



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9575		
Country/Region:	Sudan		
Project Title:	Sudan Sustainable Natural Resources Management Project- Additional Financing		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	161304 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$5,504,586
Co-financing:	\$27,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,004,586
PIF Approval:	October 30, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	November 30, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>7-26-16 There is no reference to the Aichi Targets the project will help achieve. There are no SMART indicators identified to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?</p> <p>9-1-16 Please use some of the indicators listed in the following CBD paper. They can be refined at QER if need it.</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/ind/id-ahteg-2015-01/official/id-ahteg-2015-01-03-en.pdf</p> <p>The GEF notices that on Table 1, there is reference to BD 1- Program 1, and BD-2 Program 3. The expansion of the network of Protected Areas call for BD 1 Program 2, not Program 1. In the addition, there is no justification to make us of BD 2 Program 3 on "Preventing the Extinction of Known Threaten Species. Please adjust.</p> <p>10-03-16 The GEF compared the location of the proposed new protected areas with the location of the KBAs in www.keybiodiversityareas.org/home. The comparison showed that the suggested new protected areas do not overlap with the KBAs. Thus, the project should not indicate that the BD resources will be used in the BD-1 Program 2 (Table A). Assuming the project wants to continue with the establishment of these new areas, the GEF suggests to remove the reference of the BD-1 Program 2 from Table A and to include the current request under LD (\$1.8M) and BD (\$1.8M) under LD only (\$3.6M). GEF's PMIS will interpret this as a decision to use</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the "marginal adjustment" of \$2M. Please make a note on Table D indicating this decision. 3-13-17 Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	7-26-16 The practice is to provide the specific NAPA priorities the project is addressing. Thus there should be a reference to the countries NAPA and the NAPA priorities the project will address. The document notes "The proposed activities to be supported with the LDCF funds correspond with the priority sectoral and geographical areas in the Sudan NAPA." It would be useful to provide some exact details if possible here. 9-4-16 Cover somewhere else in the review. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	7-26-16 There is no innovation in this project. It is a replication of the work done already in Sudan. The PCN needs to address the issue of sustainability. Please also address how the project will create conditions for up-scaling to avoid making a new request to the GEF in a few years to do the same	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>exactly the same somewhere else.</p> <p>9-1-16 Paragraph 13 talks about the expansion of the program, but not on the issue of SUSTAINABILITY (Ecological, Financial and Institutional) or on HOW the project will create conditions for up-scaling to avoid making a new request to the GEF in a few years to do the same exactly the same somewhere else. Please elaborate with the latest thinking.</p> <p>10-3-16 As per requirement of all GEF projects, the PIF (PID in this case) needs to have a section on Sustainability (as well as Innovation and scaling-up). Not clear why in the response matrix, there is reference to this project being "in the early concept stage" and that "detailed reasoning will only be developed and included as the project develops into a full document: if this is additional financing. The proponents must have the information regarding the issues being asked based on the experience so far with the initial project. Please elaborate.</p> <p>3-13-17</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Cleared</p> <p>7-26-16</p> <p>Baseline project(s) and Incremental Reasoning</p> <p>There is no heading for the Baseline Project and Incremental Reasoning. The proposed interventions listed under the three components appear to be stand-alone activities. The PCN does not elaborate on the baseline projects on which the GEF funded activities will stand to deliver Global Environmental Benefits. The activities of the co-financiers are not described, making difficult to understand of these projects relate to the baseline. For instance, there is reference to a loan of the Islamic Development Bank in the amount of \$10,000,000. What is this loan for? Similar questions for the WB (FCPF), the Government of Sudan (\$10,000,000 in-kind) and JICA (\$5,000,000 grant).</p> <p>Global Environment Benefits</p> <p>The Additional financing is proposing on doing in three additional states, what was done in the previous grant in the Kassala, Gezira and White Nine States. What are the Global</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Environmental Benefits to be derived from this \$7.3 million investment? For biodiversity there is only reference to "the original small mammals, birds, reptiles, other fauna, and plant life typical of the Sahel biome". Please indicate what KBAs will be considered for the location of the protected areas. There are no carbon benefits.</p> <p>9-1-16 The names of the KBAs for the location of the protected areas (i.e. for gazetting Forest Reserves and the Creation of Biosphere Reserves) were not provided on paragraph 19. A map with the location of these KBAs will facilitate the review. Please also provide a map with the location of the KBAs. Thanks.</p> <p>10-3-16 Please read entry under item 1.</p> <p>3-13-17 Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>7-26-16</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>What are the proposed "biodiversity conservation practices at the community levels within the newly</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>selected three states"?</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>The request for CCM \$1,834,862 (CCM2-Prog4) needs further justification in relation to how the investments will to promote the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest and other land uses. The proposal highlights mainly the biodiversity and water related objectives of the SLWM. CO2 emissions avoided needs to be estimated, not only ha of improved management and SLM.</p> <p>Risk</p> <p>In the Implementation Status & Results Report of June 2015, the progress towards achievement of GEO was rated Satisfactory, the Overall Implementation Progress (IP) was rated Moderately Satisfactory and the Overall Risk Rating was Substantial. Please further elaborate on the implementation risks in the proposed target regions and how the AF is planning in mitigating them (Item 14. Lessons learnt from project implementation, p. 4 of PCN).</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>LDCF</p> <p>The practice is to provide the specific NAPA priorities the project is addressing. Thus there should be a reference to the countries NAPA and the NAPA priorities the project will address. The document notes "The proposed activities to be supported with the LDCF funds correspond with the priority sectoral and geographical areas in the Sudan NAPA." It would be useful to provide some exact details if possible here.</p> <p>It would be preferable to use the LDCF resources for more than technical assistance. Perhaps it could be a little clearer how this all links together with the GEF trust fund resources, and what the climate resilient adaptive livelihood options are and how do they provide adaptation benefits related to the baseline project? The LDCF resources should really not be used for studies or gap analysis per se, but for real on the ground investments. In table B of the data sheet, under the trust fund column, there is no reference in the components to the LDCF resources. You will need to specify in the data sheet where the LDCF resources will be used.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>9-1-16</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>The target area (137,000 ha) seems ambitious. Please clarify where this number comes from. It is only cited in the foot note for the CO2 calculation. Please also provide more details on the practices used to rehabilitate the forests and rangelands to better understand the changes the project will make on the ecosystems. At CEO endorsement, based on these changes, the calculation of the CO2 benefits will have to be clearly presented using a recognized methodology such as for instance Ex-Act tool.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>The GEF is requesting information on the "implementation risks" associated with the expansion of the program to the three new areas. The use of an "early warning and seasonal weather forecast" and the use of the "drought tolerant crop varieties" are responses to weather related risks. What other implementation risks will this project likely to run into, and what was learned from the experience of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>implementing the initial project?</p> <p>LDCF</p> <p>The project description states that the LDCF will support climate resilient livelihood alternatives. Based on the experiences of the initial project, please elaborate on the type/kind of climate resilient livelihoods it would be supporting, how many beneficiaries would be expected to be reached with this support, and in how far the sustainable livelihood models would be sustainable beyond project completion. The country's NAPA identifies rain-fed farmers and pastoralists as the most vulnerable group when it comes to the impacts of climate change; please explain how these vulnerable groups will benefit from the project</p> <p>10-4-16</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>It is not clear why it is not possible to include information on "implementation risks", when this project is additional finance. Please include a section on this subject making use of all the lessons learned in the previous project.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Table B</p> <p>Under Component 2, it is necessary to split the resources requested from the GEF trust Fund and those requested under the LDCF. Currently combined in a single figure (\$\$5,380,00).</p> <p>3-13-17</p> <p>Table B. The funds of the LDCF and GEF Trust Fund were not split as requested. Please address and resubmit.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>7-26-16 Addressed on p.7 of PCN</p> <p>9-4-16 While most of the targeted beneficiary communities primarily depend on women for agricultural work and water supply, it is not clear unclear if the project would include a gender gap analysis as per the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan, and allocate appropriate budget towards addressing issues identified through such gender gap analysis. Please elaborate.</p> <p>10-3-16</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Addressed in the Response Matrix. Cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>LoE.</p> <p>The letter of Endorsement needs to be revised. The GEF Operational Focal has changed, the Totals in the table need to reflect the sum of Project + Fees, remove the SFM request, and the text needs to be amended as it makes reference to a \$1 million project (should be the sum of BD, LD, CCM and LDCF).</p> <p>9-1-16 Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>9-4-16</p> <p>Sudan is eligible for funding under the LDCF. However, the GEF Secretariat would like to inform the project proponents that the currently established pipeline of technically cleared project proposals under the LDCF amounts to approximately \$242 million, while the available resources in the LDCF Trust Fund amount to approximately \$38 million and outstanding pledges to approximately \$170 million. Since funding under the LDCF occurs on a</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		first-come first-serve basis, and there is considerable pipeline of technically cleared projects, this implies waiting time for any additional projects to be cleared at this point in time.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>7-26-16 No. Please address outstanding issues.</p> <p>9-4-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1-6, and notice text under item 7. The GEF remains available for further consultation over email, phone or in person.</p> <p>10-3-16 No. Please address issues under items 1,3,5, and 7. Thanks</p> <p>3-13-17 No. Please address outstanding issue under item 5.</p> <p>Please also see GEF comments under LCDF. This does not require action but requires attention by the WB.</p> <p>3-20-17 No. Email to Agency requesting adjustment of LDCE funds</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		considering the availability of funds. 3-30-17 yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 04, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	4-2-18 No significant changes since PIF approval. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4-2-18 1. What is the target for the SLWM for the project? In Table B of the Data Sheet the target is 60,000 ha. but in Table F it is 164,000 ha. When providing the target for this project (PMIS 9575) please provide the	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>figure for the new hectares only.</p> <p>2. What are the "Appropriate SLWM options for Sudan" (Annex 4) that this project will be using? The Table on Page 59 of the project Document is just a list, and provide no insights into what the GEF funds will be used for. This comment is in line with the comment made by STAP. Since this is AF, the project should know by now the "Appropriate SLWM options for Sudan".</p> <p>3. The targets for the project (specially for Component 2) appear to be the combination of the targets for the three new regions. What are the targets for each of the three new geographies?</p> <p>4. The target for the tons of CO2e mitigated went from 2.0 at PIF stage to 76,242,771 over 20 years. Please explain the significant difference.</p> <p>5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>4-2-18</p> <p>Please clarify the geographic targets of IFAD's co-financing. If the IFAD led "Integrated Agricultural and</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Marketing Development Project" is going to take place in North Kordofan, what is the co-financing for the other two target regions? Where is the IFA supported "Marketing / Storage/Processing Seed Development Project" going to take place?</p> <p>5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>4-2-18</p> <p>1. In the mid-term report of the previous project it says "The main challenge with disbursement is the difficulty to transfer money to Sudan because of sanctions. For the last 2 months, it was not possible to transfer money to the project account and at present the project does not have money for project implementation. This is a serious concern outside the control of the project and should be resolved as soon as possible". The disbursement of that project in the MTR is only 38%</p> <p>And in the Project Document of this project (p.11 of 75) it says:</p> <p>"The main risks identified in the Aide Memoire from the latest</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Implementation Support Review are the following: (i) the use of the New Procurement Framework (NPF); (ii) inadequate evaluation and selection capacity (iii) weak contract management; (iv) delays in processing procurement; (v) potential risk of fraud and corruption due to social influences; and (vi) poor public perception of procurement best practices".</p> <p>Please elaborate on the changes already introduced to address this matters and state the disbursement as of the end of 2017. (The information on paragraph 21 is very generic and doesn't answer this question).</p> <p>2. Please elaborate on the risks associated with expanding the operations to three new regions, that together are three times the size of the previous target regions, further away from the capital and under harsher environmental conditions (lower rainfall and higher temperatures). In the MTR, the previous and current ratings for "Progress towards achievement of PDO" and the "Overall Implementation Progress (IP)" are "Moderately Satisfactory"! Is this the reflection of the current/proposed targets for SLWM (9,832/104,000 ha),</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		beneficiaries (19,000/50,000), reforestation (4,350/17,400 ha) reported in the MTR? 3. What is the project going to do to ensure the financial sustainability of this project? 5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	4-2-18 There are no LoC from the Government of Sudan, the loans from IFAD or the grant from JICA. 5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	4-2-18 No TTs were provided. 5-1-18 Cleared	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	4-2-18 Did the WB and Sudan engaged in coordination activities with the project "Climate Risk Finance for Rainfed Farming and Pastoral Systems (GEF-UNDP)?	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	4-2-18 Yes Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	4-2-18 Regarding gender. In the MTR of the previous project, it says: "It is clear with the large jump in direct beneficiaries, the percentage of direct female beneficiaries has fallen. The team has raised this issue with the project and efforts will be made in the coming months to ensure stronger outreach to female beneficiaries, both in communities already served by the project and new communities". What is this project going to do differently to increase the participation and the number of female beneficiaries? 5-1-18 See answers in the Response Matrix. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>4-2-18 No. Please address the outstanding issues. Thanks.</p> <p>5-1-18 yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 02, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 01, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		