

## Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP)

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10350

**Countries**

Sudan

**Project Title**

Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP)

**GEF Agency(ies)**

IFAD

**Agency ID**

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

**PIF**

## Part I – Project Informatic

### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

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

The project is aligned with LDCF's CCA objective 1 of improving resilience of highly vulnerable people in conflict affected areas through access to new technologies and practices for climate change adaptation. The project will also contribute to objective CCA 2 regarding climate change mainstreaming with its focus on climate compatible natural resource management plans and livelihood investment plans. The ecosystems based approach followed in the MSP also aligns with broader integration approach of GEF 7 programmatic directions.

However, in the section 4 of part II, the MSP indicates alignment with CCA 3 which is more specific to NAP and UNFCCC related processes. This is also inconsistent with the Table A in part I. The agency is requested to review this.

The MSP indicates that the target region sees increasing conflicts on land use between farmers and pastoralists. Will the project address the conflicts issues directly under the program? If yes, please elaborate. The risk table mentions a conflict resolution mechanism. Will this factor in climate change aspects? The LDCF strategy has an entry point on climate risk and security to improve resilience of vulnerable people. The proposed MSP can potentially address this aspect of the programming directions too if focused well.

December 24, 2019: Thanks for addressing the comments. No additional comments.

##### Agency Response

#### Indicative project/program description summary

#### 2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

## **project/program objectives and the core indicators:**

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

The component 1 is clear and linked with the program objectives and indicators.

The focus of component 2 is on strengthening legal, policy and institutions for scaling up climate NRM. Within this it is not clear how strengthening early warning system fits. Possibly, it could be more relevant under output 1.2 as early warning could support implementation of climate smart agriculture and livelihood plans.

Both the components are classified as technical assistance. Under component 1, the MSP proposes to support access to finance to implement NRM and livelihood options. It is not clear if the investment needed for such implementation is already available or will the project explore opportunities for such finance. In the case of latter, how will the project address any uncertainties regarding the availability of the other fund.

This is important to elaborate as some of the key indicators such as 794000 ha of resilient land management and 84,000 beneficiaries will be dependent on this additional finance. Will the project itself invest any of the GEF resources directly in any NRM related activities?

The outputs propose a wide range of interventions from climate smart agriculture to IPM to biogas and solar irrigation and aquaculture. Will the project be able to support such a wide ranging intervention and are there finances available to support implementation of these interventions?

The output 1.1. and 1.2 have some overlaps. Output 1.1 mentions formulation of NRLMPs and also Livelihood Implementation plan. 1.2 also mention livelihood implementation plan formulation.

Under component 2, the focus is primarily on governance, policies and regulations. However, the activities under 2.1 is mainly on early warning systems. The output 2.1 title is not consistent with the detailed activities. Please review this. Also, please elaborate on how the project will support legal frameworks? Which laws or regulatory provisions will the project influence for enhanced resilience of vulnerable communities. Having a separate outcome on improved institutional capacity to assess climate risks through EWS may be more relevant.

The MSP may like to review the project components and its outputs, consolidate the interventions appropriately and make the project focus more clear.

December 24, 2019: Thanks for addressing the comments. The paragraphs on added value of LDCF is very helpful. No additional comments.

### **Agency Response**

## Co-financing

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

\$63 million grant co-finance from IFAD is proposed. This is aligned with co-financing policy and guidelines. More details of this co-finance will be useful.

December 24, 2019: No additional comments. At the CEO Endorsement Stage, please provide more details of the IFAD's program including its program components and activities.

### Agency Response

## GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

### Agency Response

## **The STAR allocation?**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

## **The focal area allocation?**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

## **The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

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

Yes. The resources are in line with the LDCF allocation to Sudan.

**Agency Response**

## **The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

## **Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

## **Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

## **Project Preparation Grant**

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The agency is requested to attach the LDCF-SCCF results framework and fill out the core indicators. To avoid double counting, please remove the indicator targets (3,4,11) on the portal. These indicators are for GEF Trust fund projects only.

December 24, 2019: Please ensure consistency in number of beneficiaries of the project. In the tracking tool, it is 63,200 whereas in the main PIF's components' table it is 84,000 in outcome and 72000 in outputs. In the section on GEBs and adaptation benefits, it is 720,000. There is also an explanation that out of these 720000 beneficiaries, 40% will see improved resilience benefits due to 40% increase in livelihoods based income. There is also a 60% number of beneficiaries with improved score in resilience score card.

Given the blended nature of the project with the IFAD's SNRLP project, the 40% attribution of total number of beneficiaries (i.e. 288,000) for improved resilience seems plausible. Using a further conservative estimation approach, it could be revised to 250,000 factoring in non-response from 10% of 288,000 beneficiaries.

January 26, 2020: The revised indicators and targets are fine. No additional comments.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The climate vulnerability of the target region is very well described using scientific evidence. The barriers are also elaborated well.

Agency Response



## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The baseline projects are described in details and their links with the proposed project is also clearly explained.

At the CEO endorsement stage, please include the recently GEF approved FAO project **Sudan: Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur. (10159)** and elaborate on the linkages.

### Agency Response

## 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The components are elaborated well. However, please refer to comments in previous section regarding alignment of activities within each components. Especially under component 2, the activities under 2.1 are more related to early warning system and related support which are not linked directly with strengthening legal and policy framework.

The two components are understood as- a) support to community groups in integrated NRM and livelihood planning factoring in climate risks and b) strengthening institutional capacity to better assess climate risks through EWS and strengthened GIS.

How the project will strengthen legal and policy aspects related to NRM planning and climate resilience is not clear?

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments.

### Agency Response

## 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

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

NA

**Agency Response**

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

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

Yes. the additional cost reasoning is described well. The paragraph on LDCF value add explained under baseline could be actually inserted under this section.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments.

**Agency Response**

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

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

Please use the LDCF-SCCF results framework to report on indicators and targets. The format was shared by the GEF Secretariat. For LDCF project, please do not fill the core indicators in the portal as these are for GEF trust Fund projects only.

In terms of target contributions, the results are quite high for the MSP. While we acknowledge that the proposed project will blend with the existing co-finance, the Secretariat would prefer indicators and targets specific to LDCF financing only.

December 24, 2019: Please look at the comment related to this in section 6 above under core indicators.

January 26, 2020: No additional comments.

### **Agency Response**

## **7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

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

The innovation aspect of the project is well explained. Integrated approach, working through village networks and innovative technologies for alternate livelihoods are clear innovation aspects of the project.

The agency is requested to elaborate a bit more on the project sustainability and scaling up potential.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments.

### **Agency Response**

## **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

## **Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

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

The map is not visible in the portal. The agency is requested to upload again.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. Map is accessible now.

## Agency Response

### Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

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

The MSP has listed relevant stakeholders which will be engaged in the project going forward.

The MSP needs to include information related to consultation that took place during project identification phase.

December 24, 2019: No additional comments.

## Agency Response

### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

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

The gender context is elaborated well.

## Agency Response

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

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

Yes. The opportunities to engage with the private sector is described well.

### **Agency Response**

## **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

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

Risks are captured well. The agency is requested to elaborate on the conflict resolution mechanism to address conflict related risks and also describe how it will be integrated with the proposed NR and Livelihood planning processes.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments.

### **Agency Response**

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

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

The institutional arrangement is elaborated for the entire SNRLP project. It would be good to explain how LDCF related activities will be coordinated.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments for PIF.

### **Agency Response**

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

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

Yes. The project's alignment with the national policies and priorities is quite strong.

### **Agency Response**

## **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

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

Yes. The project's objectives related to knowledge management is described well. However, it doesn't mention how the knowledge management activities will be carried out under the project. The agency, therefore, is requested to elaborate on the "how" part of the knowledge management approach.

December 24, 2019: Thanks. No additional comments.

### **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

### art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

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

The endorsement letter is attached and signed by the current OFP.

#### Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

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

NA

#### Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION



**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

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

Not at this stage. The agency is requested to address the comments and re-submit the MSP.

December 24, 2019: Please address the comment related to number of beneficiaries and re-submit for approval.

January 13, 2020: Please review the number of beneficiaries and consistency of the numbers across relevant sections in the PIF.

January 26, 2020: The Agency is requested to modify the results tracking sheet with the updated number of beneficiaries mentioned in the PIF.

January 27, 2020: The revised tracking sheet is fine. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

February 6, 2020: The agency is requested to address following additional comments in the PIF:

1. In table B there is no request for PMC cost. Please clarify how the project execution cost (e.g. cost of PMU staff, etc.) will be paid.
2. There is missing information (government co-financing) in the Co-financing Table: Name of Co-financier, Type of Co-financing and whether is Investment Mobilized or Recurrent Expenditures.

Please re-submit after addressing the above two comments.

1.

March 4: The Agency is requested to address the comments made on February 6 and re-submit.

March 9: The outstanding comments made on February 6 has been addressed and the PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

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

Please include the recently GEF approved FAO project **Sudan: Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur. (10159) as baseline** and elaborate on the linkages.

Please provide more details of the SNRLP project at the time of CEO approval.

## Review Dates

PIF Review    Agency Response	
First Review	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/3/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/10/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

## PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The SNRLAP project (MSP) in Sudan by IFAD 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 \$63 million flagship Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihoods Program. It will adopt a landscape based approach that goes beyond sectoral approaches 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 not only build climate resilience but also contribute to conflict reduction and security. 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 is strongly 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 99,200 people with 60% women beneficiaries and indirectly improve resilience of 720,000 people by influencing the broader IFAD funded project in the region. The project will also improve resilience of 2850 hectares land through climate resilient natural resource management plans.

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 resilient 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 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.

The project aims to engage a wide set of stakeholders including local government and private sector to spur innovation and ensure sustainability and scaling up of activities. The project has a strong gender focus and a robust knowledge management plan with an emphasis on disseminating local indigenous knowledge and global best practices at all levels.

The project is therefore recommended for approval.