

Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9425

Countries

Sudan

Project Name

Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/24/2019

Review completed by PM

11/18/2019

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

During the PIF review, we alerted UNDP that the project was very BD-oriented and an effort was needed to balance the investments between BD and LD. This effort was made in the wording. However, during the development of the project document, either we have lost some LD related aspects, or it is because of inconsistency between information in the portal, in the project document, and the request for CEO endorsement. Deep revisions are needed to make this project eligible under LD.

The GEF suggests to made a list of the proposed interventions related to the investments of nearly \$2 million of LD funds. The more detailed the list of proposed activities, the better. Thanks.

11-18-19

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AFTER TECHNICAL CLEARANCE

1- On Core Indicators: the Agency has not provided METT score for the marine protected area under sub-indicator 2.2. If the baseline is not provided at CEO endorsement, these hectare estimates won't be recoded or counted. Consider providing the METT score or using another indicator.

2- Executing Partner Type should be Government Agency:

Other Executing Partner(s) HCENR Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources	Executing Partner Type GEF Agency
--	--------------------------------------

3- Sub-totals by LD and BD between table A and table D don't match. Please re-calculate and amend accordingly.

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	150,342	750,000
LD-1_P1	Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods: agro-ecological intensification.	GET	993,265	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	993,265	5,000,000
Total Project Cost(\$)			4,100,913	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

- 4- Under the M&E budget, the cost for preparation and completion of the ESMP should have already been born by PPG funding. Please remove this from the M&E.

Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget ²⁸ (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop (with M&E plan)	UNDP Country Office	5,000	20,000	Within six months of project document signature
Inception Report (with M&E plan)	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception
Standard UNDP M&E (UNDP POPP)	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Preparation and completion of Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)	UNDP Country Office UNDP-GEF/BPPS (if needed)	Total 30,000	None	Commenced within three weeks of inception workshop ahead of project activities
Monitoring and implementation of the gender action plan and ensuring effective ESMP implementation	Project Manager (no additional charge), Gender and safeguards specialist (national consultant role)	Total 30,000	100,000	Annually

- 5- There is a quote from UNDP's ProDoc which is inconvenient as it implies that the Implementing Agency can take decisions about the use of funds for activities, which by definition is an executing function ("the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required"). Please state what the Senior supplier will be (it should be somebody from the Executing Agency, not UNDP)

Senior Supplier: The Senior Supplier is an individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project (designing, developing, facilitating, procuring, implementing). The Senior Supplier's primary function within the Board is to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. **The Senior Supplier role must have the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required.** If necessary, more than one person may be required for this role. Typically, the implementing partner, UNDP and/or donor(s) would be represented under this role. **The Senior Supplier is: UNDP,** supported by, on a specialist-input basis, the Universities of Khartoum and of the Red Sea, UNESCO and the Government in the form of the FNC and ARC.

- 6- The budget in the ProDoc shows a budget line namely "National Consultants" for \$195,281. The explanation of this budget line says "National consultant as Project Manager to run the PMU (\$145,281 over five years, \$29,056.20/year or \$2,421 pcm) + additional administrative & procurement capacity at the PMU (\$50,000 over five years, \$10,000/year or \$8,33.33 pcm)". Please charge the "additional administrative & procurement capacity at the PMU" for \$50,000 to the co-financing portion of PMC as this activity cannot be covered by the GEF portion.

There is another budget line that requires \$80,000 for transportation. Please remove the Vehicle for Khartoum and see if it is possible to cofinance the purchase of the 2 vehicles for the two project sites.

Project Management											
	HCFNR	GEF TF	GEF TF								
UNDP	UNDP	UNDP	71300	National Consultants	39,056	39,056	39,056	39,056	39,057	195,281	5.2
			71200	International Consultants	45,000	60,000	45,000	15,000	0	165,000	5.3
			71600	Travel	10,550	13,450	10,500	4,850	2,000	41,350	5.4
			72200	Transportation Equipment	80,000	-	-	-	-	80,000	5.5
			71300	National consultants	42,743	42,743	42,743	42,743	42,678	213,650	5.6
				Total Project Management (GEF)			39,056	39,056	39,056	39,056	39,057
				Total Project Management (UNDP)	176,293	116,193	96,243	62,593	44,678	500,000	

5.2. National consultant as Project Manager to run the PMU (\$145,281 over five years, \$29,056.20/year or \$2,421 pcm) + additional administrative & procurement capacity at the PMU (\$50,000 over five years, \$10,000/year or \$8,33.33 pcm)

2-19-20

Regarding the points of the previous review:

Item 6a.

GEFSEC Comment

Please provide TOR of "Project Administration and Procurement Officer" to determine where this charge has to go in the budget. Please review budget as appropriate.

Item 6b

UNDP Response

6b. PRODOC: Vehicles. As can be seen in the table in Section VIII Total Budget and Work Plan, the USD 80,000 for the three required vehicles are entirely financed by UNDP co-financing. These vehicles are critical for project implementation. No changes were made to the PRODOC or CER.

GEFSEC Comment

UNDP response contradicts the Budget in the GEF Project as shown below (Still under GEF Budget)

5.5.	<p>The project will procure 2 Toyota Hard tops (\$25,000 each) for two project sites (Mohamed Qol at Dugonab MPA, El Senait at Dinder NP) and 1 Land cruiser GX (\$30,000) for the Project Manager (Khartoum). Two national consultants will be recruited as terrestrial landscape technical specialists: one El Senait (DNP) and one at Rahad (JADNP). The consultant at Dinder NP will be paid 582,000 (over five years, being</p>
------	---

Please address this issue following the request and suggestion in the previous review as stated below:

There is another budget line that requires \$80,000 for transportation. Please remove the Vehicle for Khartoum and see if it is possible to cofinance the purchase of the 2 vehicles for the two project sites.

3-4-20

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

A full revision has been undertaken since the GEF review. The resubmission has been delayed to allow for clarity on the political situation which became very tense during June 2019 in particular. A peace agreement was signed in mid-August 2019 with departments returning to work thereafter.

Going to the point made about BD-orientation, the project in fact is a synergy between BD and LD, with the LD forming a large part in terms of the comprehensive landscape approach the project intends to take. However, it is clear that the LD-aspects of the project were not effectively communicated and described in the submitted version. Careful attention has been made to ensure the LD aspects are more prominent, generally and in detail, with the necessary deep revisions made throughout the project documentation (highlighted).

The project document has been revised, in various sections (these have been highlighted in the project document, and the CEO ER, as well as the Core Indicator Framework – Annex B), as follows:

- Brief project description, p 1, added text on landscape approach viz. land degradation as key element to the project
- under Development challenge, pp 9-10, revised text to harmonise land degradation related aspect, and p 11 strengthened link between LD and SDGs
- under Strategy, pp 12 and 13, revised LD related text
- p 20, revised LD focal areas
- under results and partnerships, pp 22-23 revised sections on LD, and pp 31-35 revised entire Component 3 activities (LD aspects further elaborated)

Please find the requested list of activities / investment related to LD in the following table, reflecting the considerable significant of LD-funded activities (partial or full) throughout the project. In many cases these activities were already designed as full or partial LD investments but were not clear in the earlier version. However on some cases, changes have been made in the allocation of budget from LD to BD following errors in the initial submission. Explanations are given as appropriate and where the activity combines both LD and BD investments, due to its nature, both and explanation is given and the budget split is shown. The budgets are in line with the budgets given in the documentation.

Outlined list of specific LD or linked LD/BD related activities as per GEF Review Request. 18th September 2019.

30 Jan 2020

The additional comments received after technical clearance are addressed as follows:

1. *Baseline METT score for Marine PAs.* The baseline METTs with scores had already been available in the original submission in the separate Excel files. However, the Marine PA METT scores had not been included in the Core Indicators in either PRODOC or CEO Endorsement Request and were also not uploaded to the GEF Portal, due to an oversight. This was now amended: the MPA METT score was now added to PRODOC Annex B, CEO ER Annex E and especially to the GEF Portal Core Indicators.

2. *GEF Portal: Executing Partner should be Government Agency.* This was an error upon submission and was now changed in the GEF Portal.

3. *CEO Endorsement Request: Subtotals between Tables A and D don't match.* This is result of an oversight during the upload of the last CEO ER to the GEF Portal in October 2019. The figures were now adjusted on the GEF Portal, reflecting those in the separately uploaded CEO ER Word document, and the numbers for Tables A and D match.

4. *PRODOC: Budget for ESMP.* The GEF Policy and Guidance does not require that an ESMP must be completed during the PPG, such that in our eyes the ESMP can be completed as a priority in the first phase of project implementation before the start of the main project activities. However, the item and budget (USD 30,000) of the preparation of the ESMP was removed from the M&E Table and Budget in Section V *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan*, this was an error. The oversight of the ESMP however was maintained in the M&E Table (now row # 4 in that table). No changes were made to the Total Budget and Work Plan or the Budget Notes.

5. *PRODOC: UNDP as Senior Supplier.* This was an error in the PRODOC – UNDP cannot be Senior Supplier. This and other parts of Section VI. *Governance and Management Arrangements* were replaced with updated elements including also the Project Organisation Structure in PRODOC Figure 3. TORs for the Project Manager were pooled in PRODOC Annex C for streamlining purposes.

6a. *PRODOC: Budget for additional national implementation capacity.* GEF SEC in prior reviews of the project requested that no implementation support be provided by UNDP. UNDP implementation support was therefore removed from the project, like also the related Direct Project Costs. The logical consequence is that capacity for administration and procurement needs to be added to the NIM Project Management Unit, for the project to deliver on time and in acceptable quality, i.e. for the project to be successful. To make this more specific, the budget note was now edited: “additional national implementation capacity” was replaced by a Project Administration and Procurement Officer, see budget note 5.2 in PRODOC Section VIII *Total Budget and Work Plan*.

6b. *PRODOC: Vehicles.* As can be seen in the table in Section VIII Total Budget and Work Plan, the USD 80,000 for the three required vehicles are entirely financed by UNDP co-financing. These vehicles are critical for project implementation. No changes were made to the PRODOC or CER.

Response 27 Feb 2020

6a. *PRODOC: Budget for additional national implementation capacity.* The TORs for the Project Administration and Procurement Officer are included at the end of Annex C: Terms of Reference for Project Board & Project Personnel. The post is listed 100% under Project Managed Costs, which appears appropriate. No changes were made to Section VIII *Total Budget and Work Plan* in the PRODOC.

6b. *PRODOC: Vehicles.* We do not understand this comment – there is no contradiction as the vehicles are not listed under the GEF budget. The Total Budget and Work Plan (Section VIII) in UNDP PRODOCs integrates GEF resources and all resources administered by UNDP (i.e. those that go through UNDP accounts – UNDP

resources and any cost-shared resources). Budget line 5.5 and budget note 5.5 were not amended in the prior submission as they did not need to be amended. The budget of USD 80,000 for the three vehicles is covered by co-financing, as can be seen in the TBWP, please see the following extract with the key cells highlighted (Donor Name: UNDP).

Atlas Activity / GEF Component	Donor Name	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Total (USD)	See Budget Note:
Project Management	GEF TF	...	National consultants	39,056	195,281	5.2.
	UNDP	...	International Consultants	45,000	165,000	5.3.
	Travel	10,550	41,350	5.4.
	Transportation Equipment	80,000	80,000	5.5.
	National consultants	42,743	213,650	5.6.
					Total Project Management (GEF)	39,056	195,281	
				Total Project Management (UNDP)	178,293	500,000		

To add further emphasis, “UNDP co-financing” was added to the start of the description of budget notes 5.3-5.6 in the PRODOC.

No changes were made in the CEO ER.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

INDICATORS

Please revise the section 5 on Global Environment Benefits in the request for CEO endorsement. The section is vague. This section should reflect the GEBs under BD and LD focal areas. The GEF request adding the quantitative indicators related to the BD and LD GEBs. Thanks.

- For the LD focal area, we should read the # of ha under SLM (4.3), and the area of land restored (especially 3.1 agricultural lands, 3.2 forest and forest lands, and/or 3.3 natural grass and shrublands). Then, national, local, social benefits can complete this section, especially from a LD point of view, including the design of local land-use planning systems to reduce competition among land uses. Please, revise.

- In the project document, see section 132 and 133: Please add quantitative indicators of BD and LD indicators of GEBs.. From a LD point of view, we need to see the # of ha under SLM, or land restoration, to reflect the value for money.

- In component 2 there is reference to 11,211,200 ha. This number does not appear again in the Indicators. Please clarify

COMPONENTS

The project continues to be overambitious with the the Extension of 2 Protected Areas totaling 70,000 ha, and the improved management of 3 Protected Areas totaling 11.2 million hectares. The GEF strongly recommends reducing the number of interventions in these PAs. A "*step-wise-approach*" to effective management is certainly more prudent, specially in an environment with significant volatility as described in the Risk Assessment. The project is clearly over-promising and likely to under deliver. This becomes evident when the proposed activities are listed side by side. Just consider those under Component 2: restoration, monitoring, IAS control, fire management, wildlife corridors, rehabilitation of Dungonab research center, & relocation of Dinder NP HQ, enforcement, infrastructure and equipment (i.e. boats, radios, walking and kayaking infrastructure), fly camps (meaning?), hiking trails, etc. The project needs to prioritize investments. Doesn't make more sense to secure the "*biodiversity assets of the PA*" (i.e. Effective Management), before spending limited financial resources on activities like those listed under output 2.3?

Component 1

1. What does "A *PA management category structure institutionalized*" actually mean?
2. Can the "demarcation of *Protected Area boundaries for Dinder, Jebel Al Dair and Dungonab PAs be done with* with funding from TA?
3. Output 1.8 sounds over-ambitious "*Creation of an information unit for managing ecological data, GIS information, remote sensing, park management data and economic and financial information*". Please narrow it down.

Component 2

1. What are the "*private land owners and private business operators (e.g. ecotourism) that will implement PA/ MPA friendly practices and plans under the Nation-Wide Conservation Strategy*"?
2. What are the IAS (and extension) to be controlled in Dinder?
3. What are the "*keystone species to be monitored in Dinder*", who has the baseline information, and the track record and the capacity to do this monitoring?
4. What are "Wildlife corridors in Jebel El Dair", the extension and proposed interventions? Same for "transitional zone increased at Jabel El Dair.
5. Four PAs are mentioned in output 2.2 but only three names are listed.

6. What are the activities and expected costs for the "rehabilitation of the Dungonag marine research center? This should be covered by co-financing, not by GEF funds. Same for the "relocation of Dinder NP HQ.

7. Is this the right time for the development and implementation of the activities under Output 2.3? Is this the right time for "Hiking trails created and fly camp installed at Jebel Al Dair NP" and for the "Package of tourism initiatives installed for Dungonab MPA including fly camps, camel safaris, diving and snorkeling"?

COMPONENT 3

1. The proposed LD activities need to be spell out. Not clear how the \$1.87 million f this components justify the use of LD resources. Spell out the proposed LD activities.

11-18-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

On INDICATORS/GEB:

Global Environmental Benefits were revised for LD and BD on PRODOC pp 37-38 and CEO ER Section 5.

Quantitative indicators for LD and BD were added here, as well as in ProDOC Results Framework and Core Indicators Annex B

For the LD focal area, the # of ha for area under SLM (4.3) as well as # ha for area of land restored (3.1 agri land, 3.2 forests, 3.3 grasslands, 3.4 wetlands) were given. National, local and social benefits linked to LD were added in the text, including any related to land-use planning systems and workshops planned under Output 3.2.

The reference to 11,211,200 ha was an error, as it describes the total area of the protected area system. The correct figure has been inserted into the relevant parts of the documentation, namely 2,039,000 ha, being 1,762,700 ha terrestrial and 276,300 ha marine.

On COMPONENTS:

OVERALL, regarding the COMPONENTS, the project ambition had already been considerably curtailed compared to the ambition in the PIF. Responding to the GEF request, the scope was further reduced – as is explained below – such as by dropping the rehabilitation of the Dugonab Marine Research Centre and relocation of the Park headquarters. The remaining activities have been crafted as practical, timebound and relatively limited in number, over a five-year period as long as they are planned out well with a strong operational base.

Much will depend on how Sudan recovers as a country after the political uncertainty and transition of 2019. What is clear from the PPG process is that there is strong technical capacity in government and in NGO partners and a great determination and passion to success, which will go a long way to ensuring the project can deliver.

However, noting that after the July 2019 transition of power and the August 2019 peace agreement, the future remains uncertain. Thus, Component 2 has been redesigned to take a step-wise approach, with implementation phases: (1) ecological management (2) operation improvements (3) economic development. That way, if the project loses momentum, at least critical biodiversity management functions will be supported. The workplan and budget reflect the phases. The team maintains the overall view though that the activities are manageable given the capacity levels and finance available, over a five-year period. Please note also that the figure of 11.2 million ha mentioned in the GEF SEC comment was an error, as described in the prior paragraph.

COMPONENT 1:

Output 1.2: the language has been updated to: *1.2. A PA management structure formalised in HCENR and WCGA in collaboration with other agencies/ministries, ensuring the PA system is structured and categorised in line with IUCN and UNESCO international and national guidelines.*

The agreement of Protected Area boundaries for Dinder, Jebel Al Dair and Dugonab PAs (Output 1.3) will be done partly with funding from INVESTMENT and partly TA. This error has been corrected in Table B of the CEO-ER and the Total Budget and Work Plan. The majority of activities under the first component remain TA related, hence this omission, however the activity remains in Component 1 due to its connection with the national PA policy and strategy development work.

The output has been simplified to: *1.8. Creation of an information unit for managing ecological data, GIS information and park management data.*

COMPONENT 2:

1. These include agricultural ranches in terrestrial areas, tourism marketing companies in Khartoum, and diving operators in the marine areas.

2. IAS management will focus especially on Nile Hyacinth, brought in by transhumant cattle. Water scarcity is a huge issue for Dinder: drying up of “maya” wetlands is already a problem, but the Nile Hyacinth further compounds this problem.

3. Please see PRODOC §100. Keystone species are lion, ostrich and further diurnal mammals and endemic bird species to be defined. Baseline information is available from the Wildlife Research Centre and WCGA as well as WildCRU at Oxford University. Technical capacity at WRC and WCGA is good, and WildCRU are a committed partner having been established in Dinder NP for some time doing ecological monitoring work, looking particularly at lion populations under an MoU with WRC.

4. The “wildlife corridors in Jebel El Dair” are where ungulate populations have been seen moving across unsecured areas from the hills of Jebel El Dair towards nearby water courses (wadis) and back. These corridors need to be secured to safeguard those vulnerable populations. The transitional zone is reference to a UNESCO term, meaning the perimeter of the buffer zone. The community want to increase the level of protection for the transitional zone surrounding the park.

5. This was an error, correct figure is three, which has been entered throughout.

6. On consideration, the rehabilitation of the marine research centre and the relocation of the park headquarters have been dropped, with funds reallocated into park operational support and the construction of two ranger outposts to secure the park from encroachment and minimise the risk of incursions and poaching.

7. Sudan does offer significant potential for niche nature-based tourism, with some unique products in both marine and terrestrial areas in areas that have faced hardly any security issues – most especially Dinder NP and the marine PAs in NE Sudan. In the original submission, these interventions were budgeted for years 4 and 5 to allow for time for the country to stabilise and the tourism climate to be developed. This approach is maintained in the resubmission where they are placed as “phase 3” interventions. The proposal is optimistic yet if preparations do not start, the country could miss a significant latent opportunity – especially now with the possibility of a new government being formed after the signing of the transition accord.

COMPONENT 3:

Please see the table above that spells out all LD-related activities. Further detail was added to the project documentation, notably the Results and Partnerships section of the ProDOC and Table B of the CEO Endorsement Request form.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Most of the component 3 is financed by LD. However, the nature of activities and the LD value for money is disputable:

- Under the output 3.3, there is an intention to promote SLM and INRM, especially in LDN sites. However this intention should be translated into a # of ha under SLM (indicator 4), # of land restored (indicator 3), and eventually the description land-use planning systems would be welcome.

- Most of the activities mentioned in the output 3.4 (tourism, fish processing, sea cucumber farming, pearl oyster, deep sea fishing) are marine oriented, and out of the scope of the LD focal area. We are not seeing how these activities are going to improve SLM or LDN, or reduce the pressure on lands. Please, revise.

11-18-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

The detailed table (above) submitted as part of this response outlines LD related activities.

Changes were made to the PRODOC and CEO ER to address this legitimate comment from GEF SEC. The main changes are descriptive, throughout the document, highlighting in more detail the technical context and specific inputs under the LD investment. The main changes are related to the allocation to particular activities under either LD, BD or both. As such, most of the activities themselves have not changed, however greater clarity has been provided to the description of whether they are LD or BD related. A notable example of where the FA budget has been clarified is for the deep sea fishing investment in Component 3, which had been attributed to LD-funded in error (though was. Not supposed to be the case). That has been rectified now and the proper apportionments made throughout (as listed in the table). In particular:

- Budget allocation errors (between BD and LD) were corrected.

- Under output 3.3, all interventions translated into core indicators (Indicator 3, and 4.3), revised text for activities under page 31-35 in the ProDOC and elaborated on these

- Under output 3.2 land use planning workshops has been linked to output 3.3 (and recommendations from process into Output 1.3)

- Under output 3.4, deep sea fishing activity was moved to BD (allocated in error in the initial submission, not intended to be under LD at any stage, just an error), plus justification given in the documentation for other activities – particularly the tourism and low value grants given in the list as per above, but mostly as livelihood diversification to avoid continuous use of LD, decrease poverty, improve livelihood security, strengthen and improve conditions for communities; diversifying livelihoods will reduce pressure on land resources in all three parks because livelihoods will be less dependent on the resources of the land if alternative livelihoods are sought (i.e. through tourism, small business development, including business through sustainable use of marine resources instead)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

There is one LoC for each of the funding sources listed in the CEO Endorsement.

Nevertheless, the language in many of the letters suggest that the contributions are in-kind (i.e. Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources; Wildlife Conservation General Administration; Range and Pasture General Directorate (RPGD); Wildlife Research Centre/Animal Resources Research Cooperation). Please modify. In addition, please include on whether the co-financing is TA or INVESTMENT MOBILIZED.

Seven out of the eleven LoC, are providing co-financing for exactly the same items: *...in the form of space, utilities and other services and facilitation for the project implementation during the project's lifetime*". These seven LoC amount to \$12,620,000 out of the \$19,508,000 of co-financing. Is it realistic to think that there are more than \$12 million dollars for the same items listed in these seven letters? Please include only those LoC that are true co-financing.

11-18-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

The co-finance for this project is perhaps surprisingly solid, given recent political challenges. Despite the changes in power, the civil service and relevant agencies have continued to function and are expected to continue to be able to improve their level of service during the planned transition period under new political leadership. There remains strong political and economic support for this project, with a great deal of personal commitment from government individuals and other stakeholders following the transition of power. Much of the support from the primary institutions of government will be in-kind because this comprises office space, staff, equipment and logistics amongst other areas, which will be critical for the project to succeed. However—it is noticeable that the cash contributions needed greater clarity in terms of the specifics of the technical assistance and investment being offered and that the original LoC had too many similarities in form. This has been addressed in a new round of LoC for two key LoC, especially that of HCENR. Other LoC have not been resubmitted due to the timings of the transition process and effect on day to day operations during the transition of power process.

Revised LoC are attached to the resubmission. “Investment mobilised” has been added to the CEO-ER table C.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Please, check information between the request for CEO endorsement, the project document, and the portal.

In the request for CEO endorsement (GEF Word Template), 6,135 ha for restored lands, and 450,000 ha of areas under improved management (out of protected areas) are mentioned in the table of indicators. However, in the portal, the number of ha of restored lands is 200, and include the restoration of mangroves, and there is no number under the indicator 4 for improved management of lands out of protected areas. Please address this inconsistency. Thanks.

In the request for CEO endorsement, the numbers seem high, and are not explained or justified. Please clarify. In the portal, we do not find indicators which make this project eligible under LD. This project is developed under LD 1.1 (SLM), and LD 3.4 (planning, to make it short): we are expecting ha of productive landscapes (agriculture or pastoralism) under SLM in the indicators, and eventually under restoration.

	6,315
	450,000
11-18-19	
Cleared	

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

The Justification of 448,700 ha under improved management is as follows:

The LD aspect of the project particularly focuses on the buffer zones of DNP (which is 350,000 ha) and JADNP (which is 98,700 ha). These buffer areas will be improved by (a) Improved LDN indicator measuring based on land condition assessments, (b) in DNP land use planning will be conducted for the buffer areas, and (c) a rangeland management plan will be developed and implemented for the buffer zone of JADNP.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes. The budgeted M&E plan is included in PRODOC Section V *Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan* (pp 54-57).

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes. Component 4 and Annex L.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

Germany. Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

5-30-19

No. Please address the outstanding issues with special reference to: 1) Indicators; 2) Co-financing and LoC; 3) Justification for LD investments of nearly \$2 million; 4) Scope of Component 2.

The GEFSEC is available for consultation in case there are questions about this review that merit further discussion.

11-18-19

Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AFTER TECHNICAL CLEARANCE WERE ADDED UNDER ITEM 1 AT THE TOP OF THIS REVIEW. Please address them.

Thanks.

2-19-20

All GEF comments are under Item 1 to facilitate review

3-4-20

This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

21 Oct. 2019

The resubmission was delayed pending greater clarity on the political situation which became very tense during June-July 2019 in particular, when also counterparts in Government and UNDP were at occasions not in a position to properly work, act or respond. With the situation calming down and the peace accord now signed in Sudan, as of mid-August 2019, the present resubmission could be prepared.

In addition to addressing the issues raised by GEF SEC in its latest review, references to direct project services and related costs incurred by UNDP were removed from the PRODOC, in anticipation of GEF SEC requests in this sense: i) from Section VII. FINANCIAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT (between §222 and 223); ii) from Section VIII. TOTAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN, in which budget line and budget note 5.1 on DPC were deleted and subsumed into budget line 5.2.; and iii) by deleting Annexes M and N.

30 Jan 2020

The additional comments were addressed under Item 1 above as requested

27 Feb 2020

The additional comments were addressed under Item 1 above as requested

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

CONTEXT: Sudan had, prior to independence, 27 Protected Areas (PAs). When South Sudan gained sovereignty in 2012, Sudan was left with 4 national parks, 2 game reserves, and 3 game sanctuaries. The terrestrial PAs amount to less than 6% of the area of the country, which is far below Aichi targets, while marine parks coverage is above the 10% Aichi target. Biodiversity in and around PAs is facing numerous threats caused by unclear wildlife policy, and limited awareness and poor enforcement. PAs are affected by increasing trespassing by nomads and their livestock, poaching, and illegal extractive activities. PAs are under-financed and have limited resources for management. Trespassing by livestock is not only competing with wildlife for resources but could also be a cause of introducing epidemics and invasive alien plants and causing wildfires. Changes in land use patterns in areas surrounding PAs has resulted in fragmentation of wildlife habitats reducing chances of wildlife survival. The objective of this project is to strengthen the national PA system and promote integrated ecosystem management in adjacent areas to reduce threats to biodiversity, mitigate land degradation, sustain ecosystem services, and improves people's livelihoods.

RESULTS: This project has the following components and outputs: Component 1 Enabling environment established at the national level for expanded PA management, will improve the policy and legislative foundation and the institutional capacity for a sustainable PA network in the country. The project will finalize a package of a strategic policy and institutional framework for PA management that will also work towards development, adoption and implementation of a National PA System Strategy—including a PA Expansion Plan. Component 2 Improved management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs, will improve management effectiveness with an emphasis on a subset of three key marine and terrestrial PAs and the management of their buffer and transitional zones. Practical interventions in three PAs will be made along the lines of (a) ecological management and monitoring, (b) operational management and (c) the development of infrastructure for PA economic development and sustainability. Component 3 SLM and Integrated Natural Resource Management in multi-use landscapes in and around targeted PAs, will restore degraded pastures and woodlands in communities adjacent to the three targeted PAs, through a combination of government-driven and community-based SLM and INRM interventions (initiating new partnerships between federal government, natural resources agencies, communities, NGOs, and donors). The project will support the development of sustainable livelihoods for communities living around PAs and MPAs as well as developing sustainable land use plans and practices for the sustainable use of natural resources. An additional Component 4 on Gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and M&E will allow lessons learned by the project through gender mainstreaming and participatory M&E to be generated and used for adaptive management purposes in order to better to promote community support for conservation practices and the development of PA systems. This component is a new addition since the PF concept.

GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY BENEFITS: The Expansion of Toker Game Reserve (660,000 ha) and the West Kordofan PA (40,000 ha) and the Effective Management of Dinder National Park (1,029,200 ha) and Jebel Al Dair NP (33,500 ha). The project also proposes to create the Talla Talla Islands conservation area (30,000 ha) and the effective management of Dungonab Bay Mukkawar Island Marine National Park (273,300 ha). This project will contribute 448,700 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and benefit more than 8,000 people. The target PAs will allow the conservation of several species ranging from Vulnerable to Critically Endangered like the Nubian dragon tree, the Nubian ibex, Dorcas gazelle, the green turtle, hawksbill, leatherback turtle, and olive-ridley turtle, and the great hammerhead shark, and scalloped hammerhead shark, and oceanic white-tip shark. The project will also result in the restoration of 5,560 ha that include agriculture land, forests, grasslands & shrubland and wetlands.

INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALE UP The project is innovative insofar as it will bring a much-needed, systematic and renewed emphasis on buffer zone/ transitional zone management across the national PA system. The project focuses on generating positive impacts on community livelihoods by putting in place practices and low-cost technologies that can be continued after the project. It will implement several crucial measures such as: land use revision in areas surrounding PAs, community based natural resources management, efficient and alternative energy use, water harvesting, capacity building, and revised PAs governance. In terms of financial sustainability, the project will demonstrate alternative sources of financing for PAs by tapping in to the revenue generating potential of PAs and surrounding areas a potential that is immense with ecotourism in the Red Sea MPAs being a case in point. Equipped with the enabling environment and practical experience, the government of Sudan (The Wildlife Conservation General Administration -WCGA, and other relevant departments) will be better able to replicate this approach to all PAs in the national system in a phased manner.

CO-FINANCING: In the amount of \$19.5 million will be provided by the Federal Government, CSOs, UNESCO, and UNDP.