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

GEF ID:	**5703**		
Country/Region:	**Sudan**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing the Resilience of Communities Living in Climate Change Vulnerable Areas of Sudan using Ecosystem based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	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-1; CCA-1; CCA-2;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,284,000**
Co-financing:	**$11,100,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$15,484,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**Ermira Fida**

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 and has prepared its NAPA.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, a letter of endorsement from the OFP dated 17 June 2013 has been submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	FI, 2/27/2014 No. The GEF has temporarily suspended	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the approval of LDCF funds until additional contributions are received. Projects will continue to be technically reviewed and cleared. They will be processed for Council review and approval as soon as adequate resources become available.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Yes; it is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability) and CCA-2 (increasing adaptive capacity).	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes. The project will enhance community resilience through EbA measures in the agriculture/food security and water sectors. These have been identified as priority sectors in Sudan's NAPA and National Communications, and as areas for mid- and long-term focus in the NAP process and the country's 25 Year Strategic Development Plan. EbA is also a promising area for Sudan to focus on in its Technology Needs Assessment.	
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to	Yes. White Nile State, in southern Sudan and with a population of 1.7 million, is one of Sudan's most vulnerable regions to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	climate change. Semi-arid zones are becoming increasingly arid, and both droughts and floods result in widespread damages. The LDCF project will bring additional adaptation benefits to 7 baseline projects that include investments in water supply infrastructure, improved livestock and crop management programs, rangeland rehabilitation, dissemination of improved seeds, and programs for women's development.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes. This 4-year project will support the establishment of a multi-disciplinary committee to facilitate national dialogue on climate change adaptation and EbA; targeted EbA trainings and policy briefs; local policy dialogue on adaptation mainstreaming; identification of climate change related vulnerabilities and risks for selected sites; on-the-ground ecosystem/rangeland improvements; integration of EbA measures in community livelihood activities; and pilot implementation of alternate livelihood activities.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes for PIF stage. At first glance many of the proposed on-the-ground EbA measures appear to be activities that are needed to address existing vulnerability regardless of climate change (e.g., sand dune fixing through tree planting, agroforestry, water supply measures, restoration of degraded pastures), so that the adaptation benefits are not immediately obvious. However, the success of this project will lie in its	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		ability to implement these measures in a way that they are resilient to climate change. By CEO Endorsement: Please make explicit the ways in which the EbA measures will be taking potential future change in climate into account in design of the on-the-ground activities. For example, bee-keeping has been suggested as an alternate, "climate-resilient" livelihood. In some parts of the world, however, the impact of climate change on bees is not clear; such considerations should be guiding activity selection, design and planning. The activities might not be "climate-resilient" in and of themselves. By CEO endorsement stage, please ensure that climate change considerations guide all proposed activities.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Not fully yet. The project will employ participatory approaches and involve local communities in validation of key process. The project will create partnerships with NGOs at national and regional levels, as well as with private sector partners at project sites. Also, the PIF mentions that women are highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		change and that the project will specifically target them, but does not mention how women's interests will be captured in the project design itself. Recommended action: It would be preferable to provide assurances that women's groups and community members will be consulted during the project preparation itself, ahead of implementation. In addition, by CEO endorsement: Please discuss more fully how stakeholders will continue to be consulted throughout project implementation. Update, FI 4/7/14: Yes, adequate information has been provided for PIF stage. Community level consultations to assess the needs of all vulnerable community groups, including women, will be a key objective of project preparation.	
	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)	FI, 2/27/14: Not quite. Please also discuss risks posed by lack of institutional coordination and capacity for EbA: due to the cross-cutting nature of EbA, coordination across relevant institutions will be necessary, including links with relevant research on resilience to climate change. Update, FI 4/7/2014: Yes. The issue has been included in the risk matrix, and mitigation measures have been provided. For example, a national dialogue process will be established that	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		will include a broad range of relevant stakeholders and is expected to develop into a permanent body for coordination on adaptation and EbA mainstreaming in Sudan.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. The project will coordinate with two other LDCF projects in Sudan in the agriculture and water resources sectors, as well as with efforts to develop Sudan's NAP. This will be done through analysis of good practice examples, monitoring of experience with climate risk insurance pilots, and drawing on sectoral V&A assessments.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	Innovativeness: EbA is a relatively innovative approach to climate change adaptation, However, as mentioned in Item 8, above, the EbA measures will need to fully consider climate change adaptation considerations and (by CEO endorsement) provide details on the measures being taken to do so. If the project simply implements a suite of ecosystem/rangeland improvements that are needed regardless of climate change, it is not innovative. Sustainability: The project includes awareness-raising and training components and involves communities in validation of key processes. These measures will assist in sustainable outcomes. Scale-up: The project includes activities that will facilitate upscaling, such as creation of a national knowledge base on EbA and assessment/expansion of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		successful practical examples emerging at the community level.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, the amounts are adequate and appropriate, with over 70 percent of LDCF funding directed at component 2, which includes on-the-ground measures to build resilience.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	FI, 2/27/14: Further information is requested. The amount and composition of co-financing is adequate ($11.1 million), with most being provided from local and national Government sources. The Agency (UNEP) is not bringing co-financing, however. Recommended action: The PIF (Section B.3) indicates a strong UNEP presence in Sudan. Please provide an explanation of why UNEP is not providing co-financing for this project. Update, FI 4/7/2014: Yes, this concern has been addressed. UNEP is providing co-financing through the SEIP2, a DFID-financed, UNEP-implemented project of $1.5 M.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Yes, project management costs are appropriate, at 4.7% of the requested LDCF grant.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
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?**	FI, 2/27/14: Not yet. Please address the comments provided for Items 10, 11 and 17. Please also note that the Agency fee	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		amount is missing from Table D and should be included. Update, FI 4/7/14: The proposal is technically cleared. However, the GEF has temporarily suspended the approval of LDCF funds until additional contributions are received. The project will be processed for Council review and approval as soon as adequate resources become available.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items 8 and 9.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	February 27, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 07, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**