GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID
9425

Project Type
FSP

Type of Trust Fund
GET

Project Title
Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan

Countries
Sudan

Agency(ies)
UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):
HCENR Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Tourism, Fisheries, Biomes, Sea Grasses, Wetlands, Mangroves, Desert, Coral Reefs, Tropical Dry Forests, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Productive Landscapes, Productive Seascapes, Species, Threatened Species, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Invasive Alien Species, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Sustainable Livelihoods, Sustainable Forest, Ecosystem Approach, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Pasture Management, Sustainable Fire Management, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Agriculture, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Cover and Land cover change, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Communications, Awareness Raising, Type of Engagement, Participation, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Consultation, Local Communities, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Academia, Private Sector, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, SMEs, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Gender results areas, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity Development, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Learning, Adaptive management, Enabling Activities, Innovation, Targeted Research

Rio Markers
Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee($)

389,587

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount($)	Co-Fin Amount($)
BD-1_P1	Improve sustainability of protected area systems: improving financial sustainability and effective management of the national ecological infrastructure.	GET	1,964,041	10,258,000
BD-1_P2	Improve sustainability of protected area systems: nature's last stand: expanding the reach of the global protected area estate.	GET	149,560	750,000
LD-1_P1	Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods: agro-ecological intensification.	GET	993,656	3,500,000
LD-3_P4	Reduce pressures on natural resources by managing competing land uses in broader landscapes: scaling-up sustainable land management through the landscape approach.	GET	993,656	5,000,000
		Total Project Cost($)	**4,100,913**	**19,508,000**

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To Strengthen the National Protected Area (PA) System and Promote Integrated Ecosystem Management in Adjacent Areas to Reduce Threats to Biodiversity, Mitigate Land Degradation, Sustain Ecosystem Services and Improve Livelihoods.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
1. Enabling environment established at the national expanded PA managementlevel for	Technical Assistance	1.1: Improved institutional and technical capacity in HCENR & WCGA Increase in capacity development scorecard by 20%. 1.2. Sudan's PA estate legally expanded to include the full diversity of its eco-regions and endemic biodiversity. Extension of additional 70,000 ha (Tokar game reserve extension, 30,000 ha; and gazetting of Suakin Archipelago and Talla Talla Islands, 40,000 ha) 1.3. Financial resources for national PA system improved. PA Policy and Strategy, Tourism Strategy agreed, financed and accepted by cabinet	1.1. Systematic training on PA System planning and management provided to WCGA staff, to be able to manage PA systems, to assess and track status of all Protected Areas and ensure effective implementation of national UNESCO-accredited biosphere reserves. 1.2. A PA management category structure institutionalised in HCENR and WCGA in collaboration with other agencies/ministries, ensuring PA system managed in line with IUCN and UNESCO international and national guidelines. 1.3. Protected Area boundaries for Dinder, Jebel Al Dair and Dungonab PAs are demarcated, associated public consultations are completed and respective management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both. 1.4. National PA System Policy, Strategy and PA Expansion Plan developed, adopted and implemented by government and partners. 1.5. Implementation of the National PA System Expansion Plan initiated	GET	550,000	3,000,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
2. Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs	Investment	2.1. Improved conservation of globally important biodiversity through enhanced management effectiveness in 3 existing PAs (2 terrestrial, 1 marine: Total: 11,211,200ha. 2.2. Relevant community representatives, private land owners and private business operators (e.g. ecotourism) implement PA/ MPA friendly practices and plans under the Nation-Wide Conservation Strategy.	2.1. Ecological Management, Restoration and Monitoring carried out in three PAs - (Dungonab, Dinder, Jebel El Dair). · Wetland rehabitation in Dinder · Invasive controls in Dinder · Fire management in Dinder · Keystone species monitoring programme in Dinder · Monitoring in Jebel El Dair · Fire management in Jebel El Dair · Wildlife corridors in Jebel El Dair · Transitional zone increased at Jebel El Dair · Rehabilitation of Dungonab marine research centre · Monitoring in Dungonab 2.2. Effective PA management, enforcement and operational support to Four Protected Areas (Dungonab, Dinder and Jebel Eldair). · VHF radio system for Dinder NP	GET	1,317,000	8,008,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
3. Integrated Natural Resource Management in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs	Investment	3.1. Uptake of INRM and SLM by communities living in areas within and surrounding PAs supports conservation through reduced exploitative pressure on PAs and improved and sustainable livelihoods.	3.1. Capacity developed on M&E for measuring land degradation and SLM and INRM interventions. 3.2. Enhanced capacity on INRM and SLM among government extension services and communities. (The focus being around Dinder NP & Jebel Al Dair NP) 3.3. Degraded rangeland in targeted areas restored and biodiversity protected through a combination of government-driven and community-based INRM and SLM interventions. (Including LDN pilot sites: range reserves and community forests; the focus being around Dinder NP & Jebel Al Dair NP and Dungonab MPA) 3.4. Support for diversified livelihoods for communities around PAs developed (the focus being around Dinder NP & Jebel Al Dair NP and Dungonab MPA, including ecotourism, CBO trainings, use of low value grant mechanisms for small business development in the three areas and investment into a deep sea fishing enterprise to avoid utilisation of the MPA).	GET	1,873,000	7,050,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
4. Knowledge Management, Gender Mainstreaming, and M&E	Technical Assistance	4.1. Lessons learned by the project through gender mainstreaming and participatory M&E are used to promote community support for conservation practices and the development of PA systems.	4.1. Gender mainstreaming strategy implemented (incorporating action plan). 4.2. M&E provides sufficient information for adaptive management and learning via active participation of key stakeholders in the project implementation.	GET	165,632	500,000
			Sub Total ($)		**3,905,632**	**18,558,000**

Project Management Cost (PMC)

				GET	195,281	950,000
			Sub Total($)		**195,281**	**950,000**
			Total Project Cost($)		**4,100,913**	**19,508,000**

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount($)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	500,000
Government	Ministry of Finance and National Economy	Grant	5,000,000
Government	Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources	Grant	2,500,000
Government	Wildlife Conservation General Administration	Grant	5,000,000
Government	Agriculture Research Corporation (ARC)	In-kind	500,000
CSO	Sudanese Development Initiative (SUDIA)	In-kind	200,000
CSO	Sudanese Environment Conservation Society (SECS)	In-kind	200,000
Donor Agency	UNESCO ISESCO Chair for Women in Science/Tech.	Grant	500,000
Donor Agency	UNESCO Khartoum Office	In-kind	388,000
Government	Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources	In-kind	2,500,000
Government	Range and Pasture General Directorate (RPGD)	Grant	860,000
Government	Range and Pasture General Directorate (RPGD)	In-kind	860,000
Government	Wildlife Research Centre/Animal Resources Research Cooperation	Grant	250,000
Government	Wildlife Research Centre/Animal Resources Research Cooperation	In-kind	250,000
		Total Co-Financing($)	**19,508,000**

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount($)	Fee($)
UNDP	GET	Sudan	Biodiversity		No	2,113,601	200,792
UNDP	GET	Sudan	Land Degradation		No	1,987,312	188,795
				Total Grant Resources($)		4,100,913	389,587

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

PPG Amount ($)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee ($)

9,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount($)	Fee($)
UNDP	GET	Sudan	Biodiversity		No	50,000	4,750
UNDP	GET	Sudan	Land Degradation		No	50,000	4,750
				Total Project Costs($)		**100,000**	**9,500**

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1,762,700.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	700,000.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	
Akula National Park Toker Game Reserve (PA Extension and incorporation into Biosphere)	**125689** N/A	**Select**National Park		660,000.00			☐
Akula National Park West Kordofan protected Area	**125689** N/A	**Select**National Park		40,000.00			☐

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1,062,700.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Dinder National Park	**125689** 2336	**Select**National Park		1,029,200.00			48.00		☐
Akula National Park Jebal Al Dair National Park	**125689** Not in WDPA	**Select**National Park		33,500.00			41.00		☐

Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	306,300.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 2.1 Marine Protected Areas Newly created

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	30,000.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	
Akula National Park Talla Talla Islands (proposed)	**125689** Not in WDPA	**Select**National Park		30,000.00			☐

Indicator 2.2 Marine Protected Areas Under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	276,300.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)	
Akula National Park Dungonab Bay Mukkawar Island Marine National Park	**125689** No WDPA ID	**Select**National Park		276,300.00			37.00			☐

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	5560.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	50.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	4,040.00		

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	1,270.00		

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	200.00		

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	448700.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	448,700.00		

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted

Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	200.00		

Indicator 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)

Type/name of the third-party certification

Indicator 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

LME at PIF **LME at CEO Endorsement** **LME at MTR** **LME at TE**

Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided

Metric Tons (expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		4,137		
Male		4,190		
Total	0	8327	0	0

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

A.1. *Project Description*.

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:

There have been no substantial changes in terms of the GEB identified since the PIF was designed and approved, although they have been provided for in more detail on the ProDOC. In particular, GEB under LD have been given greater emphasis than in early versions of the project design, with the LD investment made much more explicit. Please see ProDOC 3.4 (pp35-36) for GEB and the analysis of root causes (2.1. pp12-13) and barriers and the theory of change (2.4. pp17-19).

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects:

There have been no strategic changes since the PIF was designed and approved, except that the baseline has been elaborated on further. Please refer to ProDOC 2.3, Tables 4, 5 and 6 (pp14-18) and the co-financing tables on the ProDOC front page and in the Financial Summary of Section VIII *Total Budget and Work Plan*. Please also see Table C above.

3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[1][1] strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project:

The project framework was modified and adapted during the PPG. There is a clear rationale for simplifying the Project Document from the PIF. The initial project concept was quite complex relative to the amount of money invested into from the GEF Trust Fund, as well as the complex context of Sudan at the time of project development (financial and political context), with a significant political transition underway, including a period in mid 2019 following regime change when the future of the country was very unclear, although the situation subsequently improved considerably, particulat following the peace settlement in mid August 2019. There was initially insufficient clarity between the areas of intervention covered under Land Degradation focal area funds as opposed to those being covered under Biodiversity focal area funds. This lack of clarity has been rectified in subsequent revisons of the documentation.

The STAP review picked up some of these challenges during PIF submission, and a detailed response is provided below. However, in short, the comments can be summarised as needing to simplify the PIF into more tangible, practical interventions, with greater clarity between LD and BD elements. The need for a more pragmatic or streamlined approach was further made evident through the consultation process that took place in Khartoum and in the field during the PPG missions and considerable stakeholder engagement, as well as related to the significant political leadership changes that took place over the latter half of the PPG period (even though these did not necessarily cause immediate or medium term changes to the situation on the ground in many areas). It was made clear during the PPG missions and the consultations with land management specialists and SLM implementers in Sudan, that the size of land to be restored outside of the parks needed to be reduced to be more realistically aligned with the budget and time limitations of the project. As a result, the ProDOC reflects a limited simplification of the three project components, dropping those activities that would not be realistic in terms of the timeframe and budget allocation of the project.

Please refer to the the Project Description in Table B above, and especially the following sections in the ProDOC for the updated version:

- Figure 2. Project Theory of Change (p18)
- Section II. Expected Results, (pp20-35)
- Section IV. Project Results Framework (pp50-53)
- Section VIII. Total Budget And Work Plan (pp64-70
- ProDOC Annex A: Multi-Year Work Plan (pp73-86)

The changes to the project framework are as follows:

- The **Objective** was maintained, bar a minor improvement in syntax.

- The **Components (UNDP Outcomes in ProDOC)** 1 to 3 were maintained in terms of the language used, however a new fourth Component (UNDP Outcome) on *Gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and M&E* was added, to give these aspects more weight in terms of budget and dedicated attention. This Component 4 was assigned a budget of $135,631, reducing in turn the GEF funds available for Components (UNDP Outcomes) 1 to 3. The shift in the structure of the components is reflected as follows:

Components in PIF	Components in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
1. Enabling environment established at the national level for expanded PA management	1. Enabling environment established at the national level for expanded PA management
2. Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs	2. Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs
3. Integrated Natural Resource Management in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs	3. Integrated Natural Resource Management in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs
N/A	4. Knowledge Management, Gender Mainstreaming, and M&E

- The essence of the **Outcomes** in the PIF was largely maintained in the ProDOC and CEO Endorsement Request. However, for some, there were some simplifications to make them achievable, notably the Outcomes for Component 3 which were merged into one: a comparison is given below. For the Outcome related to Component 3, it was decided to take a holistic approach that encompassed the interconnectedness of improved and sustainable land management interventions, livelihoods alternatives and reduced pressure for resource use within the park. The outcome needed to be impact-related. Based on extensive consultations and feedback within the stakeholder groups during the PPG mission, the need for a holistic outcome, detailed outputs (which would otherwise have been difficult to align to the different PIF outcomes, as there would have been many overlaps), was decided and agreed upon. Due to the fact that communities live within the various zones of the park, this outcome was made to take into consideration land and resource use by communities who live within and around the park borders. Greater clarity has been provided to the Outcomes to better define LD and BD related outcomes from each Component, especially where there are activities with linkages.

Outcomes in PIF	Outcomes in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
1.1 Improved institutional and technical capacity in HCENR/WCGA.	1.1: Improved institutional and technical capacity in HCENR & WCGA.
1.2 Sudan's PA estate legally expanded to include the full diversity of its eco-regions and endemic biodiversity.	1.2. Sudan's PA estate legally expanded to include the full diversity of its eco-regions and endemic biodiversity. Extension of additional 70,000 ha (Tokar game reserve extension, 30,000 ha; and gazetting of Suakin Archipelago and Talla Talla Islands, 40,000 ha)
1.3 Financial resources for national PA system improved.	1.3. Financial resources for national PA system improved. PA Policy and Strategy, Tourism Strategy agreed, financed and accepted by cabinet.
2.1 Improved conservation of globally important biodiversity through enhanced management effectiveness in 5 existing PAs (3 terrestrial at 18,766.2 km2, 2 marine at 2,452 km2; 20% of the terrestrial and 30% of the marine PA system).	2.1. Improved conservation of globally important biodiversity through enhanced management effectiveness in 3 existing PAs (2 terrestrial, 1 marine: Total: 2,039,000 ha.
2.2 Relevant community representatives, private land owners and private business operators (e.g. ecotourism) implement PA/ MPA friendly practices and plans under the Nation-Wide Conservation Strategy.	2.2. Relevant community representatives, private land owners and private business operators (e.g. ecotourism) implement PA/ MPA friendly practices and plans under the Nation-Wide Conservation Strategy.
3.1 SLM and INRM conserve and restore natural resources and ecosystem functions in c. 6,670 km2 of range and wood lands in the periphery of the targeted 5 PAs.	3.1. Uptake of INRM and SLM by communities living in areas within and surrounding PAs supports conservation through reduced exploitative pressure on PAs and improved and sustainable livelihoods.
3.2 Exploitative pressures on targeted PAs and migratory wildlife more widely reduced.	---
3.3 Improved and more sustainable livelihoods.	-----

Outcomes in PIF	Outcomes in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
---	4.1. Lessons learned by the project through gender mainstreaming and participatory M&E are used to promote community support for conservation practices and the development of PA systems.

- Indicator Baselines and Targets for PA areas were updated to refect the reality, based on feedback gained during the PPG process and are now defined in detail in Section IV: Project Results Framework (pp51-54) and refered to in Table B above.

- The Outputs were changed in a few places to reflect comments from STAP and the more elaborate analyses and proposals emerging from the PPG and a need for a simpler, more achievable approach. For instance, the certification system propsed was dropped, as being too complicated, the focus on the PA strategic work was simplified, and early-level tourism inputs have been added for future economic sustainability in a changing political context, Further, protected areas inputs have been made much more practical and based on best practices around key themes of ecological monitoring, operations and economic security. All community level engagements have been focused into Component 3, with a more practical eye on activities. A step-wise phased approach has been taking to address activities in order of their prioritized need. The following table compares Outputs with changes highlighted:

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
1.1 Training on PA System Planning provided to HCENR/ WCGA staff, to undertake METT assessments of all PAs with national partners, and to undertake National Biodiversity Spatial Assessment and Land Use Plan with national and international partners.	1.1. Systematic training on PA System planning and management provided to WCGA staff, to be able to manage PA systems, to assess and track status of all Protected Areas and ensure effective implementation of national UNESCO-accredited biosphere reserves.
1.2 A PA management certification programme institutionalised in HCENR/ WCGA to catalyse further capacity development, enabling participants to engage in strategic PA management partnerships (incl. with tourism operators and neighbouring countries).	1.2. A PA management category structure institutionalised in HCENR and WCGA in collaboration with other agencies/ministries, ensuring PA system managed in line with IUCN and UNESCO international and national guidelines.
.3 Design of new legal, policy, institutional & land tenure frameworks prepared allowing sustainable PA co-management based on clearly defined and delineated zones within and around PAs (this will include revisions to and endorsement of the WCGA Wildlife Policy and the Wildlife Act).	1.3. Protected Area boundaries for Dinder, Jebel Al Dair and Dungonab PAs are demarcated, associated public consultations are completed and respective management plans are completed, taking into account the outcomes for both.

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
1.4 National PA System Strategy and PA Expansion Plan developed and adopted, to cover all sites with adequate maps and information: a) compile sites database with inventories of habitats and species, status, threats, area, management objectives, prevailing management, etc.; b) standardised METTs conducted of all PAs in Sudan (where possible given security concerns); c) Land Use Plan and National Biodiversity Spatial Assessment conducted taking into account bio-geographic / ecological coverage of habitats/ecosystems, degrees of threat, species representation and potential climate change impacts; d) feasibility studies conducted for upgrading or expanding existing PAs and establishing new PAs (incl. for upgrading conservation status of one sanctuary into a national park or biosphere reserve); e) PA system and management and expansion priorities defined and reflected in new strategies and plans.	1.4. National PA System Policy, Strategy and PA Expansion Plan developed, adopted and implemented by government and partners.
1.5 Implementation of the National PA System Expansion Plan initiated through the legal designation of at least 2 new PAs providing increased coverage for critical biodiversity (ecosystems, species)	1.5. Implementation of the National PA System Expansion Plan initiated through the legal designation of two new PAs (one being a proposed biosphere) providing increased coverage for critical biodiversity in critical marine and terrestrial habitats.
1.6 Strategy for consolidated and effective financing and financial management of Sudan's national system of PAs developed and implemented, based on resource mobilization from government and international sources, and tapping into potential for ecotourism development.	1.6. Strategy for consolidated and effective financing and financial management of Sudan's national system of PAs developed and implemented.
2.1 Participatory management of PAs will be promoted and incorporated in local development framework involving state governments, and private sector.	1.7. Finalisation and initial implementation of a national tourism strategy, targeting domestic and international tourism markets.

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
2.2 Capacity development and organisational support to PA adjacent communities, private land owners, tourism operators, etc., to enable effective participation in the planning and management of the PA and its management zones (this is directly linked to SLM / INRM training, see 3.1), and to build awareness about biodiversity and the importance of biodiversity-friendly land use.	1.8. Creation of an information unit for managing ecological data, GIS information, remote sensing, park management data and economic and financial information.
2.3 PA management tools developed and implemented in the 5 targeted PAs: a) at least these 5 METTs completed (see 1.4); b) sustainable use thresholds established for key resources (wood, NTFP including Gum Arabic) inside the PA and its management zones; c) PA management, zoning plans and business plans developed involving key stakeholders; d) cooperative agreements with local communities and NGOs developed; e) PA management plans and community cooperative agreements implemented in all 5 PAs; f) business plans implemented in at least 2 PAs (1 terrestrial, 1 marine), including testing of biodiversity-friendly revenue generating mechanisms that also benefit local stakeholders; g) training of PA staff; h) long-term ecological monitoring system in place for targeted species and ecosystems, establishing thresholds for resource use and informing PA management planning.	2.1. Ecological Management, Restoration and Monitoring carried out in three PAs - (Dungonab, Dinder, Jebel El Dair). • Wetland rehabitation in Dinder • Invasive controls in Dinder • Fire management in Dinder • Keystone species monitoring programme in Dinder • Monitoring in Jebel El Dair • Fire management in Jebel El Dair • Wildlife corridors in Jebel El Dair • Transitional zone increased at Jebel El Dair • Rehabilitation of Dungonab marine research centre • Monitoring in Dungonab
2.4 Support for alternative livelihoods: artisanal fisheries, small-scale aquaculture, eco-tourism, bee-keeping, handcrafts, sea-shell collection, planting cash-generating trees such as doum palm, date palm, agaves, moringa, etc.).	2.2. Effective PA management, enforcement and operational support to Four Protected Areas (Dungonab, Dinder, Jebel Eldair and Al Hassania). • Enforcement equipment provided at Jebel Al Hassania NP • VHF radio system for Dinder NP • Solar power installed at Dinder • Support to relocation of Dinder NP HQ from Dinder town to El Senait within the NP • VHF radio system for Dungonab • Boat and motors for Dungonab

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
	• Expansion of MPA HQ at Dungonab (Mohamed Qol) • Solar power at Dungonab HQ
(New addition)	2.3. Development and Enhancement of Economic Infrastructure in 3 PAs (Dungonab, Dinder, Jebel El Dair). • Two seasonal fly camps built near maya wetlands in Dinder NP • Limited walking and kayaking infrastructure in Dinder NP. • Hiking trails created and fly camp installed at Jebel Al Dair NP • Package of tourism initatives installed for Dungonab MPA including fly camps, camel safaris, diving and snorkelling
(New addition)	2.4. Situational analysis, stock-taking and needs assessment in Radom and Wadi Hawar PAs – with recommendations provided for improved management.
3.1 Build national capacity on M&E for measuring land degradation and SLM & INRM interventions, to support national efforts towards the LDN target	3.1. Capacity developed on M&E for measuring land degradation and SLM and INRM interventions. - national and regional capacity-building workshops on biophysical land condition asessments toward LDN (including metrics such as land cover change, net primary productivity and soil organic carbon); - Baseline land condition assessments of representative sample areas, and particular LDN intervention sites -Mid-term and end-term land condition assessments of the same sites as the baseline assessments; -long-term monitoring plan for M&E SLM towards LDN
3.2 Pasture and woodland/mangrove restoration nurseries established in several locations.	3.2. Enhanced capacity on INRM and SLM among government extension services and communities. - lead farmer training and demo sites on conservation agriculture (around DNP) - resource use development for villages around DNP - land use planning workshops around DNP - ToT for holistic rangeland management (around JADNP) - CBNRM training for villages around JADNP

Outputs in PIF	Outputs in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request
3.3 Degraded pastures restored through a combination of government-driven and community-based SLM and INRM interventions: a) training and extension services provided to targeted communities on community organising, best-practice SLM and INRM and the monitoring of LD and related restoration efforts; b) establish 10 community range reserves @ 50 ha each); c) reintroduce rotational grazing; d) bale feedstock from water deficient rangelands and crop residues from cultivated fields (estimated to 200 tons dry matter basis/yr); e) fire avoidance training and fire line construction (100 km linear km/year); f) collection of native rangeland plant species and reseeding over 5,000 ha/yr in conjunction with water harvesting; g) collection and broadcasting of forestry seeds (especially Acacia tortilis; at least in Tokar, Sinkat and El Dungonab sites) and planting of 50,000 trees over 100 ha/yr in degraded areas; rehabilitation of 50 ha/yr of mangrove.	3.3. Degraded rangeland in targeted areas restored and biodiversity protected through a combination of government-driven and community-based INRM and SLM interventions. - two community range reserves around DNP, incl nurseries, SLM plans, (20 ha total) - reseeding programme 1,250 ha rangeland around DNP - two community forests around DNP, incl nurseries, use plan, fire management, (20 ha total) - reforestation of 2,000 ha around DNP - two villages pilot CBNRM programmes - two community forests around JADNP, incl nurseries, use plan, fire management, (20 ha total) - reforestation of 2,000 ha around JADNP - holistic rangeland management plan for buffer zone of JADNP - mangrove and herbaceous spp nursery established for around DMNP - replanting of mangroves programme 200 ha around DMNP
(Previously C2)	3.4. Support for diversified livelihoods for communities around PAs developed (the focus being around Dinder NP & Jebel Al Dair NP and Dungonab MPA) - eco-tourism guide training for community members around DNP - Access to finance (low value grants) for development of small business enterprises around DNP, JADNP, DMNP - skills development around business administration - womens saving scheme around DMNP - tourism facilitation development for around DMNP to diversity livelihoods and increase livelihood security - support to sustainable fisheries through capacity building and deep-sea fishing (BD related)
N/A	4.1. Gender mainstreaming strategy implemented (incorporating action plan).
N/A	4.2. M&E provides sufficient information for adaptive management and learning via active participation of key stakeholders in the project implementation.

- The distribution of the GEF budget between Components (UNDP Outcomes) had to be amended, as follows:

Component (UNDP Outcome)	Budget in PIF (US$)	Budget in PRODOC/CEO Endorsement Request (US$)
1	600,000	550,000
2	1,413,699	1,317,000
3	1,891,933	1,873,000
4	N/A	165,632

4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing;

There have been no changes since the PIF was designed and approved in terms of overall planned financial input, indeed the overall co-financing has risen, however some of the organisatins have changed and the amounts in cash and in-kind have changed. Please refer to the cofinancing tables on the ProDOC front page and in the Financial Summary of Section VIII *Total Budget and Work Plan*. Please also see Table C above.

5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF):

The project will head-start the implementation of a national protected area strategy, in policy terms and in action in three PAs. Scientifically-sound and comprehensive plans have been formulated for three national parks; however, the success of these plans depends on a) sustainable land management, which is a relatively new concept in Sudan; b) strong management structures at both federal and state levels, which are currently lacking; and c) adequate and continued funding, and as yet these funding sources have not been secured. Therefore, there is a strong need for building institutional and local capacity for sustainable land management and PA management plan implementation and increasing the level of funding for its implementation. Therefore, this project will be crucial for its initiation. Ultimately, the success of the PA system will be enhanced through a more supportive environment for conservation planning and funding and sustainable land management. The Project aims to increase the implementation capacity of the federal and state governments for protected areas. It will improve coordination between management and implementing agencies by strengthening the national PA management system and giving it a clear strategic direction. The Project will improve the institutional knowledge and decision-making capacity base with regards to biodiversity management and effective SLM. The project works on the premise that, in the absence of sustained global financial transfer schemes to compensate for global benefits that do not accrue to the country, the PA system is likely only to reach sustainability if sufficient tangible benefits can be realised to compensate for PA management costs. The project is designed to generate global benefits through protecting globally important ecosystems. This will protect the existence values, option values and future use values enjoyed by the global community that might otherwise be forfeited, should the PA estate fail to provide an effective buffer against anthropogenic threats prevalent at the landscape level.

Because this project aims to apply a comprehensive landscape approach as the best way to address the broad multi-faceted nature of land degradation across the range of the agro-ecological zones of and surrounding the protected areas (as broader ecosystems), it has strongly linked global environmental benefits linked to the land degradation focal areas of the GEF. The integrated approach of the project and the strategic interconnected use of BD and LD focal areas funds promotes harmonised land use between PAs and adjacent land units, thereby promoting integrated and sustainable land management. This in turn mitigates the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of ecosystems and contributes to improving people's livelihoods.

Global benefits through the GEF alternative will be through greater protection afforded to three fragile interlinked landscapes rich in biodiversity and access to the ecosystem services that these landscapes will be able to offer. Crucially, the project is also expected to bring a range of national benefits through interlinked approaches by building capacity for PA management amongst PA managers and other landholders and stakeholder partners, thus helping to support PAs and the communities who live in buffer zones, dispersal areas and wildlife corridors that support the core PAs to manage those landscapes effectively and without further loss to biodiversity.

The **long-term impacts** or **global environmental benefits** (GEB) – to which the project will contribute (in a 10-15-year timeframe) are shown in table 10. These global environmental benefits are linked to the core indicator framework of the project.

In terms of the BD focal area, the project works on the premise that, in the absence of sustained global financial transfer schemes to compensate for global benefits that do not accrue to the country, the PA system is likely only to reach sustainability if sufficient tangible benefits can be realised to compensate for PA management costs. The project is designed to generate global benefits through protecting globally important ecosystems. This will protect the existence values, option values and future use values enjoyed by the global community that might otherwise be forfeited, should the PA estate fail to provide an effective buffer against anthropogenic threats prevalent at the landscape level. Specifically, the PA Policy and Strategy, Tourism Strategy and other strategic outputs from the project will ensure PA support is integrated, financed and accepted by cabinet, and the recommendations of land use planning processes will be effectively integrated into national planning. The extension of the PA system will bring an additional 70,000 ha (Tokar game reserve extension, 30,000 ha; and gazetting of Suakin Archipelago and Talla Talla Islands, 40,000 ha) under protection.

From the perspective of the LD focal areas, the project particularly supports the restoration of land (5,560 ha) in agricultural (50 ha), rangeland (1,270 ha) and forest (4,040 ha), and coastal mangrove systems (200 ha) under Core Indicator 3 (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4), and supports increasing areas under sustainable land management (448,700 ha) under Core Indicator 4.3.

In terms of national, local and social benefits, and through its attempt to reverse land degradation in the areas surround the three selected protected areas, it aims to enhance the lives of people living under high levels of poverty struggling with interlinked socio-economic-environmental challenges. Through its investments into alternative livelihood options (access to finance for small business, eco-tourism opportunities, training and skills diversification, womens savings groups) it aims to reduce dependence on natural resouces, diversifies income streams for people living around parks, and enables the potential for stewardship for natural resources (enhancing the world view that more rewards are received from sustainable use and stewardship of resources we depend on). The overall landscape approach taken by the project allows it to tailor implementation interventions and build resilience of communities who live off the land.

At the local level linking to national level decision-making, and honing in on the buffer and transitional zones of Dinder National Park: designing an depth dialogue and participatory process (as part of Output 3.2 of the project) will inform land use planning system that aims to reduce competition among land users. This process will be a learning platform for the country to more effectively improve it land use planning and implementation mechanisms. The benefits accrued from this might have longer term results and works towards the core indicators of the LD focal area (areas under SLM, 4.3).

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

There have been no changes since the PIF was designed and approved, with the exception of the added impetus given to sustainability and more detail and analysis provided in this context. Particularly, the project focused on realistic and practical interventions that have the potential to be tested and replicated through the government implementers (particularly in relation to LDN monitoring and SLM interventions). With regard to sustainability, details are provided in are listed in the ProDOC in section III (§168-170). With regards to the potential for scaling up, details are provided in the ProDOC in section II (§171).

[1] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

A.2. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes)? and indigenous peoples (no)? [1]

The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders' participation. Please refer to ProDOC Section 3.5 *Stakeholder analysis and engagement* with a breakdown of stakeholder categories, their interest in the project and their anticipated roles. A stakeholder engagement plan is outlined in Annex E of the ProDOC. Additionally the UNDP Grievance Redress Mechanism for the project is described in ProDOC Section 3.7. *Risks to the project & social and environmental safeguards* (pp42-47), in accordance with UNDP standard procedures.

Documents

Title	Submitted
ANNEX E- Stakeholder Engagement Plan	

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 40%, men 60%)?[1]

The project is categorized as Gender Responsive: results address differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights but do not address root causes of inequalities in their lives.

During the PPG, the project conducted a Gender Analysis, and created a Gender Action Plan, which is included in PRODOC Annex F, and developed a Gender Action Plan, which is shown in Table 8 in the dedicated ProDOC narrative 3.6.. *Mainstreaming gender* (pp38-42, p113).

Moreover, a new fourth component was added to the project design during the PPG, to give specific weight to M&E, Knowledge Management and Gender aspects. A Gender Specialist will be hired for the duration of the whole project. The project will thus ensure that gender mainstreaming issues will be given dedicated attention and be effective throughout project implementation and monitoring.

Documents

Title	Submitted

ANNEX F- Gender Assessment and Mainstreaming

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

A.5. Risks

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being, achieved, and, if possible, the proposedmeasures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

The risks to the project and the risks posed by the project were updated and further elaborated during the PPG, following also the completion of the UNDP Social and Environmental Safeguards Assessment (SESP). Project Risks are assessed and explained in ProDOC 3.7. *Risks to the project & social and environmental safeguards* (pp42-47) and in detail in the table in Annex G: UNDP Risk Log, which is copied hereunder. Further more general project governance risks are detailed in Section X *Risk Management*: SESP is included in PRODOC Annex D.

Key assumptions, risks to project success and mitigation measures

1. The project strategy makes a number of key assumptions in proposing the GEF intervention. Key assumptions that will influence the achievement of the project outcomes are outlined in the table below.

Table 13. Key assumptions, updated during the PPG phase

Project Outcomes	Assumptions
Component 1 *Enabling environment established at the national level for expanded PA management*	
1.1 Improved institutional and technical capacity in HCENR/WCGA.	Government will approve the legislation, policy amendments and monitoring framework developed by the project and will be able to implement them providing sufficient national funding.
1.2 Sudan's PA estate legally expanded; National PA System Strategy consolidated and comprises the new sites; gazettement decrees adopted.	
1.3 Financial resources for national PA system improved.	This requires strong legislative support and long term financial and training investment to improve capacity to ensure policies are implemented and new PAs are effectively managed.
	Government will support the established PAs with sufficient staff and national funding
Component 2 *Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs*	
2.1 Improved conservation of globally important biodiversity through enhanced management effectiveness in 5 existing PAs.	Compliance of resource users with biodiversity standards is monitored and enforced in and around the new and established PAs.
	Species and habitat integrity within PAs are protected from negative influences and continue to improve based on practices implemented under the project.
	Government will approve the necessary legislative amendments as it requires strong legislative amendments and strong collaboration and coordination among project stakeholders.
2.2 Relevant community representatives, private land owners and private business operators implement PA/ MPA friendly practices and plans under the Nation-Wide Conservation Strategy.	This requires behaviour changes amongst stakeholders to uptake practices developed under the project.
Component 3 *INRM in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs*	

Project Outcomes	Assumptions
3.1 Uptake of INRM and SLM by communities living in areas (within and) surrounding PAs supports conservation through reduced exploitative pressure on PAs and improved and sustainable livelihoods	Quick uptake of SLM and INRM practices by stakeholders in pilot areas, and wider uptake and replication across more areas post-project.
	Law enforcement is strong enough to deter local communities from unsustainable practices and encroaching into PAs.
	Alternative livelihoods prove to be more profitable than less sustainable practices.
	Government staff and PA managers trained under the project are able to effectively implement practices that deter unsustainable practices.
	Other stakeholders have interest to learn from lessons and successful practices developed by the project.
Component 4 *Gender mainstreaming, Knowledge Management and M&E*	
4.1 The project will support actions to promote women's empowerment and gender equality	Willingness for leadership and stakeholders to engage in behaviour changes that will allow for women's participation and support engagement
4.2 The project implements effective monitoring and evaluation programmes within PA institutions and knowledge-sharing and awareness campaigns to influence behaviour changes towards conservation, SLM and INRM practices.	This requires detailed national coordination and long and short-term campaigns to ensure lasting benefits.

2.   The identification of **risks** was initiated at a very early stage of project development and maintained throughout PPG development, particularly as Sudan has undergone substantial political change during the PPG process and is undergoing a transition of political powers, the end result of which is unclear at the end of the PPG process, although government functions have been essentially maintained. The main risks, risk rankings and mitigation measures are presented below. As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR. A number of risks were identified in the PIF; these have been updated during the project preparation phase.

Table 14. Risks to the project

Type of Risk / Description	Impact and Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status

Organisational/ Financial: Limited institutional and financial capacity to manage PAs effectively post-project	Institutional functionality and limitations in capacity (both financial and human resources) could undermine the project results and the long-term sustaining of results. Probability: 3 Impact: 4 MODERATE	While addressing systemic and institutional issues is beyond the scope of the project, the project design is ensuring that capacity development will take place to strengthen park management, policy influence will also ensure that financing will become sustainable - particularly in terms of incentivising protection through enhanced tourism development for the country through the project.	UNDP-CO and PMU	No change
Political: Other development sectors and processes are prioritised above the Protected Areas - which results in low levels of long-term financing and political leverage	In the past, extremely limited funding of the national budget has been allocated to effective management of parks. Current short-term priorities might outcompete budget allocation to environmental sectors - even if environmental sectors are foundational to security and human wellbeing. Probability: 2 Impact: 4 MODERATE/LOW	During the PPG phase, much effort was placed on consulting and engaging all relevant actors, including Economic Planning, Finance, and Tourism Ministries. The project, in its implementation, will seek to influence the policy environment and in particular finalise the Wildlife Protection Policy.	UNDP-CO and PMU	Decreasing at PPG stage
Political/ Organisational: Weak coordination at federal and state levels	Weak coordination can result in duplicitous and wasted financial spending, and also in contradicting laws and lack of enforcement of laws and directives at national and state levels. Probability: 2 Impact: 3 MODERATE/LOW	The PIF identified that there had been recent problems between state and governments and the WCGA. During the PPG, state authorities were engaged, and are also planned to be part of the country implementation. It remains a concern due to the transitional arrangements in place following (partial) regime change in April 2019	UNDP-CO and PMU	Decreasing at PPG stage

Political: Riots and protests in Sudan culminated in the President declaring a year-long State of Emergency from February 2019 (during last phase of PPG) and thereafter to a partial regime change in April 2019, in transition at the point of ProDOC submission (May 2019).	The ongoing regime change triggered in mid-April 2019i nitially allowed for government functions to continue, however there is a high chance of government functions being disturbed or potentially halted, at least partially, if the transition process is not effectively managed Probability: 3 Impact: 5 MODERATE	Mitigation of this risk remains beyond the scope of this project. However, if the situation seriously deteriorates, the UNDP-CO will need to decide regarding the implementation of the project. At PPG completion, the transition process was ongoing but allowed for continued government functionality.	UNDP-CO	Decreasing at late PPG stage
Political: Competing land use and conflict among resource users as a result of land grabbing through mechanized farming further marginalising small-scale farmers and pastoralists and forcing them into PAs	Further land grabbing will continue to result in communities being forced to make (unsustainable) use of natural resources. Probability: 4 Impact: 4 HIGH	Given the current country political environment and transitional government, the project, with its resources and limited political influence, will not be able to effectively change national land tenure; it is aiming to implement land use planning at local level and bring these recommendations to state and national level, but in the long term the Government of Sudan will need to secure and enforce customary land rights to stop land grabbing.	UNDP-CO and PMU	no change
Environmental: Climate Change will lead to a more variable climate in Sudan, communities who are already marginalised and vulnerable living around PAs will be most affected	The project is putting in place strategies that should mitigate the impacts of climate change (both through the increased effectiveness of protected area management as well as work on protecting SLM and INRM with communities there by enhancing their resilience through EBA). Probability: 2 Impact: 4 MODERATE	Although over the lifetime of the project, the impact of climate change is predicted to be moderate, the project will have tried, through its INRM and SLM to enhance Ecosystem-Based Adaptation thereby mitigating and enhancing ecosystem resilience to climate change.	PMU and implementing partners working with local communities	increasing through project implementation

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangementfor project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The project's institutional arrangements are described in PRODOC Section VI *Governance and Management Arrangements (pp61-64)*.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environement benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptaion benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

Project beneficiaries are listed in the ProDOC in section III (pp37-39) and Annex E of the ProDOC.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings. conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document ina user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

During the PPG a standalone fourth Component was added to the project on Gender mainstreaming, Knowledge Management and M&E, to give these aspects more weight in terms of budget and dedicated attention.

Please refer to the description of this Component in the PRODOC (pp36-37), which will also refer to the ProDOC 3.5 *Partnerships and Stakeholder engagement* (pp39-41) and ProDOC Annex E (p.109) which detail the range of qualified organisations and initiatives with whom the project will hold in depth exchanges to receive and share best practices.

Knowledge management approaches are indentified on page 36, in 3.12 (p51) and in ProDOC Annex L (p218).

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessements under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

Please refer to ProDOC 1.2 *Relevance to national development priorities, global environmental issues, and the SDGs* (pp10-11) and ProDOC 2.5 *Alignment with national strategies and priorities* (pp19-21).

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:
The budgeted M&E plan is included in PRODOC Section V *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan* (pp57-60), which refer back to the ProDOC Section VI *Project Results Framework* (pp53-56) and are consistent also with the Total Budget and Work Plan in ProDOC Section VIII (pp67-71).

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/24/2019	Yves de Soye UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor– EBD, UNDP	+33682758944	yves.desoye@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to ProDOC Section IV *Project Results Framework (pp53-56).*

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): *SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 2 (Zero Hunger), SDG 6 (Clean water and sanitation), SDG 8 (Decent work and economic growth), SDG 12 (Responsible consumption and production), SDG 13 (Climate action), SDG 14 (Life below water), SDG 15 (Life on land), SDG 16 (Peace and strong institutions), SDG 17 (Partnerships for the goals)*	

This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:

UNDAF Focus Area 2: Environment, Climate Resilience and Disaster Risk Management: Outcome 2: By 2021, people's resilience to consequences of climate change, environmental stresses and natural hazards is enhanced through strengthened institutions, policies, plans and programmes.

Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0-100) *(resilience sub-indicator 2)* (SDG indicator 6.5.1)

Percent of forest loss (SDG indicator 15.3)

This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: *SP OUTCOME 1. Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions, Signature Solution #4: Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet. SP OUTPUT 1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains.*

	Objective and Outcome Indicators **(no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)**	**Baseline[1]**	**Mid-term Target[2][2]**	**End of Project Target**	**Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions[3][3]**

Project Objective: To Strengthen the National Protected Area (PA) System and Promote Integrated Ecosystem Management in Adjacent Areas to Reduce Threats to Biodiversity, Mitigate Land Degradation, Sustain Ecosystem Services and Improve Livelihoods.	**Mandatory IRRF Indicator 1:** Area of land and marine habitat under protection (hectares) **Please see Indicator 5**	Please see Indicator 5	Please see Indicator 5	Please see Indicator 5	Please see Indicator 5
	Mandatory indicator 2: Number of project beneficiaries who have gained access to resources and capacity in INRM and alternative livelihoods through the project (disaggregated by gender)	0	5,000	15,023 (women: 7,192; men: 7,831)	Number of beneficiaries listed during each intervention; household surveys at Terminal Evaluation
					Risks: Take-up of some interventions does not happen (long-term assistance throughout project will ensure that support is given, ownership embedded throughout). Assumptions: Small value grants will support business diversification and impact for communities
GEF Component 1 / UNDP Outcome 1: Enabling environment	**GEF Outcome 1.1:** Improved institutional and technical capacity in HCENR/WCGA. **Indicator 3:** Score on UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for HCENR/WCGA	Staffing levels and skills levesl in place. Limitation over financial and some technical respurces	Increase in capacity development scorecard by 20%	Increase in capacity development scorecard by 30%	Questionnaires after training (training results); capacity development scorecards
					Risks: none. Assumptions: Capacity developed translates to improved management and enforcement overall
	Indicator 4: National policy framework	Only draft	PA Policy	PA Policy and	Policies exist and have been passed.

established at the national level for expanded PA management	developed and finalized (National PA Policy, Tourism Strategy)	Wildlife Policy (with many weaknesses)	and Strategy, as well as Tourism Strategy developed	Strategy, Tourism Strategy and financed and accepted by cabinet, and recommendations of land use planning process integrated into national planning	Risks: Political will is not there to pass through policies. Assumptions: Timeline is sufficient to finalize and pass through policies and strategies
	GEF Outcome 1.2: Sudan's PA estate legally expanded to include the full diversity of its eco-regions and endemic biodiversity. **Indicator 5:** Area and key ecosystem coverage of gazetted national PA system	PA system 11,211,200 ha	-	Extension of PAs: Terrestrial: + 30,000ha Tokar + 40,000ha West Kordofan Marine: +30,000 ha (Talla Talla Islands)	Gazetted and adhered to MAB guidelines by WCGA Risks: Park is claimed but enforcement lacking. Assumptions: Gazetting is simple and MAB guidelines are adhered to
	GEF Outcome 1.3: Financial resources for national PA system improved. **Indicator 6:** **Financial strategy in place**	WCGA Budget Support of around $13.5 million pa.a, focused mostly on salaries and PA management running costs	*Financial strategy in place, Tourism stragey in place*	*Please see Indicator 6.*	Assumptions: Government will accept financial planning Assumptions: Independepent tourism and communications planning and implementation will be possible, bringing in best practices and international experience, dovetailed with national insights and experience. National private sector will get behind the strategy (thus not too heavy handed by government)
GEF	**GEF Outcome 2.1:** Improved conservation	METT baseline	10%	15%	METT reviews by Terminal Evaluator

Component 2 / **UNDP Outcome 2** Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs	of globally important biodiversity through enhanced management effectiveness in 3 existing PAs (2 terrestrial, 1 marine: Total area: 2,039,000 ha.). **Indicator 7:** Enhanced METT scores as a result of improved conservation and management of three parks (DNP, JADNP, DMNP)	at PPG: Dinder National Park 48 Jebal Al Dair National Park 41 Dungonab Bay Mukkawar Island Marine National Park 37	improvement on METT scores	improvement on METT scores since baseline	Risks: Political issues result in less priority for park management Assumptions: Enhanced capacity and core financing for park management increased in long-run
	Indicator 8: Conservation status of keystone species (e.g. Red-fronted Gazelle, lion in DNP, kudu in JADNP, turtles and seabirds, particularly terns in DNMP) through improved numbers	0	10%	20%	Data from WRC received and measured throughout project timeline/ sightings
					Risks: Lack of enforcement may mean indicator species cannot be fully protected Assumptions: Data is sound, but it may not be.
	Indicator 9: Tourism operations at DNP, JADNP and DMNP up and running by end of project	No infrastructure or activities set up	Fly-camp infrastructure set up	Fly-camp operational and tourism activities operational	MTR and Terminal Evaluation site visits and interviews
					Risks: Tourism industry is negatively affected by current political situation Assumptions: Tourism co-operations with communities are effective and bring community benefits
GEF Component 3 /	**GEF Outcome 3.1:** Uptake of INRM and SLM by communities living in areas within	0 ha	-	5,560 ha land restored	Data will be collected based on UNCCD reporting for LDN

UNDP Outcome 3:	and surrounding PAs supports conservation through reduced exploitative pressure on PAs and improved and sustainable livelihoods.				Risks: Recurrent droughts and other natural disasters negatively affect interventions supporting LDN
Integrated Natural Resource Management in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs	**Indicator 10: Area of land restored in buffer and transitional zones of the three PAs (agricultural land, forest land, grasslands, wetlands)** Three key metrics for LDN (land cover change, net primary productivity (NPP), soil organic carbon (SOC)) based on land condition assessments are significantly improved from baseline for buffer zones of the three PAs	No baseline data established for NPP, SOC and land cover change. At project onset, baseline values established - NPP level (tDM/ha/yr) and SOC stock (tC/ha), and land cover change	10% increase from baseline land condition assessment for NPP, SOC, and positive land cover change in buffer zones	20% increase from baseline land condition assessment for NPP, SOC, and positive land cover change in buffer zones; All six pilot sites are land degradation neutral by end of project: 60 ha in total	Assumptions: Skills and capacity available to conduct training and implementation of land condition assessments, capacity is effectively built for long-term monitoring towards LDN
	Indicator 11: Areas under sustainable land management increased in all three targeted PAs (through land use planning and rangeland management planning)	0 ha	-	448,700 ha under improved SLM planning	Areas of buffer and transitional zones are under SLM planning and managed sustainably by the community
					Risks: Some of the interventions are not taken up by community Assumptions: Interventions sustain themselves beyond project closure
	Indicator 12: Average percentage of household income increase of recipients of	Baseline to be determined on	Household income	Household income increased	Data will be collected based on semi-structured interviews with recipients at baseline, mid-term, and end-term of project.

	low value grant mechanism in project areas (disaggregated for gender)	selection of recipients of grant mechanism	increased by 15% above baseline	by 30% above baseline	Risks: Businesses may not make returns by mid-term Assumptions: Capacity will be sufficiently developed to administer business and finances; recipients are willing to divulge sensitive information about household income
Component/ Outcome 4 Knowledge Management and M&E	**Indicator 13:** Gender strategy developed and implemented throughout project lifetime	Gender strategy and action plan created at PPG, no implementation	Gender strategy implemented	Gender strategy effectively implemented and mainstreamed, women participation and engagement at least equal throughout project.	Terminal Evaluation – questionnaires with women development groups in all three project intervention sites.
					Risks: Social (gender) norms with regard to patriarchal society beyond project influence (project focusing on gender roles but enhancing decision-making process) Assumptions: Appropriate IGO/NGO will be identified to help PMU implement gender mainstreaming activities
	Indicator 14: Women participation and direct access to resources and decision-making improved through business and training investments	Little to no participation	At least 50% of participation in all interventions including SLM related	50% participation in all interventions, with at least 60% women beneficiaries in business/low value grant mechanism	Review of participation of women in Component 2 and 3 interventions, Terminal Evaluation (review of results, participation sheets, interviews with key project beneficiaries)
					Risks: Women not allowed access in patriarchal society (women engagement will be assured through the gender strategy) Assumptions: Enough women interested and organized in accessing low value grant mechanism

---

[1] Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

[2] Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

[3] Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification.

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).

During the PPG, one comment from GEF had still to be addressed in addition to detailed comments from STAP; there were no pending comments from GEF Council.

Comments on the PIF from GEF Secretariat and response

GEFSEC Comment	Response
The linkages with a future LDN framework are interesting and strategic. The Agency and Government should confirm that this linkage will be made during PPG to make this project a contributor to a LDN pilot site	The project generally is aiming to achieve, in the long-term, through its multiple interventions in component 3 (reseeding range and tree spp, conservation agriculture, rangeland management planning, CBNRM piloting, etc) to move towards LDN in the entire buffer zones of the three parks. As part of this, six LDN pilot sites were chosen by the project, namely through community forest and range reserves, in Jebel Al Dair NP and Dinder NP buffer zones. Of these, four are community forests (at 10 ha each), and two are range reserves (at 10 ha each). These pilot sites will be measured for LDN during the project implementation (as per Output 3.1), using three LDN metrics (NPP, LCC, and SOC), and are included in the indicator framework.

Comments on the PIF from GEF STAP and response

We fully agree with and have considered the comments from STAP. STAP Comments were regsitered on 8th November 2017. The formal STAP Advisory Response was: "Minor issues to be considered during project design". The following response matrix details each comment and the subsequent response.

STAP Comment	Response

STAP Comment	Response
1. STAP welcomes the proposal by UNDP entitled "Strengthened Protected Areas Systems and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan." Post-conflict Sudan faces numerous environmental and human challenges that will require investment from GEF and other organizations to help overcome. However, given the post-conflict situation and massive loss of wildlife in Sudan, including multiple species from key parks, STAP recommends that careful consideration be given to the scale of the project. It is important to strengthen the current parks, expand the parks estate, and improve management effectiveness, but STAP is somewhat skeptical that this can all this be done with only $4.1 m.	Careful consideration has indeed been given to the scale of the project. The PIF was elaborate in some areas and has been reshaped into a more achievable set out outputs, better understood at country level and considered viable on the ground. Policy level work has been reduced and the areas of focus scaled down. Greater efforts have been made, through a deep-dive review in ensuring LD and BD interventions are clearly designed, witht relevant and practical outcomes for ecach focal area. Some activities have interlinked BD and LD aspects, which have been clarified.
2. This proposed project focuses on protected areas and their surrounds, and seeks to address several threats to the country's biodiversity and ecosystems by focusing on creating an enabling environment for a national PA system, improved management of selected terrestrial and marine PAs, and integrated natural resource management (NRM) around parks to support livelihoods which are largely dependent on natural resources such as land, forests, wildlife, fish, etc. for their survival. The proposal would be considerably strengthened by the inclusion of maps to orient the reader and a reduction in the amount of acronyms, which detract significantly from the readability of the document.	Simple maps of these protected areas and surrounding landscapes can be found in the Annex K of the ProDOC. However, of note, it was not possible to put together more detailed maps during project preparation phase despite the STAP request, due to a lack of remote sensing GIS facilities in government. The input of a simple GIS unit has been incorporated as an activity in the project strategy to tackle this issue.
3. STAP is encouraged to see that this is a straightforward protected area rehabilitation and extension project with laudable goals and project outlines. However, the actual design of the project is quite disordered. The wording of Outcomes and (especially) Outputs needs to be greatly shortened and simplified and the statements in the Project Description Summary need to be revised as they are unclear, long, and easily misinterpreted. The project logic is also confused, with weak prioritization of several Outputs, and some Outputs appearing under the wrong Components.	The project objectives, scope, logframe structure and wording has been revisited during PPG, as also the scope as per Comment 1 above. The result is a more logical, practical and scaled down project. Particularly, the elements in Component 3 have been realistically matched to what is achievable financially and in time, with greater attention being made to ensure the LD elements of the project are effectively defined.

STAP Comment	Response
4. Under Component 1 (regarding enabling environment at the National level), STAP suggests that the Project Outcomes would be clearer as follows: 1.1 Protected Area Act and associated policies and statutory instruments completed. 1.2 Protected Area Expansion Plan developed and adopted. 1.3 Park plans and performance compared to plans reviewed (using METT and other instruments). 1.4 Park financing requirements established and financing plan developed. 1.5 Staff capacity developed experientially by implementing the above, with high quality mentoring and monitoring of performance indicators.	Component 1 has been simplified with greater attention on how the national level strategic inouts can influence effective management on the ground through components 2 and 3. Component 2 has been redefined to be more practical, with intervnetions put together in a step-wise approach, based on priority. This is particularly relevant as ap ractical means to operate in a country which has been through a significant period of political upheaval, notably in the first half of 2019, with regime change, then transitional negotations and then power-sharing and power transition agreements being put in place.
5a. While METT is a useful tool for monitoring at the global level, and should be used, it is not a good tool for national level management. National systems need to be more goal-oriented and sophisticated. Further, METT only measures ecosystem and socio-economic goals in a cursory manner, and much better local monitoring of habitat condition, wildlife numbers and trends, tourism income and satisfaction, and community well-being will be necessary for this project.	The proposal to use the METT as described in the PIF as a tool for the creation and implementation of a PA certification structure has been dropped in exchange for a simpler approach, using IUCN categories. METT are still utilised as part of the tracking tools used in this project as M&E tools, using the GEF-6 templates (in excel), but not as an overall national level management tool.
5b. The document is correct that effective financing is essential, but it is not convincing on how this will be achieved. This is likely to be challenging until there is significant recapitalization of Sudan's parks and a market and brand are developed, both of which are well beyond the scope of a single project.	The project has tried to emphasise a steady growth in environmental sustainability though initial developments into tourism, that now seem possible in the light of a transitional period for Sudan, although the project is cautious and the economic aspects of the project have been planned for later in the project life, starting in year three.

STAP Comment	Response
6. STAP further questions the logic of Component 2. The Objective is improved management effectiveness of selected parks, but the Outputs refer to 2.1 participatory management (which is sensible, but not primary), 2.2 adjacent communities (which is Component 3), 2.3 multiple tools and 2.4 (which should also be Component 3.)	The project logframe structure has been completed reworked in terms of Component 2 with a far greater emphasis on best practice investments into three core parks, in areas of ecological management, park operations and economic security. The community elements are still there but have been made more realistic and achieveable and shifted to Component 3.
7. Output 2.3 is far too complicated and unprioritized. Surely it is better for each park to have a standardized park plan, perhaps in the form of a log-frame with five Components and associated indicators. For example: 1. Park protection and habitat/wildlife monitoring 2. Tourism and finance 3. Infrastructure and equipment 4. Communities and buffer zones 5. Management effectiveness (including staffing)	The output has been simplified and a new logic applied with greater emphasis on practical, priority outputs based on greatest need.
8. With regards to Component 3, STAP notes that it is weak and resorts to platitudes such as SLM and INRM with little or no technical basis. The demographic and institutional challenges to sustainable land management are substantial and will not be solved by tree-planting nurseries or 500 hectares of community range reserves, rotational grazing, or food baling. The underlying problem is tenure, and if this project is to be successful, STAP recommends addressing this issue directly if possible through one or two small pilots that are designed to fit Ostrom's eight principles for sustainable common property regimes.	Tenure is a key issue in the context of land degradation, and continues to be a key challenge in many countries. Yet it is not the only one, and there are examples from throughout Africa of successful SLM impacts without systemic changes in tenure regimes. Otherwise we would question decades of SLM work that didn't resolve the land tenure issue. SLM outreach can be successful if properly designed. At the same time, addressing tenure requires significant political will and institutional readiness and robust governance systems, wherefore an intervention on tenure is not yet timely in Sudan. This project design has taken into account the challenges and political sensitivities faced through land tenure in Sudan, and has through careful and strategic negotiations during PPG discovered that the most impactful way will be to create bottom up feedback mechanisms (through Component 3 land use planning workshops) into the policy area (of Component 1). The range and community forests (which have had success in previous interventions), as well as the many other pilot interventions at ground-level will inform this bottom-up approach.

STAP Comment	Response
9. In general, STAP notes that many of the problems described by this project are underpinned by a lack of security and the looming threat of conflict between various groups such as herders and farmers. The GEF does not specifically address the issue of environmental security; however it is clear from this project that achieving global (and local) environmental benefits is predicated on the secure access to food, water, and land by various competing groups. Conflict is listed in two of four potential project risks in Section 4 with preventive measures focused on avoiding certain areas and creating committees. However, given the prevalence of tension described in the project and past large-scale conflicts such as Darfur, it would be more prudent to address conflict and environmental security explicitly as key threats which are integrated more directly into the components in order to increase the likelihood of success. For example, the project could make use of existing tools geared toward projects occurring in conflict-prone areas. See USAID conflict assessment and analysis tools, etc. (https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/working-crises-and-conflict/technical-publications). UNDP also has developed methods for analysis for projects with conflict dimensions (http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/conflict-prevention/conducting-a-conflict-and-development-analysis.html). Also, in terms of climate change risk, the preventative measures listed are vague (tap into NAPA and NAP projects?)	Land use and ownership are key issues, and while land tenure will be extremely difficult to influence at national level during the project lifespan given the political situation in Sudan, it is important that the project uses the opportunity at local-level to rally support around land ownership and use, particularly around the DNP where land grabbing for mechanized farming is marginalising communities (especially nomads who have encroached into the national park) and as a result putting increasing pressure on park resources. Crucially, as noted in STAP comments to the PIF, and as was intensively discussed with a variety of capacitated national stakeholders in this thematic area as well as reviews of conflict resolution using depth dialogue processes; as a result, particularly the land use workshops (for Dinder, where this is most particularly of relevance) will be facilitated through depth dialogue processes to ensure that empathy, trust and understanding can be built with competing land-users. Workshops will also be built around community self-governing of commons with enhanced recognition of rights to self-govern by state and national government, framed by the eight principles of Ostrom's *"Governing the Commons"*. Most notably, the project made sure in its design to include particular communities of nomadic pastoralists who are the most insecure in terms of land ownership in Sudan (and particularly the areas around Dinder).
10. In terms of stakeholders, many are listed. However, a major omission is the owners of large, rain-fed mechanized agriculture, which has a significant impact on the landscape and has been the source of conflict with other groups such as small farmers and pastoralists (Trigg et al., 2012).	This stakeholder group was added and consulted during PPG.
11. In sum, STAP strongly supports the intent of this project, including a legal environment for parks, park expansion plans, park management, and buffer zone communities. However, STAP considers that the likelihood of success will be greatly improved by simplifying and clarifying the Project Summary and therefore recommends that it is carefully rewritten so that statements are unambiguous, and the project logic is consistent and logical.	As indicated above, the PPG team revisited the design of the project during PPG and have simplified it, with a more logical, practical, achievable project as a result.

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

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

PPG Grant Approved following PIF submission: $100,000			
	GETF Amount ($)		
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	*Budgeted Amount*	*Amount Spent To Date*	*Amount Committed*
PPG Component A: Preparatory Technical Reviews & Studies and Stakeholder Consultations	35,065	30,120.90	4,944.10
PPG Component B: Formulation of UNDP-GEF Project Document, GEF CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	64,935	59,600	5,335
Total	100,000.00	89,720.90	10,279.10

The PPG 2019 budget is fully committed and will be spent before the end of July 2019.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
1,876,620	1,762,700		

1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
385,000	70,000		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

The following proposed protected areas will be created by project expansion plan:

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Toker Game Reserve (PA Extension and incorporation into Biosphere)	N/A	2	N/A	630,000 + 30,000 New		
West Kordofan (Proposed PA)	N/A	2 TBD	N/A	40,000 New		

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Toker Game Reserve	N/A		
West Kordofan (Proposed PA)	N/A		

1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
1,491,620	1,062,700		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.
Note: These are areas selected by project document to be under improved management effectiveness

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Dinder National Park	2336	2	1,029,200	1,029,200		
Jebel Al Dair National Park	Not in WDPA	2	33,500	33,500		

Note: These are areas selected by METT Score and selected as project terrestrial sites

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Dinder National Park	48		

Jebal Al Dair National Park	41		

Core Indicator 2: Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
245,200	306,300		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the two sub-indicators (2.1 and 2.2) for that stage.

2.1 Marine protected areas newly created

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
	30,000	0	

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Talla Talla Islands (proposed)	Not in WDPA	2	N/A	30,000		

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Talla Talla proposed Protected Area	N/A		

2.2 Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness

Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
245,200	276,300		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.

Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (achieved at TE)
Dungonab Bay Mukkawar Island Marine National Park	No WDPA ID	2	2	276,300			

Name of Protected Area	METT Score at CEO ER	METT Score at MTR	METT Score at TE
Dungonab Bay Mukkawar Island Marine National Park	37		

Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored (hectares) outside of protected areas

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
26,250 ha 500 ha (ten community range reserves, 25,000 ha reseeding (5,000 ha per year); forests: 500 ha (100 ha per year); mangroves: 250 ha (50 ha per year)	5,560 ha land restored Dinder National Park (DNP) surrounds: 3,340 ha (farms, rangelands, forests) Jebel Al Dair (JADNP) surrounds: (forest) land restored: 2,020 ha Dungonab Bay and Mukkawar Island (DMNP surrounds: 200 ha		

Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4) for that stage.

3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
0 (extension support but no #ha given in PIF)	Total: 50 ha (to be further replicated post-project) DNP surrounds: 50 ha under conservation agriculture (demonstration plots)		

3.2 Area of forest and forest land restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
500 ha (100 ha replanting per year)	4040 ha in total DNP surrounds: 20 ha. community forests + 2000 ha. reseeding (400 ha per year) JADNP surrounds: 20 ha. community forests + 2000 ha. Reseeding (400 ha per year)		

3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)

25,500 ha	1,270 ha		
(500 ha community range reserves, 25,000 ha reseeding (5000 ha per year)	20 ha range reserves		
	250 ha per year reseeding (1,250 ha)		

3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) restored

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
250 ha (50 ha per year)	200 ha of mangroves (50 ha per year starting year 2)		
	5 wetlands in DNP by reseeding and planting		

Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (EXCLUDING #ha FROM CORE INDICATOR 3)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Description of Management Practices at PIF	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Description of Management Practices at CEO ER	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Description of Management Practices at MTR	Ha (achieved at TE)	Description of Management Practices at TE

| No #ha given | -Build national capacity on M&E measuring land degradation and SLM & INRM interventions, to support national efforts towards the LDN target.

-Training and extensions servies provided to targeted communities on best practice SLM and INRM and monitoring of interventions

-Ten community range reserves

- Rotational grazing

-Baling feedstock

-Fire avoidance training and fire line construction

-Reseeding and replanting programmes | 448,700 ha under improved SLM management

DNP surrounds:

350,000 ha under land use planning

JADNP surrounds:

98,700 ha of buffer under rangeland management | -Capacity to measure towards LDN improved, land condition assessments in all three areas around PAs

- Land use planning for the buffer zone of DNP, participatory and depth dialogue processes

- Rangeland management plan (workshops and plan development) for buffer zone of JADNP | | | | |

Core Indicator 5: Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (expected at PIF)	Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Ha (achieved at MTR)	Ha (achieved at TE)
400ha.	200ha. Mangrove and surrounding bays		

5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number of fisheries (expected at PIF)	Number of fisheries (expected at CEO ER)	Number of fisheries (achieved at MTR)	Number of fisheries (achieved at TE)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Name of Fishery	Total Ha (expected at PIF)	Type of Certification at PIF	Total Ha (expected at CEO ER)	Type of Certification at CEO ER	Total Ha (achieved at MTR)	Type of Certification at MTR	Total Ha (achieved at TE)	Type of Certification at TE
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia

Number of LMEs (expected at PIF)	Number of LMEs (expected at CEO ER)	Number of LMEs (achieved at MTR)	Number of LMEs (achieved at TE)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Figure at a given stage must be the total count of the LMEs listed in the next table.

Name of LME	Type of Pollution (expected at PIF)	Extent of Pollution (expected at PIF)	Type of Pollution (expected at CEO ER)	Extent of Pollution (expected at CEO ER)	Type of Pollution (achieved at MTR)	Extent of Pollution (achieved at MTR)	Type of Pollution (achieved at TE)	Extent of Pollution (achieved at TE)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Total area under improved management (in PIF and CEO ER Table F)

Million Ha (expected at PIF)	Million Ha (expected at CEO ER)
2,479,820	2,525,515

Calculate the total by summing Core Indicators 1-5. Ensure that there is no double-counting.

Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Total number (expected at PIF)	Total number (expected at CEO ER)	Total number (achieved at MTR)	Total number (achieved at TE)
Women	16,548	4,137	5,516 Est	7,192 Est
Men	16,763	4,190	5,586 Est	7,831 Est
Total	33,311	8,327	11,102 Est	15,023 Est

ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part I, item G by ticking the most relevant keywords/ topics/themes that best describe this project.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
☒Influencing models			
	☒Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	☒Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	☐Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	☐Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	☒Deploy innovative financial instruments		
☒Stakeholders			
	☐Indigenous Peoples		
	☒Private Sector		
		☐Capital providers	
		☒Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		☐Large corporations	
		☒SMEs	
		☒Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		☐Non-Grant Pilot	
		☐Project Reflow	
	☒Beneficiaries		
	☒Local Communities		
	☒Civil Society		
		☒Community Based Organization	
		☒Non-Governmental Organization	
		☒Academia	
		☐Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	☒Type of Engagement		
		☒Information Dissemination	
		☒Partnership	
		☒Consultation	
		☒Participation	
	☒Communications		
		☒Awareness Raising	
		☐Education	
		☐Public Campaigns	
		☐Behavior Change	
☒Capacity, Knowledge and Research			
	☒Enabling Activities		
	☒Capacity Development		
	☒Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	☒Targeted Research		
	☒Learning		
		☐Theory of Change	

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	☒ Stakeholder Engagement Plan		
☒ Gender Equality			
	☒ Gender Mainstreaming		
		☒ Beneficiaries	
		☒ Women groups	
		☒ Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		☒ Gender-sensitive indicators	
	☒ Gender results areas		
		☒ Access and control over natural resources	
		☒ Participation and leadership	
		☒ Access to benefits and services	
		☒ Capacity development	
		☒ Awareness raising	
		☒ Knowledge generation	
☒ Focal Areas/Theme			
	☐ Integrated Programs		
		☐ Commodity Supply Chains ([12]Good Growth Partnership)	
			☐ Sustainable Commodities Production
			☐ Deforestation-free Sourcing
			☐ Financial Screening Tools
			☐ High Conservation Value Forests
			☐ High Carbon Stocks Forests
			☐ Soybean Supply Chain
			☐ Oil Palm Supply Chain
			☐ Beef Supply Chain
			☐ Smallholder Farmers
			☐ Adaptive Management
		☐ Food Security in Sub-Sahara Africa	
			☐ Resilience (climate and shocks)
			☐ Sustainable Production Systems
			☐ Agroecosystems
			☐ Land and Soil Health
			☐ Diversified Farming
			☐ Integrated Land and Water Management
			☐ Smallholder Farming
			☐ Small and Medium Enterprises
			☐ Crop Genetic Diversity
			☐ Food Value Chains
			☐ Gender Dimensions
			☐ Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		☐ Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			☐ Sustainable Food Systems
			☐ Landscape Restoration
			☐ Sustainable Commodity Production
			☐ Comprehensive Land Use Planning
			☐ Integrated Landscapes

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
			☐ Transport and Mobility
			☐ Buildings
			☐ Municipal waste management
			☐ Green space
			☐ Urban Biodiversity
			☐ Urban Food Systems
			☐ Energy efficiency
			☐ Municipal Financing
			☐ Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
			☐ Urban Resilience
	☒ Biodiversity		
		☒ Protected Areas and Landscapes	
			☒ Terrestrial Protected Areas
			☒ Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			☒ Productive Landscapes
			☒ Productive Seascapes
			☒ Community Based Natural Resource Management
		☒ Mainstreaming	
			☐ Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
			☐ Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			☒ Tourism
			☒ Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			☒ Fisheries
			☐ Infrastructure
			☐ Certification (National Standards)
			☐ Certification (International Standards)
		☒ Species	
			☒ Illegal Wildlife Trade
			☒ Threatened Species
			☒ Wildlife for Sustainable Development
			☐ Crop Wild Relatives
			☐ Plant Genetic Resources
			☐ Animal Genetic Resources
			☐ Livestock Wild Relatives
			☒ Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		☒ Biomes	
			☒ Mangroves
			☒ Coral Reefs
			☒ Sea Grasses
			☒ Wetlands
			☐ Rivers
			☐ Lakes
			☐ Tropical Rain Forests
			☒ Tropical Dry Forests
			☐ Temperate Forests
			☐ Grasslands

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
		☐ Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			☐ Biosafety
			☐ Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	☐ **Forests**		
		☐ Forest and Landscape Restoration	
			☐ REDD/REDD+
		☐ Forest	
			☐ Amazon
			☐ Congo
			☐ Drylands
	☒ **Land Degradation**		
		☒ Sustainable Land Management	
			☒ Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			☒ Ecosystem Approach
			☒ Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			☒ Community-Based NRM
			☒ Sustainable Livelihoods
			☒ Income Generating Activities
			☒ Sustainable Agriculture
			☒ Sustainable Pasture Management
			☒ Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			☒ Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			☒ Sustainable Fire Management
			☐ Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		☒ Land Degradation Neutrality	
			☐ Land Productivity
			☒ Land Cover and Land cover change
			☐ Carbon stocks above or below ground
		☐ Food Security	
	☐ **International Waters**		
		☐ Ship	
		☐ Coastal	
		☐ Freshwater	
			☐ Aquifer
			☐ River Basin
			☐ Lake Basin
		☐ Learning	
		☐ Fisheries	
		☐ Persistent toxic substances	
		☐ SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		☐ Targeted Research	
		☐ Pollution	
			☐ Persistent toxic substances
			☐ Plastics
			☐ Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
		☐ Marine Protected Area	
		☐ Biomes	
			☐ Mangrove
			☐ Coral Reefs
			☐ Seagrasses
			☐ Polar Ecosystems
			☐ Constructed Wetlands
	☐ **Chemicals and Waste**		
		☐ Mercury	
		☐ Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		☐ Coal Fired Power Plants	
		☐ Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		☐ Cement	
		☐ Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		☐ Ozone	
		☐ Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		☐ Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		☐ Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	
		☐ Waste Management	
			☐ Hazardous Waste Management
			☐ Industrial Waste
			☐ e-Waste
		☐ Emissions	
		☐ Disposal	
		☐ New Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		☐ Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
		☐ Plastics	
		☐ Eco-Efficiency	
		☐ Pesticides	
		☐ DDT - Vector Management	
		☐ DDT - Other	
		☐ Industrial Emissions	
		☐ Open Burning	
		☐ Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
		☐ Green Chemistry	
	☐ **Climate Change**		
		☐ **Climate Change Adaptation**	
			☐ Climate Finance
			☐ Least Developed Countries
			☐ Small Island Developing States
			☐ Disaster Risk Management
			☐ Sea-level rise
			☐ Climate Resilience
			☐ Climate information
			☐ Ecosystem-based Adaptation
			☐ Adaptation Tech Transfer
			☐ National Adaptation Programme of Action
			☐ National Adaptation Plan
			☐ Mainstreaming Adaptation

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
			☐ Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
			☐ Technology Transfer
			☐ Renewable Energy
			☐ Financing
			☐ Enabling Activities
		☐ **Technology Transfer**	
			☐ Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
			☐ Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
			☐ Endogenous technology
			☐ Technology Needs Assessment
			☐ Adaptation Tech Transfer
		☐ **United Nations Framework on Climate Change**	
			☐ Nationally Determined Contribution
			☐ Paris Agreement
			☒ Sustainable Development Goals
		☐ **Climate Finance (Rio Markers)**	
			☐ Climate Change Mitigation 1
			☐ Climate Change Mitigation 2
			☒ Climate Change Adaptation 1
			☐ Climate Change Adaptation 2

Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

Go To Home