

Agency's CommentsComment well noted with thanks

**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(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF is grounded in a clear and credible theory of change. The PIF clearly articulates this logic through a well-presented theory of change diagram and narrative. It also quantifies the incremental GEF contribution, including restoration of 20,000 ha of degraded land, 8,000 ha under improved practices, and an estimated 3.06 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e of emissions mitigated.

Agency's Comments Comment well noted with thanks

## **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(3/10/2026) Yes. The incremental reasoning is clearly articulated. The PIF demonstrates clear additionality by contrasting the baseline with the GEF alternative, showing how GEF funding fills critical gaps through integrated, gender-responsive restoration and systemic change.

Agency's Comments Comment well noted with thanks

## **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

(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF demonstrates strong national ownership through HCENR as executing partner, effective engagement of stakeholders from community to national levels, and strategic use of partners such as FAO, WFP, and NGOs, supported by adaptive management arrangements including a Steering Committee, participatory M&E, and a grievance mechanism.

However, while the LoE indicates that the executing partner is to be determined, the Portal currently lists the High Council for Environment and Natural Resources. Please, update the Portal noting that this can be finalized during project preparation and confirmed at CEO Endorsement.

At the same time, the PIF would be strengthened at the CEO endorsement by clearer articulation of implementation arrangements (PMU structure, field coordination, fund flows), a more concrete description of private sector engagement beyond microfinance references, clearer coordination mechanisms with key initiatives, and explicit measures to manage early implementation risks linked to capacity constraints through targeted technical assistance and capacity support.

Agency's Comments

i) The comment is well noted, and as advised, is clarified in the portal.

ii) As recommended, the technical team will provide additional information at PPG to clarify the implementation arrangements, the engagement of the private sector and explicit measures to manage early implementation risks.

**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(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF identifies core indicators with justified targets: restoration of 20,000 ha of degraded land, 8,000 ha under improved practices, and an estimated 3.06 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e of emissions mitigated using FAO's Nationally Determined Contribution Expert Tool (NEXT). The PIF should also consider including Core Indicator 4.3, reflecting the area of production landscapes under sustainable land management.

Agency's CommentsThe comment is well noted. The targets will be confirmed at PPG, and area of production landscapes under SLM will be considered at PPG after additional consultations and baseline studies.

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) N/A

Agency's Comments

## **5.6 RISKS**

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF presents a comprehensive assessment of risks across political, environmental, social, institutional, and financial dimensions, with appropriate mitigation measures. Risks are aligned with Sudan's context, including political instability, macroeconomic volatility, and climate shocks. However, the PIF would benefit from clearer justification of risk ratings, stronger articulation of conflict-sensitive measures to manage potential resource-related tensions, explicit provisions for ongoing risk monitoring, and acknowledgment of emerging systemic risks. At CEO Endorsement, clarifying the rationale for risk ratings, formalizing conflict-sensitivity and risk monitoring protocols within the M&E system, and explicitly embedding flexibility into work planning would strengthen confidence in the project's ability to manage uncertainty and deliver results in a volatile context.

As Sudan is listed on the World Bank Group FY26 Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS) list, the PIF should further strengthen its treatment of Environmental and Social Safeguards. In particular, the PIF should: (i) provide additional context on conflict-affected conditions in the proposed project areas and clearly articulate how conflict sensitivity is integrated into the project concept; (ii) outline plans to undertake a conflict-sensitive

assessment during the PPG phase and reflect its findings in project design, especially with regard to capacity-building activities, stakeholder collaboration, and safeguards for vulnerable groups, including internally displaced persons (IDPs); and (iii) clarify any feedback received from Indigenous Peoples during PIF preparation and confirm that Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be obtained during the PPG phase. In addition, the project should ensure that Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' governance systems, capacity-building needs, and traditional and local knowledge are systematically integrated across relevant project components, that Indigenous Peoples' beneficiaries are appropriately identified and disaggregated where applicable, and that project activities contribute, where feasible, to strengthening tenure security for Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

### Agency's Comments

The comment is well noted, and the team appreciates the guidance provided by the reviewer. At the time of PIF development, the priority States are not active conflict States. As guided, the rationale for risk ratings will be clarified and the conflict-sensitivity and risk monitoring protocols within the M&E system will be formalized.

As recommended, additional information has been provided on: i) conflict-sensitive assessment and integration during PPG phase; and ii) engagement with Indigenous Peoples and FPIC commitments (p.12). This information will be built upon and expanded after additional consultations and baseline studies.

### 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

(3/10/2026)Yes. The PIF embeds innovation and scalability by combining community-based drought early warning systems, integrated nature-based solutions, and policy and financial innovations to shift Sudan from reactive response to proactive, resilient development. Sustainability is reinforced through institutional capacity building, policy integration, and a knowledge and learning agenda that supports replication and national uptake.

While the project shows transformative potential and alignment with GEF's integrated approaches, clearer indicators for scaling, post-project financing pathways, and more explicit national scaling mechanisms would further strengthen its long-term impact.

Agency's CommentsThe comment is well noted, and as suggested, the PIF has been updated to include indicators for scaling, post-project financing pathways, and more explicit national scaling mechanisms would further strengthen its long-term impact (p.21).

## 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(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF is strongly aligned with GEF's priorities across biodiversity and land degradation (20,000 ha restored, 8,000 ha under improved management), and climate change (over 3 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered/avoided), while directly supporting Sudan's national commitments under the Rio Conventions. Through integrated landscape restoration and climate-resilient livelihoods, the project delivers multiple global environmental benefits and exemplifies GEF's multi-focal, integrated approach.

Agency's CommentsComment noted with thanks.

**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

(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF aligns with Sudan's national priorities and development plans. The project directly supports these aims by improving agricultural productivity sustainably and reducing vulnerability to climate hazards.

The PIF could briefly indicate how the project aligns with relevant global and regional initiatives, such as the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (2021-2030) and the Great Green Wall initiative, and how it may contribute to Sudan's reporting under the Rio Conventions. While not required for PIF approval, signaling potential engagement with regional platforms (e.g. IGAD's Drought Resilience Platform or AFR100) and opportunities for regional knowledge exchange with similar GEF/IFAD dryland initiatives in Sahel and Eastern Africa regions could add value during implementation.

Agency's CommentsThe comment is well noted and appreciated. In response, additional information has been provided on alignment with regional and global initiatives, as well as IGAD and others (p.38).

**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

(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF maps contributions to KMGBF Targets 1, 2,3, 7,8,10, 13, 20, 22 and 23, linking outputs to global biodiversity goals.

Agency's CommentsComment is well noted with thanks.

## **7 D. Policy Requirements**

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026)Yes. The PIF demonstrates compliance with all key GEF policy requirements, including safeguards, gender equality, stakeholder engagement, and accountability. Initial screening confirms manageable environmental and social risks, strong gender mainstreaming, planned stakeholder engagement, and establishment of a grievance

mechanism, with remaining instruments to be finalized during CEO endorsement. Overall, the PIF shows solid institutional commitment and readiness to proceed to CEO Endorsement, subject to minor refinement.

Agency's Comments Comment is well noted with thanks.

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

(3/10/2026) Yes. The PIF includes a list of stakeholders consulted during project preparation; however, none of the listed stakeholders appear to be Indigenous Peoples and local Community (IPLC) representatives. Additional details should therefore be provided during project design, including a clear and inclusive engagement strategy for IPLCs. It is also noted that all consultations referenced took place in 2024; please clarify whether any consultations were conducted in 2025. While some information is provided on the role of farmers? and pastoralist organizations in relation to the project objectives, further detail would strengthen the PIF, particularly regarding the roles of civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and women and youth groups. This should include information on how these groups will be engaged and consulted during project design and implementation to meaningfully inform project components and activities.

Agency's Comments Indeed most consultations were undertaken in 2024 as the Agency was building momentum to support the country to prepare the PIF. However, there was a pause in the consultations in 2025. However, the consultations were resumed after additional IFAD engagements with the government of Sudan. The consultations continued leading to the preparation of this PIF.

As has been noted above, at PPG, a stakeholder engagement plan will be prepared which will spell out project consultations with IPLCs, the youth, the private sector, and women, among others. At CEO, information will be included regarding information on how these groups will be engaged and consulted during project design and implementation to meaningfully inform project components and activities.

#### **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

(3/10/2026) Yes. However, as the project has drought related outputs. Please, revise the financing table to include LD-3.

Agency's Comments Comment has been noted with thanks ? as guided, LD-3 to address DLDD has been added.

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) N/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) N/A

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) N/A

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

(3/10/2026) PPG is requested for \$219,000.00. There is no exception

Agency's CommentsComment noted with thanks.

**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(3/10/2026) Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(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

(3/10/2026) The PIF is endorsed by the OFP. However the Letter of Endorsement (LoE) signed on March 11th, 2025 by an OFP (Dr Mona Ali-Mohammed Ahmed) which is not the same OFP in Portal (Mr. Suliman Elboni Suliman), who was appointed on February 9th, 2026 - the PIF was submitted on March 3rd, 2026. The LoE must be signed by the official OFP (Mr. Suliman Elboni Suliman) by the time of PIF submission. A new LoE is required.

The STAR resources indicated above are being endorsed for the project listed above and submitted by the GEF Implementing Agency via the GEF Portal.

Sincerely,

Dr Mona Ali-Mohammed Ahmed

Secretary General – GEF-OP Focal Point



**Sudan**

**Mr. Ibrahim Omda Khatir Tomas**

Political Focal Point since 2026-02-28

General Director

Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Khartoum

Sudan

**Mr. Suliman Elboni Suliman**

Operational Focal Point since 2026-02-09

Secretary General

Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR)

Khartoum

Sudan

Agency's CommentsThe comment is noted with thanks ? and as advised, a new LoE has been provided.

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) Yes. However, a new LoE is required and must be signed by the official OFP (Mr. Suliman Elboni Suliman).

Agency's CommentsComment well noted, and as noted above, a new LoE has been provided.

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026) Yes.

Agency's CommentsConfirmation noted with thanks

**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(3/10/2026) 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(3/10/2026)Yes. A map with geolocation information has been uploaded; however, providing separate geolocation figures would be more appropriate and clearer

Agency's CommentsThe separate geolocation figures will be provided at CEO after detailed studies have been conducted which will give indications of exact project sites ? which will be georeferenced.

**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

(3/10/2026)Yes. ESS screening has been uploaded. A full ESS package must be submitted at CEO endorsement.

Agency's Comments Comment is well noted, and the full ESS package will be submitted at CEO endorsement as has been reminded.

#### Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026)Yes.

Agency's Comments Confirmation is noted with thanks.

#### Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

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

Secretariat's Comments(3/10/2026)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(3/10/2026) N/A

Agency's Comments

#### 9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

(3/10/2026).The use of Sudan's remaining STAR allocation for a GEF project is welcome, with the project aiming to restore **20,000 ha of degraded land**, bring **8,000 ha under improved practices**, mitigate an estimated **3.06 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e**, and deliver socio-economic benefits through inclusive governance and nature-based solutions. While the Letter of Endorsement has been duly signed by the former GEF Operational Focal Point, the current PIF

requires further revision to fully meet GEF quality standards. In addition, a new Letter of Endorsement signed by the newly appointed Operational Focal Point is required.

Agency's Comments The new LOE signed by the newly appointed OFP has now been uploaded in RoadMap.

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

**Secretariat's Comments**

(3/10/2026). During project preparation and prior to endorsement, the PIF should provide additional detail on stakeholder consultations undertaken to inform project design, including the roles of the private sector, local communities, and relevant civil society organizations, and how these stakeholders will be engaged throughout project development and implementation. The stakeholder analysis should clearly explain how consultation results are reflected in project components and outputs, and how meaningful engagement with vulnerable populations and Indigenous Peoples will be ensured during implementation. In addition, once the gender analysis and Gender Action Plan are completed, their findings and actions should be systematically integrated into project components, outputs, and activities, with indicative budget allocations. Monitoring and evaluation arrangements should also ensure that MTR and TE reporting captures gender-specific results and progress on GAP implementation.

**Agency's Comments**

The additional comments are well noted ? and as noted above under 9.1, reasonable efforts have been made to address the comments, and the team looks forward to providing additional clarity during full design for CEO endorsement.

In this on-going process to improve the quality of the PIF, additional information has been provided on stakeholder consultations and how they will be engaged throughout project development and implementation (see p.39).

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/10/2026</b>	<b>3/23/2026</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>		