



# Sudan's Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10479

**Countries**

Sudan

**Project Name**

Sudan's Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency Project

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

5/6/2021

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Namrata Rastogi

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

## 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

7/6/2021: In table A, the focal area outcome should be filled out completely and correctly as follows: ?Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies through the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency?.

9/1/2021: This has been corrected. The project remains aligned to the PIF and changes to the budget components are accompanied with a clear explanation. The overall budget remains the same. Cleared. However, please address this comment - Under Part I: Taxonomy, please tick mark Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency.

10/12/2021: Cleared.

##### Agency Response

25 August 2021: Corrected in the GEF portal.

**4 October 2021:** Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency is selected in the GEF portal, Under Part I: Taxonomy.

#### 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

7/6/2021: The name of Component 2 is different in Table B and in the alternative scenario. Please address.

9/1/2021: This has been revised. Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: The name of Component 2: "Provision of tools, systems, trainings, and assistance in line with the transparency provisions established in the Paris Agreement" revised to be consistent throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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 7/6/2021: Co-financing of \$400,000 in kind from the government is confirmed.

Agency Response

**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 7/6/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**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 7/6/2021: Yes.

## 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

7/6/2021: We note that the total number of beneficiaries has increased from 280 from PIF stage to 300 at CEO ER stage. However, we note that the total number of women to benefit from the project has reduced. Please clarify and add an explanation of how these targets have been estimated in the space provided below the core indicators table.

9/1/2021: We note that the total number of women beneficiaries for this project has been revised to the original number of 140. However, please provide an explanation of how this overall target (of 300 total beneficiaries, and the split for men and women) was calculated.

10/12/2021: Cleared.

## Agency Response

25 August 2021: Number of women beneficiaries revised to 70 for the mid-term target and 140 for the final target in the CEO ER and ProDoc.

**4 October 2021:** An explanation of how the overall target of 300 total beneficiaries was determined, as well as the split between men and women is included in Annex 9 of the ProDoc and on in the CEO ER. The number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment is determined based on the participation record in the CBIT planning stage and similarly anticipated participation of Stakeholders on the project activities/capacity-building:

? The total number of people involved in the CBIT planning stage was 584.

? Of the 584 people involved, 300 were direct beneficiaries and 284 were indirect beneficiaries

? Of the 300 direct beneficiaries, 118 people participated in the technical working groups and different group of 182 participated in the training workshop.

? Of the 118 people who participated in the technical working groups, 47 of the participants were women

? Of the 182 people who participated in the CBIT project preparation activities training workshop 93 were women.

? Therefore, the total number of end-of-project direct beneficiaries who are women is calculated as  $47 + 93 = 140$  women.

? The estimated expected number of stakeholders from different institutions (25 ministries and 12 additional institutions with 300 direct beneficiaries and 888 others) participating in the project (TWGs, trainings and workshops) is further illustrated under section 10 of the CEO ER and in Annex 9 of the ProDoc

## **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

7/6/2021: Overall, the Portal entry is difficult to read as there is no format nor line breaks between the paragraphs. Please improve the format of the text to facilitate the reading of the project (as it is in the Prodoc).

Please provide a detailed explanation of the problem and the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed with respect to transparency. We note that this information is unchanged from the PIF, but the information needs to be provided separately in this section.

- The major root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are briefly listed. Please clarify how they were identified and ensure they are aligned with barriers or capacity constraints which have been already identified through the UNFCCC processes and past reporting/projects.

- 

- 9/1/2021:Comments have been addressed. However, a description of Sudan's first NDC (submitted in May 2021) is missing. Please revise to include this updated information.

10/12/2021: This has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

Comment 7/6/2021: Overall, the Portal entry is difficult to read as there is no format nor line breaks between the paragraphs. Please improve the format of the text to facilitate the reading of the project (as it is in the Prodoc).

Response 25 August 2021: Formatting of the text in the GEF portal improved to separate paragraphs in line with the CEO ER in MS Word which is also attached to Documents section to facilitate the reading.

Comment 7/6/2021: Please provide a detailed explanation of the problem and the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed with respect to transparency. We note that this information is unchanged from the PIF, but the information needs to be provided separately in this section.

Response 25 August 2021: Additional text on barriers and root causes added under the ?Project Justification? section of the CEO ER.

Comment 7/6.2021: The major root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are briefly listed. Please clarify how they were identified and ensure they are aligned with barriers or capacity constraints which have been already identified through the UNFCCC processes and past reporting/projects.

Response 25 August 2021: Clarifications on how the barriers and root causes have been identified are added in the CEO ER in section 1a.1.

**4 October 2021:** A brief description of Sudan's submitted NDC is provided under 1a.1 and Output 3.1.2 of section 1a.3 of the CEO ER

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/6/2021: In the baseline, in addition to what the Government is doing to meet its Convention-related actions, there is no presentation of existing related initiatives the project could build on. Please provide a detailed explanation of the baseline scenario with respect to transparency. Please clarify in particular the current state of any MRV, inventory and transparency-related systems. In addition, the list of challenges facing Sudan with regard to current UNFCCC reporting obligations and transparency would better fit in the previous section on the problems the project needs to address.

This should include the current institutional arrangements including technical working groups or coordinating bodies etc., processes and procedures in place for MRV systems,

IT systems and QA/QC processes that may exist, NC and BURs that Sudan may have submitted and processes for developing them, status of the GHG inventory, any assessment conducted internally or by UNFCCC on the gaps related to MRV/transparency etc. A description, possibly in a table format, could also be provided of current projects/initiatives in place related to transparency and the issues/topics it aims to cover.

●9/1/2021: Some comments have been addressed however, please address the remaining comments:

●1. Some explanation has been provided on what the current MRV/transparency systems and processes in Sudan. And some of it is implied through the alternative scenario section. However, please include a clear overview in this section of the current systems and processes in place related to MRV/transparency specifically the GHG inventory preparation process and the inventory quality - are there any established processes for data collection and reporting, what sectors are covered/IPCC methodology is used, QA/QC processes being undertaken currently.

●2. Provide the approximate timeline by which the TNC and first BUR is expected to be completed.

●3. In the portal document, in table 1.1, please include the UNEP DTU MRV, REDD+ activities related to MRV, CBIT AFOLU project and any other relevant transparency/MRV projects in this table.

10/12/2021: Comments have been addressed. Cleared.

### Agency Response

25 August 2021: Information on a) current state of MRV and details on MRV-related institutional arrangements; and b) current projects/initiatives in place related to transparency upon which the project can build regarding mitigation and adaptation and the issues/topics they aim to cover has been added under the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects? section of the CEO ER. The list of challenges facing Sudan with regard to current UNFCCC reporting obligations and transparency has been moved under the section on the problems the project needs to address.

### 4 October 2021:

1. Provided an overview in section 1a.2 of the CEO ER concerning current systems and processes in place related to MRV/transparency specifically the GHG inventory preparation process and the inventory quality control procedures.

2. Finalized versions of the TNC and first BUR are expected to be completed by 30 September 2021 and submitted to the UNFCCC by December 2021.

3. Added 3 projects to Table 1.1 of the CEO ER ? GEF portal and to Table 6.1 with additional information on status and partners.

**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

7/6/2021: In general, the description is too limited, the proponents arguing that there is no change from the PIF or that the details are in the Prodoc. We would expect more details in the project description.

Based on the stakeholder information provided in the stakeholder section of this portal document, it is unclear which sectors will be covered by this CBIT project. Please clarify which sectors will be covered for GHG inventories, tracking mitigation progress and tracking adaptation progress, specifically providing any linkages with the NDC (ie if some sectors are being covered that is not in the NDC or vice versa, please provide a rationale).

The description under project map and coordinates mention that most activities will be focused in the state of Khartoum. However, the stakeholder table mentions state-level institutions. Provide rationale for why this is the case considering ETF requirements are national. Comment on how this limitation may be addressed and how many other additional states may be added on the project. Comment on which Ministry covers ?coastal zone? as it is mentioned in the A-NDC.

This project is heavily dependent on local and international consultants. Describe how capacity will be developed and built in-house within the government and relevant institutions through this project.

In addition address the following comments:

Output 1.1.1 : Please clarify what is meant by ?revision and updating project?s plan and budget?

Output 1.1.2: It is not clear from the current description of this outcome, how it differs from some of the others. Several of the activities such as identifying gaps, proposed new structure for institutional arrangements and coordination arrangements, etc are covered in other outcomes. Clarify what the aim of this output is, and what it entails, and how



some of the work may leverage or build on other outputs. For example, since this activity is meant to focus on legal and procedural arrangements (as opposed to institutional arrangements) provide details on what these may be ? ie will it support drafting a law, what procedural arrangements are envisioned? Legislative initiatives seems to be covered by Output 1.1.1 already, so it might be worth combining this and the previous output together.

Output 1.1.3: Provide additional details on what is meant by supporting the setting up of steering and technical committees. What kind of support does this entail ? technical, administrative, financial? It seems that this would have strong linkages on the Output 1.1.1 ? comment on these linkages.

Please provide additional details on the capacity building program and what its focus is. It is not clear from the current description if this is transparency focused or broader. For e.g. what is meant by mitigation analysis or adaptation planning in this context. Additional details on the capacity building program and the ToT should be provided either here or in the KM section. For eg, what steps will be taken to ensure that local capacities, and those within the government are built. Consider collaborations with an institute, either in Sudan or in the region, to help build those capacities, or housing an expert to sit in the HCENR to build capacities etc.

On stakeholder consultations, comment on the role of the stakeholders, and what the objective of these consultations are.

Output 1.1.4: this output seems to suggest that the institutional arrangements for transparency and its structure has already been determined by Sudan. If that is the case, it is not clear from the description why Output 1.1.1 is needed. Please comment. Additionally, activities in this output seems to be duplicating some of the activities proposed in the previous one such as setting up sectoral technical working groups, providing technical input to HCNER and others. It seems that the difference may be that the previous output is focused on HCENR while this is focused on inter-institutional mechanism. Please confirm and consider clarifying and building on the synergies between these activities. In other words, it is not clear why the HCENR is being treated separately from this output. It seems like HCENR would be a key stakeholder in an inter-institutional mechanism and rather than having these outputs s separate it may make sense to have one capacity building program, stakeholder workshops, technical inputs etc.

Clarify what is envisioned for the data center within the transparency unit for HNCER. Would this be an online platform that allows various ministries to access, collect and store data, or is this a data repository (ie not accessible by all)? Comment and provide additional details.

We note that Output 2.1.1 mentions tools as does output 2.1.2. It is not clear how these are separate. Please clarify.

Output 2.1.1: provide additional details on how these trainings will ensure that capacity continues to be built and is ?institutionalized? and not impacted by staff turnover etc. Provide additional details on what is envisioned for comprehensive training programs, which stakeholders will be involved (is this for government or private sector as well, which sectors will it cover ? GHG inventories cover a wider range of sectors compared to the mitigation NDC of Sudan which is focused only on three sectors, what is envisioned in terms of tracking adaptation progress etc.). The descriptions mentions institutes in Sudan ? please provide potential candidates with whom these training programs could be developed in collaboration with.

Output 2.1.2: The description seems to be very general in terms of tools, approaches for transparency requirements. Please provide specific details on what is envisioned here, and how existing tools and approaches from other institutions that have already been developed may be leveraged. For example, please provide details on what is envisioned under data management sharing protocols in terms of tools and approaches. Similarly, it is not clear what is specifically meant by key components of MRV system and how that may differ from some of the other elements already covered in the descriptions here.

Output 2.1.3: clarify how the activities in this output are different from those mentioned above. Provide additional details on the transparency portal and if it will link with the data center, who the audience for this portal is and what its objective is (i.e. will this be in Arabic, English or both; is this to inform a local audience or an international audience etc.)

Output 3.1.2: it is not clear why progress in all sectors will need to be tracked when Sudan?s NDC only covers three sectors. Please clarify.

Output 4.1.2: comment on how the CBIT Global Coordination Platform will be leveraged by this project.

- 
- 9/1/2021: Some comments have been addressed, however please address the following remaining comments.
  1. We note that additional detail has been provided in this section. However, the paragraph describing the major gaps in Sudan's current capacity is repetitive and redundant. Please remove from this section, and any information from this paragraph that is missing from the section on root causes and barriers can be moved there.
  2. On sector coverage, please revise to mention the First NDC submitted in May 2021, and sector coverage accordingly.
  3. The description under project map and coordinates - sufficient explanation has been provided to clarify the role and engagement of state- level institutions. However, since ETF requirements are national, it is still not clear why this section says "Most of the activities of the project's four outcomes will take place in Khartoum". If this is because Khartoum is the capital please clarify this. Or please replace the current sentence with "this is a national project".

4. Cleared.
5. Cleared.
6. Output 1.1.1 - Cleared.
7. Cleared.
8. Cleared.
9. The explanation provided in the table below on the capacity building program is sufficient. However, this information is not fully reflected in the portal document. (for example, there is no specific mention of emissions forecasting or activity data collection methods). Please update and ensure that these align throughout the documents. Output 2.1.1 and Output 2.1.3 mentions the capacity building program but the details provided do not fully align with the table below. We note that the prodoc has this information but not the portal.
10. Cleared.
11. Stakeholder consultation comment - Cleared.
12. Cleared.
13. Cleared.
14. Output 2.1.1 - Cleared.
15. Cleared.
16. Output 2.1.2 - cleared.
17. Output 2.1.3 - cleared.
18. Output 3.1.2 - please update to reflect the first NDC submitted in May 2021.
19. Cleared.

10/12/2021: All comments have been addressed. Cleared.

## Agency Response

### **4 October 2021:**

Responses on the comments from 1 September 2021 (points relate to points (numbers) in comments)

1. Removed repetitive text
2. Sector coverage revised in line with the First NDC submitted in May 2021.
3. Added this clarification in Annex E of the CEO ER and in the ProDoc
9. Updated Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 to include the details in the previous response matrix and the prodoc.
18. Updated CEO ER to reflect Sudan First NDC (interim updated submission) submitted in May 2021.

<https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/ndcstaging/PublishedDocuments/Sudan%20First/Sudan%20Updated%20First%20NDC-Interim%20Submission.pdf>

Responses to comments from 7/6/2021:

COMMENTS 7/6/2021	RESPONSES 25 August 2021
<p>7/6/2021: In general, the description is too limited, the proponents arguing that there is no change from the PIF or that the details are in the Prodoc. We would expect more details in the project description.</p>	<p>Additional details added to the description of the project in the CEO ER.</p>
<p>Based on the stakeholder information provided in the stakeholder section of this portal document, it is unclear which sectors will be covered by this CBIT project. Please clarify which sectors will be covered for GHG inventories, tracking mitigation progress and tracking adaptation progress, specifically providing any linkages with the NDC (ie if some sectors are being covered that is not in the NDC or vice versa, please provide a rationale).</p>	<p>In the CEO ER, sectors to be covered for GHG inventories and tracking mitigation/adaptation progress have been clarified. Noted that explicit linkages will be made to the NDC under the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 7, 13, and 14. All GHG-emitting sectors in the (I)NDC will be covered (i.e., energy, forestry, land use, land-use change, and forestry (LULUCF), and Waste) for tracking mitigation progress. For adaptation, priority sectors (i.e., water, agriculture, public health) will be tracked. Progress with explicit linkages to the NDC will be reported in the development.</p>
<p>The description under project map and coordinates mention that most activities will be focused in the state of Khartoum. However, the stakeholder table mentions state-level institutions. Provide rationale for why this is the case considering ETF requirements are national. Comment on how this limitation may be addressed and how many other additional states by added on the project.</p>	<p>Given that the overall goal of the project is to help Sudan mainstream climate change considerations into national and sub-national (i.e., state-level) development policies, the engagement of local institutions is essential for strengthening and sustaining efforts to monitor, report, and verify the effectiveness of mitigation and adaptation measures implemented at the state level. As such, state-level institutions are key stakeholders that will collaborate with national institutions on policy implementation and capacity building; provide local data and information about lessons learned from previous implementation; and coordinate with relevant national institutions and stakeholder the tracking of progress in the implementation of national initiatives. The project will work closely with the HCENR on Components 1, 2, 3, and 4 in coordinating climate change transparency activities at the state-level and ensuring access to the knowledge generated.</p>
<p>Comment on which Ministry covers 'coastal zone' as it is mentioned in the A-NDC.</p>	<p>Coastal zone issues are addressed within the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources</p>
<p>This project is heavily dependent on local and international consultants. Describe how capacity will be developed and built in-house within the government and relevant institutions through this project.</p>	<p>Implementing the capacity building program will adopt a 'train the trainer' approach to promote optimal knowledge transferal and replication of the potential from consultants to government and other personnel.</p>
<p>Output 1.1.1 : Please clarify what is meant by 'revision and updating project's plan and budget'?</p>	<p>Revising and updating the project's plan and budget has been deleted from Output 1.1.1</p>

Output 1.1.2: It is not clear from the current description of this outcome, how it differs from some of the others. Several of the activities such as identifying gaps, proposed new structure for institutional arrangements and coordination arrangements, etc. are covered in other outcomes. Clarify what the aim of this output is, and what it entails, and how some of the work may leverage or build on other outputs. For example, since this activity is meant to focus on legal and procedural arrangements (as opposed to institutional arrangements) provide details on what these may be ? i.e. will it support drafting a law, what procedural arrangements are envisioned? Legislative initiatives seem to be covered by Output 1.1.1 already, so it might be worth combining this and the previous output together.

Clarified the aim of Output 1.1.2 and removed legislative reference under Output 1.1.1 in the ER. Output 1.1.1 and Output 1.1.2 are intended to be distinct with the former focusing on institutional aspects (inter/intra ministries) and the latter on legislative and administrative modalities of the MRV system.

Output 1.1.3: Provide additional details on what is meant by supporting the setting up of steering and technical committees. What kind of support does this entail ? technical, administrative, financial? It seems that this would have strong linkages on the Output 1.1.1 ? comment on these linkages.

Additional details on what is meant by supporting the setting up of steering and technical committees added to 1.1.3. ?in support of the activities of various technical working groups. The steering and technical committees will provide technical guidance and be composed of national experts and ministry counterparts and will ensure that the project adheres to project-level commitments which are in focus the long-term strategic goals of the project?..?

Please provide additional details on the capacity building program and what its focus is. It is not clear from the current description if this is transparency focused or broader. For e.g. what is meant by mitigation analysis or adaptation planning in this context.

Additional details on the focus of the capacity building programme in the CEO ER in section 1.1.3. Specifically, the focus of the capacity building programme is on topics related to a) GHG inventory development focusing on activity data collection methods, GHG emission estimation from various sub sectors in Sudan, uncertainty estimation, QA/QC and reporting issues; b) mitigation planning focusing on estimation methods for baseline emission forecasting, mitigation scenario development, construction, estimation of air pollution control measures, cross cutting investment and finance issues, statistics, and data management; and c) support systems and tools focusing on MRV and LULUCF and up-to-date relevant tools, models and software for supporting GHG inventory, mitigation planning, adaptation, and climate finance assessment. The capacity building programme will increase the capability of Sudan to enhance the transparency of each of the above topics, resulting in more comparable, consistent, and accurate reports included in its NCs and BURs. The training programme will apply a Training of Trainers approach which will foster collaboration and knowledge transfer across Sudanese institutions (national and international). The trainers to be trained will be supported by the HCENR with a view to ensuring the sustainability and replicability of the capacity building process, post-project.

Additional details on the capacity building program and the ToT should be provided either here or in the KM section. For eg, what steps will be taken to ensure that local capacities, and those within the government are built. Consider collaborations with an institute, either in Sudan or in the region, to help build those capacities, or housing an expert to sit in the HCENR to build capacities etc.

Provided additional details on steps to ensure effectiveness of the capacity building program in the CEO ER within the discussion of Output 1.1.3.

On stakeholder consultations, comment on the role of the stakeholders, and what the objective of these consultations are.

Background on the objective of consultations and stakeholder roles added in section 1a.3 of the CEO ER (pages 9-10). These stakeholder consultations will be extensive and will be held prior and during the capacity building programme. The objective of these consultations is to a) directly hear what stakeholders perceived training needs; b) better understand the effectiveness of the programme can be achieved (relative to potential operational constraints such as power outages); and c) identify suitable corrections as needed for addressing stakeholder concerns and accomplishing the overall goal of the training programme.

Output 1.1.4: this output seems to suggest that the institutional arrangements for transparency and its structure has already been determined by Sudan. If that is the case, it is not clear from the description why Output 1.1.1 is needed. Please comment. Additionally, activities in this output seems to be duplicating some of the activities proposed in the previous one such as setting up sectoral technical working groups, providing technical input to HCNER and others. **It seems that the difference may be that the previous output is focused on HCENR while this is focused on inter-institutional mechanism. Please confirm and consider clarifying and building on the synergies between these activities. In other words, it is not clear why the HCENR is being treated separately from this output. It seems like HCENR would be a key stakeholder in an inter-institutional mechanism and rather than having these outputs separate it may make sense to have one capacity building program, stakeholder workshops, technical inputs etc.**

In the CEO ER, a) clarified that the institutional arrangements for transparency and its structure has not yet been determined by Sudan; b) removed duplicative activities across outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4; and c) clarified that the role of the HCENR is focused on developing inter-institutional mechanisms through the development and management of an online transparency tool and its coordination with key stakeholders

Clarify what is envisioned for the data center within the transparency unit for HNCER. Would this be an online platform that allows various ministries to access, collect and store data, or is this a data repository (ie not accessible by all)? Comment and provide additional details.

Indicated in the CEO ER that the data center is intended to be a dedicated space within the physical building used to house computer servers and peripherals associated with management of the online transparency portal. The purpose of the online portal is to disseminate materials to raise awareness of transparency obligations under the Paris Agreement and contribute to progress for the NDC and the long-term strategy to enhance transparency. Through this system, development partners and stakeholders across relevant sectors in Sudan will be able to access and upload data subject to security protocols to be implemented. The online transparency portal will also involve an awareness-raising component for the general public that will be available in Arabic and English.

<p>We note that Output 2.1.1 mentions tools as does output 2.1.2. It is not clear how these are separate. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Reference to tools in Output 2.1.1 deleted</p>
<p>Output 2.1.1: provide additional details on how these trainings will ensure that capacity continues to be built and is ?institutionalized? and not impacted by staff turnover etc. Provide additional details on what is envisioned for comprehensive training programs, which stakeholders will be involved (is this for government or private sector as well, which sectors will it cover ? GHG inventories cover a wider range of sectors compared to the mitigation NDC of Sudan which is focused only on three sectors, what is envisioned in terms of tracking adaptation progress etc.).</p>	<p>Added additional details on the approach in the CEO ER within Output 2.1.1 to include the design of the capacity building program to be a) guided by input from the Steering Committee, local academic/research institutions, local and international experts; b) premised on developing training materials to Sudanese conditions; and c) will follow a Training of Trainers (ToT) approach.</p>
<p>The descriptions mention institutes in Sudan ? please provide potential candidates with whom these training programs could be developed in collaboration with.</p>	<p>Examples of potential training centers in Sudan added within Output 2.1.1 in the CEO ER and the ER added.</p>
<p>Output 2.1.2: The description seems to be very general in terms of tools, approaches for transparency requirements. Please provide specific details on what is envisioned here, and how existing tools and approaches from other institutions that have already been developed may be leveraged. For example, please provide details on what is envisioned under data management sharing protocols in terms of tools and approaches. Similarly, it is not clear what is specifically meant by key components of MRV system and how that may differ from some of the other elements already covered in the descriptions here.</p>	<p>Added details regarding tools and approaches for transparency in the CEO ER within Output 2.1.2. Indicate that the output will rely on leveraging existing tools for application in the Sudan such as the Low Emissions Analysis Platform (LEAP) model which has been used in the process; the IPCC 2006 GHG inventory software (also used in the TNC process); and the adoption of MRV system tools developed by GIZ (Tool Version 4.1).</p>
<p>Output 2.1.3: clarify how the activities in this output are different from those mentioned above. Provide additional details on the transparency portal and if it will link with the data center, who the audience for this portal is and what its objective is (i.e. will this be in Arabic, English or both; is this to inform a local audience or an international audience etc.)</p>	<p>Within Output 2.1.3 of the CEO ER, indicate that the output is distinct from the previous output and focus on the community beyond those involved in project activities (i.e., the general public). The portal is directly linked to the online transparency platform housed in the data center proposed under Output 1.1.4.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.2: it is not clear why progress in all sectors will need to be tracked when Sudan?s NDC only covers three sectors. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Clarified within Output 3.1.2 that the focus is on energy, forestry, and waste, consistent with the sectors identified in the INDC and the ongoing process</p>
<p>Output 4.1.2: comment on how the CBIT Global Coordination Platform will be leveraged by this project.</p>	<p>Indicated in the CEO ER that CBIT Global Coordination Platform will be leveraged to incorporate lessons learned and emerging knowledge within ongoing training program development</p>

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/6/2021: Ok.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request



7/6/2021: The incremental cost reasoning of the project should be fully described instead of simply relying on the fact that it has not changed from the PIF stage. This is particularly true considering the PPG should have allowed to better clarify existing projects and initiatives the project will be able to build on.

9/1/2021: This has been revised. Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Provided additional details on incremental cost reasoning in the CEO ER.

**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

7/6/2021: ok.

Agency Response

**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

7/6/2021: Please strengthen the description here focusing specifically on the innovative aspects of the project, elements that make it sustainable. In terms of scaling up, consider how the project may be expanded across sectors, or in the Arabic region etc.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Provided additional details regarding innovativeness and sustainability in the CEO ER.

**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

1/31/2020: This is a national capacity-building program. N/A.

●7/6/2021: Map: please note that the map is attached in Annex D (and not E as indicated in this section).



- 9/1/2021: The map has been placed in the correct Annex. As suggested in the alternative scenario section, please consider revising/clarifying the language here.
- 10/12/2021: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

25 August 2021: Annex E: Project Map(s) and Coordinates are properly referenced in the CEO ER.

**4 October 2021:** Revised/clarified the language to indicate that, as a national project, most activities will take place in the capital city of Khartoum, with some activities undertaken in various states to help promote state-federal coordination on transparency issues.

#### 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

N/A

#### 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

7/6/2021: Comment on the stakeholder consultations during the design phase ? who was consulted, and its outcomes.

Annex 9 table: we welcome this table however there are ministries that have been listed where there does not seem to be a role for them in any output (i.e. for Ministry of Mining it is blank). Also ensure that this Annex aligns with the information provided in the portal document and ProDoc.

Since private sector involvement is anticipated in this project, this should be included in the table in the portal document as well as in the table in the Annex. Please provide specific details on which private sector actors will be involved ? including associations etc.

Provide additional details on the private sector stakeholders, including which ones. See comment in the previous section.

9/1/2021: Please address the remaining comments.

1. We note the inclusion of an additional paragraph on stakeholder engagement during the design phase. The response in the table below mentions a report titled "Summary of stakeholders consultation activities for Sudan CBIT project". However, this is not reflected in the portal document or the ProDoc. Please check and add.

2. We note the inclusion of private sector organizations in Annex 9. Cleared.

10/12/2021: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**4 October 2021:** 1. Added a reference to the report entitled: "Summary of stakeholder?s consultation activities for Sudan CBIT Project" to both the CEO ER and prodoc.

Responses to the comments from 7/6/2021:

#### COMMENTS 7/6/2021

7/6/2021: Comment on the stakeholder consultations during the design phase ? who was consulted, and its outcomes.

#### RESPONSES 25 August 2021

Details on stakeholder consultations during design phase have been added to the CEO ER. These details are based on the stakeholder engagement report entitled: "Summary of stakeholder?s consultation activities for Sudan CBIT Project" which summarized stakeholder consultations with its associated recommendations for the CBIT project.

Annex 9 table: we welcome this table however there are ministries that have been listed where there does not seem to be a role for them in any output (i.e. for Ministry of Mining it is blank). Also ensure that this Annex aligns with the information provided in the portal document and ProDoc.

Annex 9 in the ProDoc revised to ensure that listed entities have a specific role. Also, information in Annex 9 is aligned across the ProDoc and CEO ER

Since private sector involvement is anticipated in this project, this should be included in the table in the portal document as well as in the table in the Annex. Please provide specific details on which private sector actors will be involved ? including associations etc.

Provide additional details on the private sector stakeholders, including which ones. See comment in the previous section.

Annex 9 in the ProDoc revised to include types of private sector organizations and t

---

## 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

7/6/2021: Please provide a more detailed summary of the gender analysis and plan in the Portal entry based on what is provided in annex 11 of the ProDoc.

9/1/2021: The Gender Analysis and Action plan does not appear as a separate attachment in the documents section of the GEF portal. Please revise the language here in the portal to clarify that the Annex 11 is attached to the ProDoc (and is not a separate document).

10/12/2021: The Gender Analysis and Action plan is in the Annex 11 of the ProDoc. Cleared.

### Agency Response

25 August 2021: Provided a more detailed summary of the gender analysis and plan in the CEO ER. Furthermore, the Gender Analysis and Action plan is uploaded as separate attachment to Documents section in the GEF portal.

**4 October 2021:** The Gender Analysis and Action plan is provided in Annex 11 of the ProDoc and is also attached separately to the GEF portal.

### 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

7/6/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**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

7/6/2021: The climate risk and COVID-19 risk and analysis need to be further developed following STAP and GEFSEC guidance.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Added a section on Covid-19 risks and mitigation responses in Section 5 of the CEO ER; integrated Covid-19 risks into Annex 7 (UNDP RISK REGISTER) of the ProDoc.

**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

7/6/2021: Provide details on how this CBIT project will coordinate with other related projects, especially the BUR and NC3 project and not duplicate the work. Mention any additional bilateral initiatives on transparency that the country might be undertaking.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Table 6.1 of the CEO ER already provides an overview of initiatives with which the CBIT project will coordinate and highlight the specific outcome around which the collaboration will be focused.

**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

7/6/2021: This section is incomplete. Please provide how the strategies, actions, plans etc. align with this project in a table format. Some of the information in this section may be more appropriate in the section on coordination with other initiatives above.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Table added to the CEO ER on how the strategies, actions, plans etc. align with CBIT project; moved the bulleted information to the previous section on collaboration.

**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

7/6/2021: The knowledge management approach should also include also a budget.

Please include considerations and details as mentioned in the alternative scenario section above. Align with the description in the alternative scenario including the capacity building system, ToT, and collaboration with institutes. Clarify why some of these elements are not mentioned in the timeline.

Comment on how the project will leverage the CBIT global coordination platform and consider the role of Sudan and how it may learn from, and disseminate knowledge, in the region.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

**COMMENTS 7/6/2021**

7/6/2021: The knowledge management approach should also include also a budget.

**RESPONSES 25 August 2021**

In Section 8 of the CEO ER a) added column to the table titled: 'Key KM products and in budget?' with appropriate cell entries; b) provided additional details about Component 4 KM activities; and c) discussed the communication plan/strategy to disseminate project results on an online transparency platform.

Please include considerations and details as mentioned in the alternative scenario section above. Align with the description in the alternative scenario including the capacity building system, ToT, and collaboration with institutes. Clarify why some of these elements are not mentioned in the timeline.

Additional details provided for knowledge management

Comment on how the project will leverage the CBIT global coordination platform and consider the role of Sudan and how it may learn from, and disseminate knowledge, in the region.

Commented how the project will leverage the CBIT global coordination platform.

**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

7/6/2021: ESS has been completed and assessed as low.

Agency Response Social and Environmental screening procedures (SESP) was revised in May 2021. Based on SESP criteria this project was exempted from further SESP screening. The document justifying exemption is attached to the portal - ESS section.

**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

7/6/2021: 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

7/6/2021: Under the benefits section, there should be a presentation of the beneficiaries (who they are) and how their number has been estimated.

9/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 25 August 2021: Additional beneficiary details provided, including a summary table.

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/6/2021: See below.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/6/2021: Please address comments below:

Indicator 1, Mid-term target. There seems to be an error since both mid-term and end of project year target says ?100 are women?. Please revise.

Please add the CBIT indicators.

Under project outcome 2, it is not clear why adaptation or support has been omitted.

For indicator 4 and 5, it would be helpful to be clear in terms of what is meant by ?at least 3?. Is it at least 3 trainings on each topic ? GHG inventories, mitigation tracking, adaptation tracking etc., or three altogether. Similarly for indicator 5. We would suggest being ambitious and strengthening these targets where feasible. Some elements for indicators could include establishment of a capacity building program; # of tools, methodologies, templates etc by sector developed, etc.

9/1/2021: Comments have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

**COMMENTS 7/6/2021****RESPONSES 25 August 2021**

Indicator 1, Mid-term target. There seems to be an error since both mid-term and end of project year target says, ?100 are women?. Please revise.  
Please add the CBIT indicators.

Corrected

CBIT indicators added to the Project Results Framework in the ProDoc and CEO ER

Under project outcome 2, it is not clear why adaptation or support has been omitted.

Included reference to adaptation under outcome 2 in Annex A: Project Results Framework and CEO ER.

For indicator 4 and 5, it would be helpful to be clear in terms of what is meant by ?at least 3?. Is it at least 3 trainings on each topic ? GHG inventories, mitigation tracking, adaptation tracking etc., or three altogether? Similarly, for indicator 5. We would suggest being ambitious and strengthening these targets where feasible. Some elements for indicators could include establishment of a capacity building program; # of tools, methodologies, templates etc. by sector developed, etc.

In the CEO ER, clarified number of trainings (at least 3 on each on MRV systems, GHG inventories, mitigation, and adaptation) for indicator 4 and strengthened end of project target for indicator 5.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/6/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/6/2021: Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/6/2021: Yes.

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  
N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

7/6/2021: Please address comments.

9/1/2021: Please address remaining comments.

10/12/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>7/6/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/1/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**