



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	5651		
Country/Region:	Sudan		
Project Title:	Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$73,059	Project Grant:	\$8,526,000
Co-financing:	\$25,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,599,059
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Rami Abi Salman

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. Sudan is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated November 24, 2013, has been attached to the submission. Please refer, however, to Section 19 below.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework. It would contribute towards all three CCA objectives.</p> <p>The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), however, should include a breakdown of indicative co-financing by CCA objective.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide, in Table A, a breakdown of indicative co-financing by CCA objective.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section B.1 of the PIF notes that the proposed project is relevant to the priorities identified in Sudan's NAPA. The PIF could be more specific</p>	

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>in this regard. Where appropriate, it would also be useful to explore the ways in which the proposed project could contribute towards the NAP process as a means of continuously and iteratively identifying and addressing medium and long-term adaptation needs. This would go beyond aligning the project with the initial priorities identified in Sudan's draft NAP document.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) spell out the NAPA priorities that the proposed LDCF grant would address; and (ii) explore, where appropriate, the ways in which the proposed project could contribute towards the NAP process.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would contribute towards implementing Sudan's NAPA priorities on community-based rangeland management and rehabilitation; drought early warning systems for disaster preparedness; as well as water and soil conservation measures. The project would also strengthen Sudan's climate information and early-warning systems as per the draft NAP document.</p>	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on IFAD's Livestock Marketing and Resilience Programme (LMRP), indicatively set to start in the end of 2014 with an implementation period of seven years. The baseline program seeks to enhance livestock productivity, value addition and marketing.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>While the baseline program appears relevant and the PIF outlines well the context in which this intervention would be carried out, it is not clear what areas and beneficiaries LMRP would target; and how these areas and beneficiaries would be left vulnerable to the effects of climate change in the absence of the proposed LDCF grant.</p> <p>Moreover, the relationship between LMRP and the indicative co-financing figures in Table C remains unclear. The sources and amounts of co-financing should be clearly and consistently reflected in the description of the baseline program in Section A.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>Finally, according to the draft Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP) for Sudan, the funding envelope for LMRP would include \$7 million from the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP), which would affect the baseline scenario, but this is not reflected in the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify, in Section A.1 of the PIF, what areas and beneficiaries would be targeted by LMRP; (ii) describe how those areas and beneficiaries would be left vulnerable in the absence of additional funding for adaptation; (iii) describe how the baseline program relates to the indicative co-financing figures provided in Table C;</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and (iv) clarify whether and how ASAP resources would be deployed in the baseline scenario and, given these adaptation funds, what outstanding adaptation needs would be left unmet.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The re-submission clarifies what areas and beneficiaries would be targeted by LMRP, and the ways in which the baseline program would fall short in addressing the adaptation needs of rural communities across agricultural and forest landscapes. It remains unclear, however, how the \$25 million in indicative co-financing relates to LMRP or other baseline initiatives. Moreover, the re-submission does not clarify whether and how ASAP resources would be deployed in the baseline scenario as indicated in the draft COSOP.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please refer to previous recommendations (iii) and (iv).</p> <p>02/25/2014 --YES. The re-submission clarifies how the indicative co-financing relates to LMRP, and that ASAP could contribute at a later stage towards scaling up successful adaptation measures.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. The Project Framework (Table B) should include a breakdown of indicative co-financing by component. In addition, outputs 1.2.1, 2.1.1 and 3.1.3 refer to unspecified "landscapes" and "three states" that could be spelled out for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>clarity.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, (i) please revise the Project Framework accordingly, if necessary; (ii) provide a breakdown of indicative co-financing by component; and (iii) name or otherwise specify the "landscapes" and "three states" referred to in the Project Framework.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, project outcomes and outputs should be coupled with specific and measurable targets and baselines. At this time it is not clear what indicators could be used to monitor outcome 1.1 and output 1.1.3, for instance, which are quite broad and somewhat ambiguous.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Given the outstanding questions regarding the baseline program, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this time.</p> <p>Components 1 and 2 refer to mixed rangeland, forest and rain-fed agriculture landscapes. It is not clear how these landscapes and “ by extension “ the resource users would be selected within the vast intervention area comprised by the four states mentioned in Section A.2 of the PIF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Given that LMRP is focused on the livestock sector rather than mixed landscapes and multiple user groups, it is not clear to what extent the proposed, additional adaptation measures would overlap with the areas and beneficiaries targeted by LMRP; and how the latter could serve as a vehicle for scaling up resilient practices introduced through the LDCF grant. It would be important to demonstrate that the LDCF would not finance stand-alone natural resources management and planning.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. (i) Please clarify how landscapes and resource users would be targeted for additional adaptation measures; (ii) to what extent these additional measures would target the same landscapes and beneficiaries as LMRP; and (iii) how LMRP could, in practice, serve as a vehicle for sustaining and scaling up successful approaches to adaptation.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>The revised PIF clarifies that the LDCF project would complement LRMP by promoting an integrated approach to natural resources management in different landscapes. The re-submission also provides further information</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regarding the ways in which successful adaptation measures could be mainstreamed into national and sub-national planning and decision-making processes, and scaled up through future investments.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the outstanding recommendations in Section 6, please adjust the additional reasoning accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>02/25/2014 -- YES.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including of CSOs, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and mitigation measures have been adequately identified for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Among the projects and programs listed in Section A.4 of the PIF, ASAP should be included in the event that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ASAP financing would support adaptation measures in the context of LMRP or otherwise. In addition, the PIF could mention the UNDP-LDCF project "Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan", which includes interventions in North Kordofan.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include, in Section A.4 of the PIF, the UNDP-LDCF project "Implementing NAPA Priority Interventions to Build Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan" and, if applicable, ASAP.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- YES. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives, with which coordination will be sought. Please refer, however, to recommendations under Section 6 above.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. Given the questions raised above, the innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit and clarify, if necessary, the innovative aspects of the proposed project as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>up.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would promote an integrated approach to climate-resilient natural resources management across rangeland, cropland and forest landscapes. The project is closely aligned with Sudan's national adaptation priorities, and it seeks to promote enhanced adaptation action in national and sub-national planning and policy-making processes. Through policy support as well as close alignment with IFAD's baseline program, the project appears well placed to achieve sustainable adaptation benefits with a viable pathway for scaling up.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 7 and 8, please (i) adjust the grant amounts per component if necessary and (ii) ensure that co-financing amounts are included and consistently reported across the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>document.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the grant amounts per component, if necessary.</p> <p>02/25/2014 -- YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In addition to co-financing brought by IFAD, indicative contributions, in kind or otherwise, from the government and beneficiaries “ which appear to be included in the financing envelope of LMRP according to the draft COSOP “ would signal a greater degree of ownership of and commitment in the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6 above, please adjust and consistently provide all indicative sources and amounts of co-financing.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6 above, please ensure that all indicative sources and amounts of co-financing are captured in Table C and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>consistently provided across the document.</p> <p>02/25/2014 -- YES.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. At \$406,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. A PPG of \$80,000 is requested, which is within the norm established for projects of up to and including \$10 million, but no PPG fee is included in Section I.E of the PIF. The PPG would be provided with a fee of 9.5 per cent.</p> <p>The Letter of Endorsement also omits the PPG fee. Consequently, as the fee is added, the total LDCF funding request will exceed slightly the funding endorsed by the Operational Focal Point.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide the PPG fee in Section I.E of the PIF and adjust the PPG or grant amount to ensure that the overall funding request does not exceed the total amount endorsed by the OFP (\$9,415,970); OR include the fee without other changes and provide a revised Letter of Endorsement.</p> <p>02/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The PPG amount has been adjusted to \$72,400 in the re-submission, but the associated fee of \$7,600 exceeds 9.5 per cent of the grant.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		ensure that the PPG fee does not exceed 9.5 per cent of the grant. 02/25/2014 -- YES.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 19. 02/07/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 8, 16, 17 and 19. 02/25/2014 -- YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 7 above.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	December 10, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 07, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 25, 2014	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**