



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

GEF ID:	<b>9425</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sudan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthened Protected Areas System and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Sudan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5741 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,100,913</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$17,220,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$21,320,913</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Doley Tshering,</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>3-21-16 Yes. The alignment of this PIF is presented on Page 10. This information needs to be included as part of Table A. Aichi targets are listed on page 10. Please address issue.</p> <p>6-20-16 In Table A, the Agency needs to split the GEF Financing and co-financing</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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>per Focal Area Program. Currently mixing Programs 1 and 2 for BD-1. Current allocation to Programs may shift if new LD programs are needed to justify the use of LD resources.</p> <p>9-1-16 Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>3-21-16 There is reference to the NBSAPs, and MEAs including NAPA, NAP and NCSA. Please provide a bit more detail as of the consistence of this project, specially for the investments related to Component 3.</p> <p>6-20-16 Cleared</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>3-21-16 The Root Causes are not addressed while the barriers are clearly stated on pages 8 and 9. The GEF suggest shorten or removing headings not relevant to Part II, 1. (i.e. Honey bee diversity, agro-biodiversity), and concentrate on items that relate to the PIF: PAs and land Use and Land Management.</p> <p>6-20-16 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound	3-21-16	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes. The Table for the Baseline Projects (p.9) and GEBs and Incremental reasoning (p.12-13) are very good. Thanks.</p> <p>6-20-16                      While incremental reasoning was cleared in the previous review, it came to the attention of the PM that most of the baseline projects are BD oriented. We would need more information on the baseline scenario and the co-financing related to the third component. Are the co-financiers aware that they are listed in this PIF with an indicative co-financing \$ figure? Is the co-financing of Wildlife Conservation General Administration of \$8.0 M in kind and \$1.6 M in grants going to materialize during project execution? Nothing worse for project developers and implementers to find out that co-finance promised at PIF stage does not materialize at project execution. What are these funds for? What is the co-financing supporting the LD activities? With better understanding in the baseline and the co-financing for the component 3, the GEF may want to suggest a mix of activities under the LD program 1 and 4.</p> <p>9-1-16</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Thanks for information on consultation with co-financiers.</p> <p>3-16-17 Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>3-21-16</p> <p>Table B is clear and has the potential to deliver at least part of the GEBs described in the PIF. There are nonetheless some questions regarding the scope of the project and how to deliver the outcomes.</p> <p>1. The budget for the entire project may not be enough to deliver all GEBs. The budget for Component 1 (\$598K) is very low to deliver all the outputs. Same for Component 2 (\$1.8M) and most likely for Component 3 (\$1.4M). The GEF suggest to either reduce the geographic scope of the project (fewer PAs) or increase the budget. The PIF is overpromising and likely to under-deliver. Sudan still has STAR resources available for GEF-6, at least when looking at the PIFs submitted to the GEF. Please consult with OFP.</p> <p>2. Is the location of the proposed New Protected Areas determined already? If so, are these areas considered Key</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)? The project needs to fully justify that the location for the new PAs, follows clear biodiversity and ecological criteria. KBAs are mentioned on page 10. Can the Agency and the Government elaborate more on this issue, assuming the potential new protected areas have been identified. Thanks.</p> <p>3. Output 1.6. The development of a strategy for an effective financial management of Sudan's national system of PAs is the easy part. What is the likelihood that this project can implement the plan? Based on the ample experience UNDP has on this issue (several GEF projects have this outcome), please provide examples of similar processes and the timeline. While this makes sense on paper, the GEF wonders if this is achievable considering budget and time. Thanks.</p> <p>4. Output 2.1. 1) Regarding ecological monitoring. This is a very important but ambitious output. Has UNDP search in the NGO and Academic community who may have the baseline information? If there is someone out there with that information (most likely), it would make sense to bring them on board,</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>rather to start from scratch. 2) Similar to output 1.6. Can these business plans be developed and implemented considering funding and time? This is pretty ambitious.</p> <p>5. Output 2.2. The PIF is already very ambitious. Not clear why to spread even more trying to cover areas that are, literally, out of the reach of the project. The GEF suggests eliminating this output, unless these areas can be service properly with additional and sufficient financial resources.</p> <p>6. Component 3. This is the hardest part of the project to develop and implement with sustainability. The PIF is proposing providing TA \$1,469,816 in 6670 Km2. That means \$2.2/ha. What is a reasonable benchmark for this type of investments? The Type should be changed from TA to INV.</p> <p>7. A key question regarding this component is: Do all these "plans", "agreements" and "training" with communities have a chance to get implemented and sustained through time? Are there true "alternative livelihoods" that the project can readily use? While stabilizing the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>agricultural and pastoralism frontiers to ameliorate the pressure on PAs, sounds and is a good idea, the conservation community is still to come-up with implementable solutions that last beyond the funds and time of this project. Please elaborate on this and adjust the PIF accordingly.</p> <p>8. Output 3.4 Aren't there methodologies already developed for this purpose? This is not the first time this is going to be done. On the contrary.</p> <p>9. How is the project planning on stabilizing the numbers and distribution of threatened migrating fauna species in critical habitats (e.g. Ostrich, red – fronted gazelle and wild sheep, migratory water fowl)?</p> <p>10. What are is being proposed for "restoration"? Where is this going to take place, and is it likely to be stable trough time? Who will be in charge of these investments and what are they going to derived from restoring pieces of the landscape?</p> <p>6-20-16</p> <p>While the title of the project suggests</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>a focus on PAs, this is actually a Multifocal Area Project with comparable investments using resources from the BD and LD focal areas (\$1.9M and \$2.1M respectively). In that regard, while the first two components on PAs and BD investments are well documented and justified, the third component with LD investment does not fully justify the use of these resources. Many outputs appear to complement the BD investments rather than be justifiable uses of LD resources. The GEF request a more detail description of the proposed activities related to the LD Focal Area. This should apply to all outputs, specially those related to Output 3.7. As described, these outputs are more in line with the BD objectives than to LD objectives (fisheries, bee keeping, aquaculture...).</p> <p>The formulation of the output 3.6 (the most interesting from a LD perspective) is not specific enough or quantifiable. The Agency and Government should propose a SMART formulation, and include the number of hectares under SLM as a core indicator in the result framework.</p> <p>The linkages with a future LDN</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		framework are interesting and strategic. The Agency and Government should confirm that this linkage will be made during PPG to make this project a contributor to a LDN pilot site.  3-16-17 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	3-21-16 Yes. Pages 14 and 15 of PIF. Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	3-21-16 Sudan has enough STAR allocation to cover this project. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	3-21-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1, 2 , 3 and 5. Thanks  6-20-16 No. Address issues under items 1,4 and 5. Thanks.	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		3-16-17 Cleared	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 21, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 16, 2017	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> 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
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		