



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

GEF ID:	<b>9506</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sudan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening targeted national capacities for improved decision making and mainstreaming of global environmental obligations</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5798 (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>CCCD-1; CCCD-2; CCCD-3; CCCD-5;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$2,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Susan Waithaka</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Tom Twining-Ward</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>The project proposes to address CCCD 1, 2 and 3 and proposes to update their NCSA.</p> <p>As has been mentioned with other projects - it is recommended that there is a focus on 1-2 objectives with lesser outputs. We therefore recommend that the outputs are reduced and subsequently the budget.</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>Information requested 6/23/2016</p> <p>GEF financing is reduced from US\$ 1.5 million to US\$ 1 million. Co-financing is reduced from US\$ 1.5 million to US\$ 1 million. The project fees were reduced as a result of reduced GEF financing.</p> <p>Cleared 1/23/2017</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>Note quite. The project is consistent with addressing the barriers identified in the NCSA Report (2008). The project will also liaise with the various activities under the Conventions, such as Sustainable Land Management under the UNCCD, adaptation to and mitigation of the impacts of climate change (NAPA) under the UNFCCC, and biodiversity conservation (NBSAP) under the CBD. The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) 2015-2020 was prepared in 2015.</p> <p>There is also mention of national strategies such as the National Strategic Plan (2007-2031) including the Twenty-Five Year National Strategy which contains an Environment and Physical</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Development strategy that align with the CCCD.</p> <p>However the project does not mention of the Convention Articles that the project will address. This is an important part of the CCCD projects.</p> <p>Please provide. 6/23/2016</p> <p>Provided. Cleared. 1/23/2017</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>Not Clear. There is no clear description of the current state of policy and legal institutional set up nor how the RIO Conventions are being implemented. There is no clear description of the problem that exists beyond a general description which could apply to any country. What is the structure of government in relation to managing the MEAs in Sudan?</p> <p>Please explain</p> <p>6/23/2016</p> <p>During the PPG stage the institutional analyses will describe the current</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>state of policy and legal framework and institutional arrangements to meet and sustain RIO conventions objectives, among other MEAs.</p> <p>Cleared 1/24/2017</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Not Clear. There is no clear description of the baseline provided. Please provide details on which project the GEF investment will be building on?</p> <p>6/27/2016.</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 1/24/2017</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Not yet. As suggested for other similar projects, please reduce the number of objectives being addressed to two and reduce the number of outputs in order to arrive at a reasonable budget.</p> <p>Component 2. 2.2 - Not clear - not specific - please unpack 2.3 - Not clear what this means 2.4 - Explain what you mean by this output - as worded it is not clear 2.5 -Be more specific and explain what is meant by integrated environmental development best practices</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 3 refers to CCCD 1 - however - no information has been provided on the current situation in relation to data management, information management and what the problem may be. More information will help to explain the outlined outputs. We would also suggest that the outputs are reduced to a manageable 4-5 outputs.</p> <p>Component 5 - suggest as we have before that this item is not treated as a separate component.</p> <p>Revision requested</p> <p>6/27/2016</p> <p>During the PPG it is recommended that more information on the current situation is provided. Further for output 4.3 - more clarity and information should be provided on how the education curricula will be engaged. This is a huge undertaking- and more thought and discussion should take place. During CEO endorsement - more indepth information is requested including specifics on what levels and institutions.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1/24/2017	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Somewhat. The project indicates that all key outputs will take account of gender related concerns and where possible generate gender benefits. Please elaborate on what this means. In addition the project also indicate that it includes several validation measures and gender sensitive indicators to help ensure equal access and benefits. Please explain this.</p> <p>There is an indication of involvement of CSOs. At CEO endorsement please provide details of participation and plans for further engagement with all stakeholders.</p> <p>Information requested</p> <p>6/27/16</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 1/25/2017</p>	
<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>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes - Funding from CCCD GEF 6 allocation - however there is a request that the budget is reduced and keeping the objectives and outputs focused.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		6/27/2016	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. The following need to be addressed:</p> <p>There should be fewer objectives addressed and the outputs should be reduced as well- so as to arrive at a budget of \$800,000 - \$ 1Million.</p> <p>Information requested</p> <p>6/27/2016</p> <p>Budget has been reduced and some activities have been removed.</p> <p>Cleared 1/24/2017</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	June 28, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<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 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?		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<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.