



Strengthening Adaptation through Institutional Building and Resilient Livelihoods in South Sudanese Agro-pastoral Landscapes (SABRELA)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11418

Countries

South Sudan

Project Name

Strengthening Adaptation through Institutional Building and Resilient Livelihoods in South Sudanese Agro-pastoral Landscapes (SABRELA)

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

11/22/2023

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

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

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC November 03, 2023

Please update the ToC diagram and make the text readable

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes. However, component 1 in page 25 state improving access to financial services. Its not clear what the project will do that will ensure the target communities can have access to the said financial services and under which output. Please make it clear. Also, consider revising output 2.1.2 (Sustainable agro-pastoral practices?).

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to b): Comment well noted. In response, additional information has been provided in the description of component 1 to clarify how communities in target states will be facilitated to access financial services. Also, as recommended, output 2.1.2 has been rephrased to: 8,000 ha of production landscapes in target States under sustainable agro-pastoral practices

22/11/2023

TOC Diagram amended to make it readable

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC November 21, 2023

Please update output 3.1.2 in both the summary and the project description sections using this suggested text "3.1.2: Lessons and knowledge products, including those capturing gender perspectives, systematically collected and disseminated to intended audiences (50% being women)".

GEFSEC November 02, 2023

Yes.

However, given the nature of gender roles in the agro-pastoral systems, and as stated in the document that women are most impacted by climate change than men, a strong integration of gender (i.e women) in component 2 is highly recommended as well as specific gender markers in component 3 on gender segregated data on KM. This could specifically be integrated in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and in the Monitoring and Evaluation systems.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Comment well noted and appreciated. As recommended, gender has been reflected more in the suggested outputs, and additional information has been provided under component 2.

22/11/2023

Done

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 17, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes.

b). Yes. Two major barriers have been identified. We think conflict as stated in the document is another major barrier of its own.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to b): As suggested, a barrier focusing on conflict has been added to the list of barriers.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 17, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes.

c). Yes. We acknowledge the listed projects, however, an analysis of what lessons have been learned from those projects that SABRELA will be complementing is missing.

d). No. Only STASS as one of the stakeholder who has expressed interest (letter included as attachment) and that many stakeholders were part of the project design. Although it is stated that more stakeholders will be confirmed at PPG stage, please provide a list of the current stakeholders and what role they will play in the project lifecycle.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to c): As recommended, a section with bullet points has been provided to show lessons that have been drawn from the baseline project scenario.

Response to d): The recommendation has been well received, and in response, a table of stakeholder and their potential role in the project has been added on p.25.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 17, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes. There is description of the theory of change including detailed explanation of the components and outcomes. However, there is no illustration of how the different components, outcomes and outputs would relate to the expected results as well as the different causal pathways and assumptions. Please ensure the TC diagram/illustration is included with the necessary elements.

b). Not clear. Please make sure the outputs for each component in the TC is clearly presented as outlined in page 5-7 and described.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to a): Comment well noted. In response, a diagram has been provided showing the pathways that ensure agro-pastoral systems of vulnerable communities and institutional capacities for natural resources management are strengthened enhancing the socioecological resilience of vulnerable communities in target States in South Sudan. Additional information has been provided in the document to clarify the project's pathways.

Response to b): As recommended, outputs have been clarified in the Theory of Change ? a table has been included at the bottom of the ToC to spell out in full the initials in the actual ToC.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 02, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). No. Although the LoE states that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security is the executing agency, there is no description of any institutional arrangement that has been established. There is a contradicting statement that "the government agencies will be important in providing policy checks and balances to the projects" page 28 (last para). Please provide details on the institutional arrangement in line with the LoE and what role will the GEF Agency (IFAD) be playing.

b). No statement has been provided.

c). Yes, however, please ensure that the section on "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" in Portal is completed accordingly.

d). Yes

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to a): IFAD as the GEF Implementing Agency will play a supervisory role and will not be directly involved in the execution. A description on the envisaged implementation arrangements was added.

Response to b): Indeed no comment has been provided because IFAD does not foresee playing any role in the execution of the project.

Response to c): This has been addressed in the portal entry. The list of ongoing projects/GEF and non GEF has been added to this section.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 17, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes. However, the document mentioned several times that South Sudan is known for frequent episodes of fragility and communal conflicts, but this has not been listed as a potential risk to the project implementation. Please provide more details for the exclusion of conflict as a risk factor to the project.

c). Yes. the overall ESS risk for this project has been rated as "Moderate", however, it is not clear the plan during the PPG to address moderate environmental and social risks at the screening stage. Please provide a plan for any further environmental and social assessment during the PPG and development of environmental and social risk management and monitoring plan.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Response to b): As recommended, fragility and communal conflicts have been included under political and governance as high risk.

Response to c): The comment is noted and appreciated. In response, it is indicated that the project will draw on IFAD's Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) to screen project activities. Based on the findings, the project will develop environmental and social risk management and monitoring plan, as appropriate.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

a). Yes

b). Yes (Including improved access to financial services, diversifying income streams, community participatory capacity development, strengthening market-linkages as well as building institutional arrangements for Climate Change Resilience).

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 24, 2023

Yes (CCA-1)

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes (including national policy priorities and commitments to regional and global MEAs)

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 17, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes. However, please upload the attendance sheets separately to ensure visibility of the names listed

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Portal issue: This has been addressed in the portal.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

CCA-1.1.

Some elements of the project also address CCA-1.3 (strengthening an enabling environment and creating space for the private sector, page 22-para 4) as well as CCA-1.4 (whole-society approach page 11 para 3).

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

Confirmation noted with thanks

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

No

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

No

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

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
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC November 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC November 02, 2023

Yes. However, some parts of the LoE have been modified. e.g. an important footnote of the letter has been removed. Please provide a new LoE that includes the footnote or alternatively the OFP sends to the GEF an email that accepts the inclusion of the footnote as part of the LoE.

Agency's Comments

15/11/2023

An email will be sent by the OFP confirming acceptance of the inclusion of the footnote. However please note that the Executing Entity (The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) has already undergone capacity assessments under IFAD's current investment projects.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes (page 46)

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC November 22, 2023

During the PPG stage, please provide detailed description of the targeted counties where the project will be implemented.

Agency's Comments
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/26/2023	11/15/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2023	11/22/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		