

Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10350

Countries

Sudan

Project Name

Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP)

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

8/12/2020

Review completed by PM

4/20/2021

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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. However, please elaborate if there are any changes in the endorsement document from the original PIF.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response There are no changes in the endorsement document from the original PIF, with the exception of a section added to the risk matrix on COVID-19. This is reflected in Part 1.

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

As indicated above, please elaborate if there are any changed from the PIF document.

Output 1.1 and 2.2 , both indicates technical assistance for NR and adaptation governance and seems overlapping. For all the outputs in Table A, results are listed. However, no results are mentioned for output 2.2.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Output 1.1 aims at strengthening NR and adaptation management, whereas Output 2.2 delivers enhanced institutional capacity on NR and adaptation governance. Output 1.1 has been rephrased for clarification.

The expected result of Output 2.2 has been elaborated in Section 3.1 ?the sustainable natural resources and livelihood adaptive programme (SNRLAP): the added value of the LDCF?. Under Output 2.2, the activities funded by LDCF will be disseminated as knowledge products and promoted through dialogues during the implementation of SNRLP to support institutional capacity building.

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

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

Please provide more details of all the different types of co-financing listed.

GEFSEC

Thank you for providing details of the IFAD funding. However, the details are primarily about IFAD's process and not much about how the funding was "identified for this LDCF project. Please provide some additional details.

11 March GEFSEC

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The explanation of grant and loan has been included in Section C ?confirmed sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type?.

19 February 2021

A paragraph was added in section C.

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

The financing is adequate. To demonstrate the cost effectiveness better, please restructure the components description to highlight LDCF supported outcomes first and then link it with the baseline project.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response The entire document, in particular Section 3.1, has been revised and restructured to highlight the LDCF's contributions to the project.

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 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 CEO Endorsement Request

The targets remain realistic. However, there is potential to have target under indicator 4. Please review and consider.

GEFSEC

We referred to core indicator 4 of the LDCF-SCCF results framework or tracking tool, not the GEF trust Fund indicator. Core indicator 4 of LDCF is about number of people trained. We see that 72000 beneficiaries are included as target under this. Thanks.

Regarding indicator 3, the Table B indicates 150 NRLMPs, however the tracking sheet says 160 plans. Please review. Also, please elaborate this indicator under section 6 of "Adaptation benefits".

Also, please remove entry of indicator 4 in the portal as it is for GEF Trust Fund projects.

In the LDCF Tracking Tool, under the meta-information sheet, please review the percentage distribution across different sectors. For example, it is not clear why coastal zone management and disaster risk reduction is included given that these aren't project's focus. We suggest to increase the share of climate information services and consider agriculture and NRM as other two sectors. Water management can also be included.

11 March 2021 GEFSEC

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The 2,850 ha of land brought under climate resilience management have been included (Jubraha).

During the discussions with the GEF, at PIF stage, it was suggested not to count the hectares planned under the implementation of NRMLPs because only indirect effects of LDCF/SNRLAP (under the IFAD co-financing).

19 February 2021

1- Noted.

2- In the tracking sheet, there are 160 ?policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience? of which 150 are NRLMPs under the ?regional policies/plans? and 10 under the ?national policies/plans? as describe in the proposal. We elaborate on this indicator under section 6 of ?Adaptation benefit?.

3- Done.

4- Done.

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

Yes. The climate scenario is very well described along with root causes and barriers.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The baseline scenario is well described. The details of baseline IFAD project is provided to provide a clear context of how LDCF could add value to Sudan's efforts to tackle climate impacts. Other baseline initiatives are also elaborated. Please review potential of linking this project with broader regional Great Green Wall Initiative which includes Sudan. The overall focus of the MSP aligns well with GGWI objectives including the IFAD-GCF project.

GEFSEC December 15:

Please elaborate on links with GGWI, if any.

GEFSEC

Please respond to the above. Thanks.

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

9 February 2021

Part II Section 2.i has been included to elaborate projects and initiatives under/relevant to GGWSSI in Sudan.

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

In the alternate scenario, a restructuring of the components is recommended for better clarity on what LDCF funding will do vis-a-vis the baseline project.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Section 3.1, has been revised and restructured to delineate between what the LDCF project will be supporting and what the IFAD baseline project is supporting.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project's alignment is elaborated based on GEF 6 LDCF SCCF programming strategy. Please revise it to link with GEF 7 strategy.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Modification was done to link to GEF 7 Strategy.
--

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the incremental reasoning is described well. However, it is recommended that incremental reasoning goes beyond just adding value to the IFAD funding to more broadly on the complete baseline scenario including national policies and other initiatives.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response The expected synergies which LDCF is expected to bring are described referring to the INDCs and SDGs in Annex 9 and to current initiatives (e.g. WWG) and past and current projects in the Sudan (FAO, WB, etc.).

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

The agency is requested to elaborate the rationale for adaptation benefits of communities from climate change more. A theory of change is also recommended to be included to provide a clear framework of how the project will deliver resilience benefits building on the baseline.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response This section has been revised to elaborate the rationale for adaptation benefits of communities from the project. A theory of change has also been provided.

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

The section could elaborate more on innovation and sustainability aspects of LDCF related support e.g. EWS, climate data integration in resource planning, etc. These are potentially innovative in the target regions too. Also, please provide sustainability aspects of EWS and climate services.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response The LDCF's support for EWS and climate data integration in resource planning has been elaborated along with expected synergies from the cooperation with agencies working on similar systems in Sudan, which can strengthen sustainability aspects.

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

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

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

Yes. The project may include FAO also as one of the stakeholders as they will also be implementing an LDCF project in Sudan. Also, it would be good to specify which CSOs the project will engage with e.g. Slow Food International

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response This was added to the proposal.

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

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

Private sector as a stakeholder and also as beneficiaries of the project is proposed.

However, the MSP could elaborate a bit more on how private sector will be engaged in the course of the project.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response This has been added to the proposal under the private sector section.

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

Please include COVID-19 as a potential risk.

GEFSEC

Thank you. We appreciate the details regarding how the project will be compliant to WHO and national government's requirements related to COVID-19. However, please provide more details about how COVID-19 can affect project outcomes/activities and how will the project address those risks. The risk in this context could be broader economic and social beyond direct health risks. Also, as per recent GEF guidance for all endorsements, Agencies are required to provide an analysis of opportunities also that the project will consider to support green and resilient recovery. Therefore, please provide an analysis of risks and opportunities associated with this project in more details (ideally as an Annex in addition to the risk table). A guide in this regard has been shared with GEF Agencies.

In addition to COVID-19, based on recent guidance from GEF STAP, all projects need to provide a brief climate risk assessment. While we acknowledge that the project will directly support tackling climate risks and impacts on communities, a short analysis is requested regarding how climate risk may affect the project outcomes. Based on STAP's guidance the analysis may include the following.

- i. Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?
- ii. How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?
- iii. Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate change and its impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?
- iv. What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

GEFSEC: Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

The potential risk due to COVID-19 (medium) has been included in Section 5 ?risk?, along with proposed mitigation measures.

19 February 2021

1. The "Action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic: an analysis of risks and opportunities" was developed in Section 5 after the risk matrix to respond to the requirements of the document shared by the GEF "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics".

2. A section was developed to present how climate risks may affect the project's outcomes and how the project was made to alleviate these risks in Section 5 after the risk matrix and the "Action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic: an analysis of risks and opportunities".

Furthermore, a thorough climate risk assessment is presented in the section "1a. Project Description. 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)" and complemented by the Annex 5 "Design Climate Change in depth analysis of SNRLP".

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

The institutional arrangement is elaborated well. The description seems to be for the baseline SNRLP project. It is understood that the LDCF funding will be embedded within it. However, the Agency is requested to provide a bit more clarity upfront on how the two programs are positioned with clear reference of how LDCF project activities will be coordinated.

GEFSEC December 15

Thank you. However, in this section also, please elaborate how the two projects will be linked from an implementation point of view.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

The revised 3.1 clarifies the relationship between the LDCF funding and the baseline SNRLP project.

19 February 2021

The revised 3.1 clarifies the relationship between the LDCF funding and the baseline SNRLP project.

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

Please review the list of national strategies and plan again and list only those which are directly relevant.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response See Annex 9 attached to the proposal and section on WWG in the proposal.

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

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. Please modify the component in the attached document if Table B is modified in CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comments cleared.

Agency Response Annex 2 - Environmental and social management plan for SNRLP
in line with the table B.

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
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
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please provide detailed budget.

GEFSEC

Thank you for the budget sheet. Please see comments below:

- Please confirm that the first sheet "Total" has the numbers in USD '000 unit. It is not specified.
- Please provide year wise break up.
- For consultancy related expenditure, please indicate a break down in terms of unit fees and number of days.

- Nearly 1.1 million is allocated for construction of Jubraka under equipment and materials budget head. The description of Jubraka indicates that it is an approach for smart agriculture which includes various activities including capacity building, best practices, etc. It is not clear what "construction" (of physical infrastructure) will be supported by LDCF funding and whether it will be better value for money. Also, this allocation to Jubraka isn't consistent with Table B budget allocation under Outputs 1.1. and 1.2 as there isn't a very clear mention that the funds will be used for construction activities primarily.

11 March 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

See Annex 8: SNRLAP Budget (including M&E and KM budget)

19 February 2021

Total is USD ?000. Now specified in the table.

Year wise break up provided.

Consultancies break down done (man-month).

A paragraph was added in output 1.2 to clarify the construction of jubrakas under the LDCF: ?The cost of construction of jubraka consists on fencing, supplementary irrigation (drop irrigation and/or small cistern), horticulture material, seeds and water fees if needed. The programme?s Economic and Financial analysis of Jubraka with size of 0,25 feddan (includes main production of cucumber (0,075 feddan), tomato (0,075 feddan), okra (0,05 feddan) and watermelon (0,05 feddan)) with investment costs including fencing, supplementary irrigation (drop irrigation and/or small cistern) and horticulture material and the recurrent costs including seeds and water fees evaluated the average incremental income at EUR 23. Compared with the model of jubraka used without CSA, the CSA model of jubraka presents a higher financial efficiency in terms of financial Net Present Value (NPV) estimated at EUR 39, financial internal rate of return (IRR) accounting for 20%, and the financial benefits-cost ratio (BCR) of 1,2.?

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

LDCF core indicator sheet is attached. The Agency is requested to provide a theory of change also.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comment cleared.

Agency Response The LDCF/SNRLAP Theory of Change is attached in annex 7.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC April 5

Please address the following comments from PPO

1. On Project Information: Duration is wrong, please correct the total duration and dates of start and completion.

2. Please attach the project budget under Annex E in the portal also.

3. Please attach the co-financing letter.

4. Gender Equality and number of beneficiaries: It is well noted that the submission provides a gender analysis and elaborates on a plan of action to address gender in the project. It is unclear, however, how any of the proposed activities will help closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. Component 1 of the project state (in output 1.1) that "72,000 community members have their NR ownership or user rights secured via registration of community forests and rangelands". It is unclear, however, (from the gender analysis or gender action plan) whether this output will be disaggregated by gender. The disaggregated numbers are inconsistent in the document.

In one place it says "50% of beneficiaries will be women e.g. In total, 99,200 people will benefit directly from the LDCF. The LDCF will support community mobilization and Natural Resources Management (NRM) planning through the creation of 150 cluster/network with Natural Resources and Land-Use Management Plans (NRLMP) with Climate Change Adaptation mainstreamed. It will enable 72,000 persons (including pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, 50% women) to build resilience to Climate Change by improving their management of natural resources, giving ownership and reducing dispute over use of land and natural resources". While in another place it says "72,000 community members, including 20,000 women and 7,200 vulnerable people will benefit directly from the LDCF investment".

Also, the above number of total beneficiaries 99,200 isn't consistent with the total number of beneficiaries in the tracking tool which says 171,200 beneficiaries. It is not clear how 72,000 number is reflected in the tracking sheet. Are they part of the total 171,200 beneficiaries? If yes, then why it is segregated from the total number?

5. Environmental and social safeguards: The project overall ESS risk has been classified as moderate and IFAD has attached the environmental and social management plan. Please ask IFAD to provide the ESS risk screening/assessment report for the project. In addition, Sudan experiences some of the world's highest levels of sexual violence, but the attached environmental and social management plan does not mention any potential issues related to disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals/groups or any risks or potential adverse impacts on women, including Gender-Based Violence or Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.

6. Budget: Please explain the details of ?Equipment & Materials and Goods? in budget; and (ii) in project information PMC is set at \$332,000 ? however in budget only \$129,000 are meant to be used ? please clarify.

GEFSEC April 20, 2021

As discussed over email, please review the core indicator 4 and relevant output target in the tracking tool of the project. The beneficiaries under this are the recipient of training and capacity building activities only, not general beneficiaries benefiting from climate adaptation solutions. So, it is different than core indicator 1.

GEFSEC April 26, 2021,

Project to be returned to the Agency due to the following additional comment from PPO :

The budget that was uploaded in Portal is off the margins, so it does not allow us to understand what is charged to which source.

In principle, from what we see, still Audits are charged to the M&E plan, but was the M&E plan in Portal merges IFAD and GEF, one doesn't know who would pay for the Audits (if it is the IFAD's portion, please disregard this comment).

Please note that as per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?. Often times the external audiences only have access / only look at to the CEO Endorsement/Approval template in Portal once posted on the website, so the budget information is only accessible through Portal. That is why having a comprehensive Budget in Portal is key for transparency purposes. When properly resubmitted, we will be in a position to re-assess it.

Agency Response

1. The total duration is 72 months: date of start was revised to 1 June 2021 and date of completion 31 May 2027.
 2. See Annex 8: SNRLAP Budget (including M&E and KM budget)
 3. Co-financing letter attached.
 4. In total, 99,200 persons will benefit directly from the LDCF: 72,000 persons (50% women) through implementation of 150 Natural Resources and Land-Use Management Plans featuring climate adaption objectives. The additional 27,200 persons is comprised of 23,600 women and 3,600 men including 7,200 highly vulnerable beneficiaries through establishment of 27,200 jubrakas (homestead gardens). Total beneficiaries disaggregated by gender: 39,600 men and 59,600 women. Indeed, of LDCF beneficiaries (99,200), 60% (59,600) are women. The inconsistent numbers in the document have been addressed.
- The tracking tool reflects the number of beneficiaries and is disaggregated by gender as explained above. Figures in the 'Core Indicators' section (including total no. of direct beneficiaries) are automatically calculated and double counted the 72,000 beneficiaries receiving support through activities 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. Following advice received from the Secretariat (Aloke Barwal's message of 8 April), the tracking tool has been amended to ensure the total is accurate: the number of beneficiaries of activities 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 has been reduced by half, to 36,000, and a comment included to explain that both activities cover the same 72,000 beneficiaries.
5. See Annex 2: Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for SNRLP. The revised ESMP addresses risk of gender-based violence or sexual exploitation and abuse and provides mitigating measures. Please be informed that both SECAP and ESMP are prepared for the entire co-financing activities including LDCF investments.
 6. (i) The details of 'Equipment & Materials and Goods & Services' are explained in Annex 8: Construction of Jubraka for women and vulnerable households (fencing, supplementary irrigation (drop irrigation and/or small cistern), horticulture material, seeds and water fees if needed). (ii) In Table A of the Project Information Section of the CEO Endorsement Proposal, the amount USD 332,000 is specified as the contribution of the project to LDCF Programming Directions *Objective 2: Mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Resilience for Systemic Impact* (CCA2). However, this does not correspond to the PMC. PMC financed by the project remains USD 129,000 as shown in Table B and in the project budget (excel sheet).

April 20, 2021

Indicator 4 and tracking tool reviewed and resubmitted. CEO document amended in section 6 of Part II.

April 29, 2021

Following exchanges with the portal help desk, we were able to paste the budget in the Portal in such a way that ensures it can be viewed. Note that the budget for annual audits is paid by IFAD. It is therefore left in the M&E budget, consistent with feedback on the Portal and confirmed by GEFSEC's Program Unit .

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided

Agency Response

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

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please address the comments made above in the review sheet and resubmit for consideration.

Please address additional comments and resubmit. Thanks.

12 March, 2021

All comments cleared. Please remove the entry of Core Indicator 4 **Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) 2850 ha** in the portal and re-submit.

Comment cleared.

April 5

Please address the following comments from PPO

1. On Project Information: Duration is wrong, please correct the total duration and dates of start and completion.

2. Please attach the project budget under Annex E in the portal also.

3. Please attach the co-financing letter.

4. Gender Equality and number of beneficiaries: It is well noted that the submission provides a gender analysis and elaborates on a plan of action to address gender in the project. It is unclear, however, how any of the proposed activities will help closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. Component 1 of the project state (in output 1.1) that "72,000 community members have their NR ownership or user rights secured via registration of community forests and rangelands". It is unclear, however, (from the gender analysis or gender action plan) whether this output will be disaggregated by gender. The disaggregated numbers are inconsistent in the document.

In one place it says "50% of beneficiaries will be women e.g. In total, 99,200 people will benefit directly from the LDCF. The LDCF will support community mobilization and Natural Resources Management (NRM) planning through the creation of 150 cluster/network with Natural Resources and Land-Use Management Plans (NRLMP) with Climate Change Adaptation mainstreamed. It will enable 72,000 persons (including pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, 50% women) to build resilience to Climate Change by improving their management of natural resources, giving ownership and reducing dispute over use of land and natural resources". While in another place it says "72,000 community members, including 20,000 women and 7,200 vulnerable people will benefit directly from the LDCF investment;".

Also, the above number of total beneficiaries 99,200 isn't consistent with the total number of beneficiaries in the tracking tool which says 171,200 beneficiaries. It is not clear how 72,000 number is reflected in the tracking sheet. Are they part of the total 171,200 beneficiaries? If yes, then why it is segregated from the total number?

5. Environmental and social safeguards: The project overall ESS risk has been classified as moderate and IFAD has attached the environmental and social management plan. Please ask IFAD to provide the ESS risk screening/assessment report for the project. In addition, Sudan experiences some of the world's highest levels of sexual violence, but the attached environmental and social management plan does not mention any potential issues related to disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals/groups or any risks or potential adverse impacts on women, including Gender-Based Violence or Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.

6. Budget: Please explain the details of "Equipment & Materials and Goods" in budget; and (ii) in project information PMC is set at \$332,000 however in budget only \$129,000 are meant to be used? please clarify.

The project is returned based on the above comments. These comments are pasted above under "GEF Secretariat Comments" above in the review sheet where the Agency is requested to provide a response on how these have been addressed in the proposal.

GEFSEC April 20, 2021

As discussed over email, please review the core indicator 4 and relevant output target in the tracking tool of the project. The beneficiaries under this are the recipient of training and capacity building activities only, not general beneficiaries benefiting from climate adaptation solutions. So, it is different than core indicator 1. Please resubmit after addressing this last comment.

GEFSEC April 20, 2021

All comments have now been addressed by IFAD. The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC April 26, 2021,

Project to be returned to the Agency due to the following additional comment from PPO :

The budget that was uploaded in Portal is off the margins, so it does not allow us to understand what is charged to which source.

In principle, from what we see, still Audits are charged to the M&E plan, but was the M&E plan in Portal merges IFAD and GEF, one doesn't know who would pay for the Audits (if it is the IFAD's portion, please disregard this comment).

Please note that as per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?. Often times the external audiences only have access / only look at to the CEO Endorsement/Approval template in Portal once posted on the website, so the budget information is only accessible through Portal. That is why having a comprehensive Budget in Portal is key for transparency purposes. When properly resubmitted, we will be in a position to re-assess it.

GEFSEC May 3, 2021

The budget sheet is now uploaded appropriately on the portal in the relevant section. All comments cleared and the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	9/15/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/21/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/12/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/31/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2021

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The SNRLAP project (MSP) aims to mainstream climate change in natural resource management (NRM) and livelihood development in highly vulnerable and conflict affected areas of Butana, Sennar and Kordofan regions of Sudan. The project will be blended with IFAD's \$49.9 million flagship Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihoods Program in Sudan. It will adopt a landscape based approach and link local actors to national institutions in the decision-making processes related to climate resilient NRM and livelihoods of farmers and pastoralists. The project, through proactive community engagement, will ensure shared and commonly agreed sustainable management approaches for natural resources which will contribute to conflict reduction and security in the region through improved climate resilience. A unique aspect of the project is its engagement with White Nile and Blue Nile states for inter-state governance of natural resources for improved climate resilience. The project will also complement the The Great Green Wall for the Sahel and Sahara Initiative (GGWSSI) in Sudan.

SNRLAP is aligned with Sudan's NAP and climate change adaptation objectives of LDCF related to climate mainstreaming, climate security and access to innovative technology and best practices for climate adaptation. The ecosystems based approach followed in the MSP also aligns with broader integration approach of GEF 7 programmatic directions. The LDCF support will directly benefit 171,200 people with 56% women beneficiaries. The project will also improve resilience of 2850 hectares land through climate resilient natural resource management plans and build capacity of 72000 on improved climate adaptation decision making.

The project proposes to use LDCF for two interlinked components for transformational impact. The first component will focus on scaling up best and indigenous practices such as Jubraka cultivation (community home garden) and testing new climate adaptation solutions through integrated land use plans, climate smart agriculture practices and local business enterprises development. The second component aims to strengthen institutional framework for uptake of climate resilient natural resource management and livelihoods. Under this, the project will support integrated GIS and early warning system infrastructure for evidence based governance and planning of natural resources. Additionally, the component will develop a drought and flood monitoring system and establish an institutional structure for a comprehensive multi-sector and multi-level consultation.

SNRLAP aims to engage a wide set of stakeholders including local governments and private sector to spur innovation and ensure sustainability and scaling up of activities. It has a well defined gender integration strategy and a knowledge management plan which emphasizes on disseminating local indigenous knowledge and global best practices at all levels.