

Strengthening the Capacity of Government and Communities in South Sudan to Adapt to Climate Change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9723

Countries

South Sudan

Project Name

Strengthening the Capacity of Government and Communities in South Sudan to Adapt to Climate Change

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/13/2018

Review completed by PM

10/25/2019

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Unclear. Several substantial changes have been introduced compared to what was presented at PIF stage. Justifications are partly unclear.

(1) Output 2.6 "Five school kitchen gardens to provide food and shade to 1,000 pupils" has been added as a new activity. While implicitly it may make sense to have such an activity, the adaptation rationale of the activity is not addressed explicitly in the proposal. Please add such an adaptation rationale, or alternatively remove the activity.

(2) Output 2.8 "Improved cookstoves distributed to 1,000 women in Kapoeta" has been added as a new activity. It is unclear whether clean cookstoves would be adopted and used in practice by the local population. Evidence in other circumstances has shown that clean cookstoves are often not being used, even if handed out free of charge, as they do not align well with local cooking traditions. Please provide ample scientific evidence, if existing, about adoption rates of clean cookstoves in the targeted area in South Sudan, in order to justify such an activity. Alternatively, please remove the output entirely as it is not justified. There are other ways of reducing the use of charcoal, for instance by increasing the efficiency of charcoal production itself, or by applying sustainable forest management practices to ensure that wood is being used in a sustainable fashion.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

(1) **Output 2.6:** Droughts have multiple effects on poor families and communities, particularly children as lack of food and water can result in social disorder and nutritional deprivations that can have both immediate and lifelong impacts. Kapoeta is a semi-arid area and the prolonged drought has contributed to food shortage that could cause threats to children's health. The communities in Kapoeta practice mono-cropping i.e. explicitly planting sorghum for their food needs. The proposed intervention of planting trees in selected schools will provide shade to school children in dry and sunny weather conditions and provide fruits for nutritional benefits. In addition, the school kitchen initiative will help children to be aware of the environmental benefit of trees. These responses have been integrated into the narrative of the CEO ER and the project document.

(2) **Output 2.8** "improved cookstoves distributed to 1000 women in Kapoeta" - The prolonged droughts in eastern parts of South Sudan have not only placed a burden on the surrounding natural resources but also on households to fulfil their needs for cooking fuel. With the prolonged droughts, competition over natural resources has caused high tension between host communities, so it is important to help utilize the available fuel resources sustainably and curb the high demand. The traditional methods of cooking on open fires or three-stone fires used by women are inefficient in terms of energy, along with being time and resource consuming as firewood is often in far-off areas and buying charcoal is costly. These responses have been integrated into the narrative of the CEO ER and the project document.

A few successful examples are cited below:

- (i) In 2015-16, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has distributed over 2000 fuel-efficient stoves and trained 820 women on how to use them in Lainya County near Juba to address the cooking energy needs of vulnerable families, mainly women. The fuel-efficient stoves usually use 50 percent less firewood for cooking and in turn reduce the burden and time spent collecting it — which can take on average four to six

hours, covering distances of up to 25 kilometres. Moreover, women who are Traditionally responsible for collecting firewood in often isolated areas, so the fuel-efficient stoves are also helping to reduce the exposure of women and girls to sexual and gender-based violence. Also, women and girls will be spending less time looking for firewood, giving them time for other things such as income-generating activities, and therefore strengthening their livelihoods.

(ii) CARE international is also planning a training on Energy Saving Stoves in selected areas of Unity State, South Sudan. The main purpose of the training is to provide skills and knowledge for local women on how to produce the fuel sufficient stoves and therefore enhance the ability of generating income and reduce the risk associated with frequent movement to firewood collection which exposed women and girls to various GBV and protection incidents.

(iii) The women-led Forum for Community Change and Development launched a campaign in 2013 to train women in the Yei region to use and build improved cooking stoves. The new stoves required 75 percent less firewood than traditional stoves so women don't have to make as many dangerous journeys to the forest. "Our major purpose of carrying out this project," said Anne Kyomugisha, the group's executive director, "was to help reduce gender violence, improve education in the community, and educate women about the importance of the forest and preventing soil erosion." Over 200 women have learned how to use and build the stoves; many have also started to sell them for profit.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. The project structure and design is overall sound and clear, however, several issues remain as follows:

(1) Under Output 2.1, there are 19,000 women beneficiaries out of a total of 51,000 beneficiaries. Why is this figure so low, and are there any means available to you to make this more equitable?

(2) Output 2.3 establishes local disaster risk management committees and participatory land use plans to demarcate off-grazing areas. The output description specifies that the resulting plans would be implemented "by local authorities". Please elaborate how potential tribal tensions and dimensions of tribal authorities will be accounted for and reflected in the activity, to ensure that the implementation will follow a just and equitable as well as sustainable approach.

(3) In the proposed project budget, there is budget for security guards for the proposed hydro-met stations. Indeed, this seems necessary in the context of local security considerations. However, it seems unclear how the security guards would be paid for once the project has concluded its implementation phase. There seems to be a possibility that the security guards may not be extended by the government due to lack of budget and the equipment may face risk of demolition or theft. Please address this consideration.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Cleared.

November 12, 2019:

Thank you for submitting the indicators information GEF-7 format. We note the number of hectares under climate resilient management is 335. This is extremely low. We appreciate this comment is coming at this late stage of the process. However, based on recent discussions, we request UNEP to please consider opportunities to significantly increase the level of ambition for this indicator.

December 16, 2019:

Noted and cleared at this stage, with understanding the hectares indicator at the inception stage..

Response to Secretariat comments

- (1) 19,000 women will benefit from the agricultural, water provision and cookstove interventions. For women, the project will help them to produce crops along climate resilient lines and provide boreholes, which requires a larger unit cost per head given the training and capacity development needed, while the water catchment structures that were prioritised by stakeholders for men and their cattle can be provided a lower cost per pastoralist. The adaptation measures proposed are gender—focused, to benefit both groups of men and women, and realistic within the current budget envelope. The Disaster Risk Management Committees set up in Terekeka and Kapoeta counties will be the mechanism for scaling up good practice to the rest of the County.
- (2) The activities under this output 2.3 were planned based on extensive consultations with the communities and their elected tribal leaders including local authorities. Since the proposal came from the beneficiaries, it is highly anticipated there will not be tribal tensions and implementation of the proposed activities will follow a just and equitable as well as sustainable approach.
- (3) Thorough discussions were held with the concerned government line Ministry on the future protection of the MET equipment and assurance has been given by the MET Office that the guards looking after the new MET equipment will be paid from government budget after the closure of project. If required, a letter from the MET Directorate can be furnished to ensure continuity of payments to the guards. In addition, efforts will be made to place the MET equipment in protected areas, such as; airports, offices of the governments, etc., so that, there is minimum protection required after the project closure. It is also hoped that, in proving the utility of the meteorological stations for national planning and for agriculture, that this will provide the incentives to protect and maintain the equipment.

Response to November 12, 2019 comments

The project targets were carefully designed in the PPG phase, in a consultative manner recognizing the challenging national context in South Sudan. However, we acknowledge that 335 hectares restored is a low target. Following up stream discussions with GEF Sec and so as to avoid adjusting the figures arbitrarily and unilaterally, UNEP commits to strengthening this aspect during the project inception phase when we can re-examine the project results framework and engagement strategy in a consultative manner. UNEP will share the revised target with GEF Sec during inception.

[1] FAO. 2017 Introduction to ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) in the agricultural sectors: Context, approaches and lessons learned <https://www.slideshare.net/FAOoftheUN/introduction-to-ecosystembased-adaptation-eba-in-the-agricultural-sectors-context-approaches-and-lessons-learned>

[2] FAO. 2018 Ecosystem-based adaptation for smallholder farmers <http://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/319891/> Accessed July 20th, 2018.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

In the proposed budget, it is foreseen to purchase 5 vehicles/cars for field implementation and another car for monitoring, for a total of 6 vehicles. At USD 60,000-65,000 each, this amounts to a considerable share of the project expenses and it is unclear whether this is the most cost-effective approach. The standard approach would be to utilize existing stock of vehicles from other projects, from co-financing or baseline initiatives, instead of purchasing a range of vehicles just for this project. While security indeed requires convoys of at least 2 vehicles for any one field trip, it should be possible to use vehicles that are financed from other sources or already in stock.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Due to the current economic situation in the South Sudan, the ministries are under-resourced and do not have enough vehicles to cater for their staff day to day needs, therefore, it would for them to provide their vehicle for project activities in the field. Moreover, the few available vehicles with the government institutions are in poor mechanical conditions and do not pass UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) standards for field use in South Sudan. Similarly, the vehicles other partners have for the specific activities of their projects, and these vehicles may not be available for LDCF project day-to-day activities, particularly for field activities. The option of hiring vehicle was also considered; however, this option was also appeared to be not cost-effective but rather too expensive. For example, hiring of one vehicle which fulfils the UNDSS requirements for one year would cost more than purchasing 5 vehicles during project life. See attached calculation of hiring vehicle which is based on UNDP service rates in South Sudan

After extensive discussions with the partners who committed in-kind co-financing for this project, we are now able to secure one vehicle for the project activities in Juba from the MET Office. The request is cut back to two vehicles that can go to the field, where travel between the two project sites will be alternated and which remains compliant with UNDSS rules and regulations. The budget has been adjusted accordingly and the relevant sections of the prodoc and CEO ER have been updated.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please provide co-financing letter confirming \$100,000 from GAN and \$15 million from the government, as indicated in the Table containing sources of co-financing.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Please change type of co-financing listed for \$15 million government co-financing. It currently says "guarantee" in the relevant section in GEF Portal, while humanitarian finance usually is not provided in the form of a financial guarantee. Please correct.

DS, June 18, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

1. \$100,000 from GAN – provided in the full project document, page 160.
2. \$15 million from the government - provided in the full project document, page 158.

The co-financing letters attached

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

No. Please provide excel file with tracking tool, in addition to the four core indicators for adaptation in a separate document.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

This is provided.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

The CEO comments at the CEO Endorsement are adequately addressed in the project document

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Unclear. Please respond to the few recommendations from STAP.

DS, March 29, 2019:

The responses are still missing in GEF Portal. Please include them in Annex B in GEF Portal. See screenshot below:

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF). ③

N/A

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS. ③

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below: ③

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To Date	Amount Committed
Project Personnel and Consultants	98,000	90,311.54	8,960.61
Travels	24,000	24,489.86	

DS, June 18, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Responses to the STAP comments are now included.

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Unclear. Please respond to comments from UK, Canada and Netherlands, which were provided before PIF approval.

DS, March 29, 2019:

The responses are still missing in GEF Portal. Please include them in Annex B in GEF Portal. See screenshot above under STAP Question.

DS, June 18, 2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility (Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 30, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

Full-Sized Project

Least Developed Countries Fund

GEF Project ID: 9723
Project Duration: 5
Countries: South Sudan
Project Title: Strengthening the Capacity of Government and Communities in South Sudan to Adapt to Climate Change
GEF Agencies: UNEP
Other Executing Partners: UNEP PCDMB and SS and Ministry of Environment
GEF Focal Area: Climate Change

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Concur**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNEP proposal "Strengthening the capacity of government and communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change". The project aims to use an Ecosystem-based Adaptation approach at the landscape level to increase the capacity of local communities and institutions in South Sudan to adapt to climate change. Overall, STAP believes the PIF is very well-developed, as well as scientifically and technically sound. In order to strengthen the project, STAP makes the following remarks and recommendations:

Recommendations:

1. In the Adaptation scenario in Component 2, the timing of establishing alternative livelihoods will be critical to bridge the gap between the restoration activities and the emergence of their results in order to prevent premature exploitation of restored ecosystems and thus disrupt the recovery process. The project design has been approached firstly to build capacities, awareness and ownership for adaptation among communities. Participatory land-use planning and capacity development for ecosystem management will be a critical activity to be implemented in Outcome 2 in order to get a shared agreement on the placement of the water harvesting structures for benefit of pastoralists, afforestation, wood lots and fruit trees for the benefit of both men and women, livestock grazing and climate resilient agriculture for the benefit of women. These various activities are elements in an integrated EbA model. Output 2.3 has the details of these participatory planning and management mechanisms. Local management committees will be set up to manage water point access, seed storage facility and tree nurseries.
2. The list of stakeholders on page 20 is comprehensive, but in order to reduce the coordination burden, it might be practical to define a smaller core group including those stakeholders who could do most for the success of the project and who would benefit most from the project. The Project Steering Committee is a standard operating procedure for projects and will be the key governance mechanism for this project. We have designed the project to focus on two sites for manageability, given the South Sudanese operational context. Table 9 of this document contains the list of stakeholders by output, which we believe to be necessary and which we believe to be realistic.
3. The fate of this project will depend on the success of efforts to mitigate conflicts and establish durable peace. In Component 1, the plan to refurbish the hydro-meteorological monitoring stations according to the needs of policy-making is essential, but strong safeguards/risk management strategies will need to be put in place. Interventions will be implemented in areas that have a low incidence of conflict and insecurity (see Appendix 15 of the project document for the vulnerability assessment report). The selection of project sites was informed by pre-existing risk analyses, such as that conducted for Kapoeta as a case study for the State of Environment Report. Linkages to latest security updates and approval will be sought from UNDSS before field travels commence. Paragraph 105 and Table 4 of the project document set out in more detail the selection process for the sites the project will work in.

Adequate measures will be taken to protect meteorological equipment. Measures will include fencing equipment and placing it on raised platforms and poles, as well as the procurement of security guards. The project will use existing infrastructure such as government buildings and compounds to install equipment.

Remarks:

1. The proposal presents a thorough diagnosis of the current situation in South Sudan, identifies the drivers degrading the natural resource base (page 4) and correctly concludes that prevailing socio-economic processes and natural resource management practices increase the vulnerability to climate change and undermine the adaptation potential (page 6). The situation is made worse by a range of barriers to vulnerability reduction and adaptation (page 5). As indicated in the baseline scenario, the GoSS has embarked on serious efforts to address current problems that, if successful, provide favourable conditions for implementing the alternative scenario under the proposed project.
2. STAP welcomes the presentation of climate information, which appears to have well informed the design of the project. Specifically, the recognition that natural assets such as forests can bring adaptation benefits, but are also themselves at risk under a changing climate, is important.
3. The intended methodologies are appropriate and may work well.
 - a. The process of stakeholder engagement seems adequate.
 - b. The eloquent presentation of the meticulously developed theory of change deserves special acclaim, as does the detailed demonstration of the conformity of the proposed project with the guiding principles in the NAPA.
 - c. Transferring and adopting EbA to local conditions is an important innovation element of the proposed project. Asking participating communities to make in-kind contributions in flexible forms (labour, materials, other assets) is a clever idea to induce the sense of ownership for the project in the community.
 - d. The plans to mainstream gender issues in the project are well-conceived.
 - e. The risk assessment is comprehensive and the risk management actions are clearly presented. The countermeasures seem to be realistic and have a good chance to substantially reduce the various types of risks.
 - f. The KM plan appears adequate.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>

3. Major issues to be considered during project design

STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:

(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.

The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.

The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

Strengthening the capacity of government and communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change (LDCF)

Questions posed by Canadian LDCF Council member:

1. We note that the expected \$30 million in co-financing from the Comprehensive Agriculture Master Plan (CAMP) may not be realistic. It is our understanding that the CAMP financing is uncertain and only receives small amounts to date. How does the proponent expect to address this issue? Are there other sources of funding the project can seek?

2. We request that the document be updated to reflect the current geo-political environment. How does UNEP plan to successfully implement this project in light of the current spread of civil conflict? Are appropriate risk mitigation measures in place?

Response 1

1. The Government of South Sudan has initiated work on the preparation and implementation of some projects highlighted in the CAMP, and following is the status of these projects:

a) **CAMP Implementing Ministries Capacity Development project** - with a total cost of \$20 million and duration of 5 years. The Japan Government has agreed to provide \$10 million, and would add up the rest of the funds as the project progress. The work on the implementation of the project will start in 2017-18.

b) **Agriculture Development & Food Security** – The World Bank will provide \$50 million over 6 years

In addition to the CAMP, the following are some of the other approved or pipeline projects. These projects are being implemented by the UN agencies in collaboration with the government:

c) **Recovery and stabilization Project** – A collaboration between UNDP, FAO and WFP with a grant value of \$10.0 million.

d) **Building Resilience through Assets Creation and Enhancement (BRACE) Phase 2** - A DFID-UK funded project with a grant value of \$20 million. The project will finish in 2019.

e) **Sustainable Agriculture for Economic Resilience** – a collaboration of FAO, UNEP and USAID with a first trench of \$10 million.

The detailed project design phase will consider what the best grant and co-financing strategy will be given the adaptation focus of the project concept and the security situation in South Sudan.

Response 2

a). **Location of the project:** The first technical task will be to carry out a climate risk, vulnerability and security assessment in order to identify the Districts and communities where the project will work. The project team will identify areas that are relatively free from political instability and where the project team will be able to work to achieve the project objectives. A risk mitigation plan will be developed to address potential security issues. It should also be noted that more than 50 percent of South Sudan is relatively calm and accessible.

It should also be noted that development work is possible in South Sudan. Many UN agencies are implementing development and environment projects: For example:

- GEF-4, post-conflict protected area management project - UNDP (recently completed)
- Local government service delivery project - UNDP
- Control of animal disease and prevention intervention project - FAO
- Resilience building, diversification of livelihoods and local economy strengthening among local communities UNDP/FAO, IOM, UN WOMEN
- Strengthening of extension services for livestock, agriculture and fishery sector - FAO
- Main streaming of disaster risk reduction in to development plans - - UNDP
- Empowering of women through training, sensitization and access to justice system - UNDP/UN WOMEN

Other than UN Agencies, several international NGOs are implementing projects in South Sudan. For instance, DFID has funded a BRACED project since 2014-15, which is currently being implemented.

b) **Execution modality:** The project will be internally executed by UN Environment with political leadership by Government of South Sudan. Procurements will be processed by UN Environment. The UN Environment South Sudan Office will executed all the activities (workshops, meetings, stakeholders discussions, missions, etc). Budget control is strictly with the UN Environment South Sudan Office. The UN Environment South Sudan Office executes the projects in full cooperation and

collaboration of the government and in this way help to build execution capacity within Government. The execution process will follow established practice: all activities under the projects will be pre-agreed at the annual work plan stage with the government partners in advance. Periodic briefing on the projects will be given to the government. All project meetings will be chaired and steered by the government.

-

The Post Conflict and Disaster Management Branch in Ecosystems Division specializes in working in difficult situations (Afghanistan, Niger Delta, South Sudan) and has the necessary systems and procedures in place to deliver in South Sudan, where they have had staffing since 2009, which has been staffed by international and national staffing. Of recent, this office has successfully implemented enabling activities such as:

- A) GEF- NAPA project
- B) GEF-NCSA project
- C) GEF - INC project
- D) GEF NBSAP project

At present, UN Environment South Sudan office is implementing a project to produce South Sudan's first State of Environment Report (funded by DFID through Concern Worldwide)

Response to UK –Strengthening the capacity of government and communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change (LDCF)

1. Post Conflict and Disaster Management Branch in Ecosystems Division specializes in working in difficult situations (Afghanistan, Niger Delta, South Sudan) and has the necessary systems and procedures in place to deliver in South Sudan, where they have had staffing since 2009, which has been staffed by international and national staffing. Of recent, this office has successfully implemented enabling activities such as:

- A) GEF- NAPA project
- B) GEF-NCSA project
- C) GEF - INC project
- D) GEF NBSAP project

2. Development work in South Sudan: Many UN agencies are implementing development and environment projects. The project document has a list of development projects and investments that this project should coordinate with. DFID has funded a BRACED project since 2014-15.

3. **Execution modality:** The project will be internally executed by UN Environment with political leadership by GoS. Procurements are undertaken by UN Environment and the UN Environment South Sudan Office executes all the activities (workshops, meetings, stakeholders discussions, missions, etc). Budget control is strictly with the UN Environment South Sudan Office. The UN Environment South Sudan Office executes the projects in full cooperation and collaboration of the government and in this way help to build execution capacity within Government. The execution process will follow established practice: all activities under the projects will be pre-agreed at the annual work plan stage with the government partners in advance. Periodic briefing on the projects will be given to the government. All project meetings will be chaired and steered by the government.

4. **Location of the project:** Operational risks were a key design consideration in the development of the full proposal. The risk and risk mitigation table has the details of the risk mitigation plan. The project document has a well-developed analysis on the political and risk environment based on a climate risk, vulnerability and security assessment carried out to identify the project Districts and communities, which are relatively free from political instability.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

December 16, 2019:

This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

DS, January 10, 2019:

Not yet. Please address comments above and submit revised CEO endorsement request. Please also revise the taxonomy to only provide applicable phrases, and change the project duration to be stated in months instead of years.

DS, March 29, 2019:

Not yet. Please address comments above.

DS, June 18, 2019:

Yes. All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

DS/PPO, August 23, 2019:

The Agency response to the Netherland's Council member's comments is still missing in the Annex B of GEF Portal. Please include that response and resubmit the CEO endorsement request. In addition, the Project Management Cost (PMC) exceeds the applicable standard per the GEF policy. Please reduce the PMC accordingly.

JS, October 24, 2019:

The Agency response to the Netherland's Council member's comments has been included in the GEF Portal.

The PMC is now 5% in the project budget.

Response to Secretariat comments

This has been corrected.

August 23 response

The response to Netherlands' comments have been added to the portal.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

South Sudan is the world's youngest nation, and the last LDC to access the LDCF. This project constitutes the first LDCF project in South Sudan for implementation of concrete adaptation efforts. With at least 80% of its population under the poverty line and 65% in extreme poverty, the country will need any help it can get to address climate change impacts.

This project aims to increase the capacity of government and in particular vulnerable communities in South Sudan to adapt to climate change, through three principal components: (1) Institutional capacity development including the development of national land use maps, inter-Ministerial policy coordination and research action, and national decision-support systems for integrating adaptation and sustainable environmental management into land-use and development planning; (2) Ecosystem-based adaptation approaches including diversified livelihoods and climate-smart agricultural techniques such as agro-forestry and conservation agriculture; and (3) national climate change awareness-raising campaign combined with meteorological science training for Masters' and PhD students, who will be mandated to stay in South Sudan for a period of at least 3 years after graduation and service the government.

The project also includes a small budget for a competitive small grants program for research on climate change adaptation in South Sudan including on the linkages to peacebuilding, natural resource management and human rights.

The project will work in Terekeka and Kapoeta, where the root cause of conflict among communities is access to natural resources, for example, forests, water points and grazing land. Climate change is an added stressor to hardship and displacement. Local peacebuilding will be promoted using natural resources such as reforestation as the basis for rebuilding key relationships and a common vision. The project is expected to work with 51,100 direct beneficiaries (28,000 in Terekeka and 23,100 in Kapoeta, including 19,000 women).

The project will be anchored in the country's Comprehensive Agriculture Master Plan, co-financed by \$25.9 million from the national government, University of Juba, and the GEF Agency. This project is the very first adaptation project in South Sudan and will provide a signal that the international community is stepping forward to help the country out of its dire situation, through environmentally-aligned adaptation solutions.