



Watershed approaches for climate resilience in agro-pastoral landscapes

Basic Information

GEF ID

10178

Countries

South Sudan

Project Title

Watershed approaches for climate resilience in agro-pastoral landscapes

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP, UNIDO

Agency ID

UNDP: 6011

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes. Project aligns well with CCA-1, CCA-2 and LD-1-1.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

The project is overall designed in a sound and effective manner, reflecting upstream consultations with the country on their LDCF plan. However, several questions remain as follows:

(1) The amount requested for Component 1 seems relatively high given that this component only includes technical assistance for institutional capacity building. Please justify the amount by providing estimated number of trainers and extension personnel that will receive training under Output 1.4. Please further consider the added value of Output 1.3 on "guiding materials", given that LDCF resources should first and foremost target concrete on-the-ground benefits for vulnerable people. Would the project be able to deliver the envisaged outcome/objective without this output, and if so, can it be removed? For example, perhaps there is existing guiding material from similar projects in the region that could be used to enhance cost-effectiveness of this project.

(2) Please review the country's intention to embark on a National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process, and describe whether Component 1 would overlap with that effort. If so, please ensure complementarity of NAP processes and this project, and describe relevant provisions in the PIF.

(3) Please include an estimation of number of beneficiaries for the investment component, especially Output 2.2 on Farmer Field Schools. Please further confirm that most of the LDCF/GEF resources will be used for on-the-ground investments as opposed to training and capacity building.

(4) It is questionable in how far "medical kits" (Output 2.3) for animal health workers will be helping communities to adapt to the impacts of climate change. Please consider alternative adaptation measures that entail more potential for sustainable results in the long-term, given that medical kits will likely be one-off benefits and would have to be replenished by further donor resources. Alternative models include switching to more climate-resilient animal species, for example, as has been done in various other LDCF projects. Various other approaches may exist that could yield similar results in terms of enhanced food security in light of climate impacts to the beneficiaries.

(5) While the theory behind Component 3 is clear, the way the individual outputs are currently formulated seems to leave room for misinterpretation in the sense that it is not clear whether and how many hectares the project will actually restore, what the extent of the envisioned groundwater recharge capacity would be, and how many communities would benefit from such measures. Currently, the outputs could be interpreted as purely aiming at planning and training processes, which would not count as "investment" and which would seem rather costly and inefficient. Please clarify.

(6) Please describe how sustainability of water points will be ensured in the long-term (Output 3.4 for example).

DS, April 27, 2019:

(1) Please reallocate additional funds from Component 1 (institutional capacity building) to one of the other activities that results in on-the-ground investments, given the still volatile situation in the country.

(2) Comment cleared at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage, more information on complementarity with the NAP process will be required.

(3) Comment cleared.

(4) The linkage between climate change and common diseases are unclear and not sufficiently explained. However, even if the linkages would be explained in more detail, the proposed provision of veterinary medical kits seems like a short-term measure that will not necessarily lead to long-term changes in practices and behaviors. It also seems that medical kits would need to be replenished by other donor resources, which are not on the horizon. Once medical kits are used up, there is no plan for making this a long-term solution for climate change adaptation. Please remove this activity.

(5 & 6) Comments cleared. Most of the funding from Component 3 will be allocated for concrete on-the-ground adaptation measures such as contour and check dams, canals and water storage, drainage work, borehole excavation and hand pumps. It is also noted that, during PPG phase, groundwater recharge capacity will be assessed where boreholes are proposed.

DS, May 5, 2019:

All comments cleared except for comment (4) above on veterinary medical kits, as this activity is still contained in the PIF.

DS, May 7, 2019:

Section 1.6 contains the following sentence: "animal healthcare workers will be trained and provided medical kits." Please refer to above comment.

DS, May 7, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

(1) The policy work is proposed to trigger the catalytic effect towards establishing the framework for concrete on-the-ground benefits for vulnerable people. As a young country, South Sudan policy support processes and activities would include a substantial focus on trainings and adopted training/guiding materials to orient the respective stakeholder groups on the project and orientation on policy change that would be proposed. This is necessary to overcome the current policy and capacity gaps in the challenging context of South Sudan. The budget for component 1 was reduced by 200,000 USD based on initial feedback from the GEF Secretariat.

Policy actions would also support the activities of Component 2, which will require a different and adopted policy trajectory.

Hence the policy work will help to analyze existing policies, gaps and challenges; and set the framework for learning from the investment components of the project and also support the scaling up on pilot scale interventions and adaptation models required to deliver concrete on-the-ground benefits for vulnerable people.

(2) The Government of South Sudan has further proposed and embarked on formulation of the complimentary long-term adaptation plan and programme framework, the National Adaptation Programme, NAP to map out long term adaptation plans and projects. The NAP process, led by government Department of Environment, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, and involving the sector ministries and

agencies, is expected to benefit from the renewed peace accord in mid-2018,. The NAP had been underway at the time the country achieved the long-term CPA adoption; and validations had been planned at the time of this project discussion.

The NAP priorities are expected to build on and scale up the NAPA pilot interventions and investments, as well as leverage scaled investment for adaptation. This project compliments the respective processes, as it seeks to expand focus of climatic adaptation responses to a national scope, and tentatively identifies measures addressed to climate vulnerability scenarios across the wider national scope, expanding to areas of Terekeka, wider eastern and western equatorial, northern Baharalgazal and Awuil at large. The NAP enabling actions will be evaluated in complement to the NAPA priorities and projects, and scaled investment and adaptation scenario included in further formulation of this project.

(3) Most of the LDCF/GEF resources will be used for on-the-ground investments.

Component 2 will comprise the most notable investment resources, established at over 50% of the LDCF/GEF financed budget to the project.

Training and capacity building are nonetheless crucial requirements for South Sudan considering the underdeveloped institutional capacities at all level, and a minimally nascent private and productive sector. An assessment of CBOs will determine the number of farm field schools needed to reach the maximum number of the 75,000 beneficiaries in the targeted landscapes.

(4) The outbreak of animal diseases has been a challenge for communities relying heavily on livestock for their livelihood. Climate variability impacts on livestock are widespread, and the reference to "medical kits" should in fact be understood to mean "veterinary medical kits", which would be provided as mobile service units animal health workers, enabling efficient and timely delivery of services on the ground and further increase the resilience and productivity of livestock. At this stage, the kits are a priority to avert the outbreak of epizootic diseases and was the favored adaptation measure.

(5) With increasing reliance on ground water and the direct impacts of extreme weather events, declines in the resource are widely noted across the project targeted watersheds. Recharge systems will be evaluated and promoted (recharge capacity will be conducted during the PPG phase). Most of the funding for component 3 will be on-the-ground investments (contour and check dams, canals and water storage, drainage work, borehole excavation, hand pumps) on 30 micro-watersheds covering an area of 15,000 ha of land.

(6) Sustainability of borehole-based water points will be ensured by first targeting the most water stressed communities and locations, where benefits will have a high impact. The output will integrate market driven measures and service models, for instance by linking water supply service provision to alternative livelihoods activities, including agribusinesses. The measures will aim to generate scaled demand for portable water supply and services. Water points may also be co-located with income generating investments, while at the same time serving the needs of communities and households within the catchment areas.

UNDP/UNIDO, May, 1, 2019:

(1) A further 300,000 USD have been re-allocated to component 3 for on-the-ground investments.

(2) Noted.

(3) Noted

(4) The activity has been removed and funds for the activity will be allocated for on-the-ground investments. Core indicator 4 (Number of people trained) has been reduced to reflect the budget reduction.

(5 & 6) Noted.

JP, 7 May 2019: the mentioned sentence is removed.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS/RS, April 10, 2019:

Unclear. It seems that neither one of the proponent agencies are carrying out any relevant activities in the country that would contribute, through co-financing, to the proposed project's objectives. It seems questionable what the two agencies' capacity in the country is, and whether it is sufficient to ensure smooth and high-quality implementation. Please clarify, and if necessary, consider adjusting the project design. For instance, what is UNIDO's capacity in South Sudan, and how will it help implement the project? It seems that the competitive advantage is not clear.

Please consider whether UNDP projects from the large humanitarian assistance sector can be utilized to contribute to this LDCF project's results, and vice versa.

Finally, please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

DS, April 27, 2019:

All comments cleared, except on type of co-financing. Currently, all co-financing sources are listed as "Investment mobilized". This seems unlikely, given that some of the government co-financing will probably come as "in-kind" and "recurrent expenditure", such as office, supplies, government staff time etc. Please revise co-financing items listed to reflect more realistic scenarios.

DS, May 5, 2019:

Comments cleared.

JS, Oct 28, 2019:

Comments by Agency on Oct 23, 2019 are cleared.

JS, Oct 31, 2019, based on inputs from PPO:

In-kind co-financing from UNIDO has been marked as "investment mobilized". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please consider changing this classification to "recurrent expenditures". For further information, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

JS, Nov 1, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

The proposed locations of this project are in fact newly established states, and therefore the main reason why project titles and also proof of baselines may appear unclear. UNDP can rely on an outposted office in Wau for project implementation and monitoring and is conducting peace building and health activities in the region. For UNIDO baselines and project implementation capacity includes the projects in Wau (also covering Pibor and Torit states), which were formerly part of the Northern Bahr el Ghazal province; from which Aweil state has been newly established in 2017. Moreover, the national and decentralized administration of the restructure provinces and resulting 32 states, including Aweil, had not been settled until the in August 2018.

Therefore, considering the old state structure, UNIDO has long established and proven capacity in implementing projects across South Sudan, which constitute co-financing as well as a baseline administrative structure to support the project implementation. UNIDO also maintains common project office, which is co-hosted with UNDP office in Juba; which also provides administrative support to UNIDO and

other agencies at a cost recovery basis. The project office in Juba administers the project in Wau, as well as the fisheries project financed by Canada covering the newly established states of Terekeka, Nimule and Juba; as well as the Japan financed agribusiness project in Juba. These capacities would enable operation in the new location, and also constitute aspects of UNIDO's co-financing to the LDCF/GEF financed project.

UNIDO development projects, focusing on agribusiness development in the former Northern Bahr el Ghazal province, will be used to contribute to this LDCF project's results, estimates as follows:

GEF Agency	UNIDO Projects with EU (USD \$2,270,807), and Canada and FAO (\$3,698,272)	Grant		5,969,079
------------	--	-------	--	-----------

Ref: <https://open.unido.org/projects/SS/projects/>

UNDP used the GEF definitions to differentiate investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures. Due to the difficulty in assessing the exact share of recurrent expenditures in the government co-financing, we had used 20% as an indicative way to calculate those. The recurrent expenditures have been removed and the UNIDO co-financing has been added to the table.

UNDP/UNIDO, May, 1, 2019: Co-financing from the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Water Resources and Irrigation, related to the Comprehensive Agricultural Development Master Plan (CAMP) and related Irrigation Development Master Plan (IDMP), have been revised to include estimated recurrent expenditures.

In response to the following:

GEFSEC - 21 October 2019 (JS and JMS):

- We take note that the cofinancing is indicative at PIF level, and we understand that it is challenging to find high cofinancing in South Sudan. However, the cofinancing for the Land Degradation aspects is low (1:3), and an effort would be welcome to strengthen these aspects.

UNDP/UNIDO, Oct, 23 2019: We have some indications for additional co-financing, however, a series of consultation will be held to forge new partnerships and catalyze additional sources of financing, in particular for the land degradation activities. The PIF has been revised to include this consideration and instruct the PPG team to dedicate additional efforts to seek and confirm additional sources of co-financing for the land degradation activities.

UNDP/UNIDO, Nov 1 2019: The UNIDO co-financing has been adjusted to show as "recurrent expenditures" in line with the co-financing guidelines.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. The expected number of beneficiaries has been provided, and is gender-disaggregated. However, please fill in and attach the 4 LDCF core indicators and the associated meta-data indicator sheet (Excel file), as circulated to GEF Agencies on April 3, 2019. In addition, given that the project also requests resources from LD STAR, please provide an estimated number of hectares for Indicator 4 "Area of landscapes under improved practices" (excluding protected areas); this should be done in GEF Portal field in the indicator section.

Please further explain in the PIF whether the recipient country is pursuing Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets and if so, will the project help the country achieve its targets?

DS, April 27, 2019:

The 4 LDCF core indicators and associated meta-data have been received. Some issues remain:

(i) Please remove the tick mark for "project is explicitly related to the formulation and/or implementation of NAPs" in the Excel file meta-data.

(ii) In GEF Portal, please provide an estimated number of hectares for Indicator 4 "Area of landscapes under improved practices" (excluding protected areas), given that the project also requests resources from Land Degradation allocation (STAR).

DS, May 5, 2019:

Comments cleared.

JS, Oct 28, 2019:

Comments by Agency on Oct 23, 2019 are cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, April, 24, 2019:

This was an omission at submission, the core indicator sheet will be uploaded and the STAR indicator will be filled in the GEF portal. South Sudan has not set their targets for Land Degradation Neutrality, although they are among the countries that committed to set targets in the future. Component 3 is focusing on sustainable land management and includes a number of measures to avoid, reduce or reverse land degradation in the target area.

UNDP/UNIDO, May, 1, 2019:

The Excel document has been revised and Indicator 4 will be filled in the GEF portal at re-submission.

In response to the following:

GEFSEC - 21 October 2019 (JS and JMS):

- We note that 15,000 ha are mentioned under 4.1 in relation to terrestrial areas managed for Biodiversity. Is this an error, and are the 15,000 ha intended to be included under 4.3 for Sustainable Land Management?

UNDP/UNIDO, Oct, 23 2019: This was an error, the 15,000 ha are for Sustainable Land Management and the PIF has been updated to show this target under 4.3 instead of 4.1.

Project/Program taxonomy**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response**art II – Project Justification**

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Please clarify which of the initiatives that are currently listed as "baseline initiatives" take place in Aweil State, given that the latter is the project location. If baseline initiatives take place in other states, they may not count as baseline, except if justified. Please further include a description of ongoing government-led initiatives and government plans that count as baseline.

DS, April 27, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

All of the baseline projects retained are linked to the northern part of South Sudan, including Aweil/East Aweil states, formerly Northern Bahr el Ghazal and can support or apply to the interventions planned in the target locations.

For government-led initiatives, the Comprehensive Agricultural Development Master Plan (CAMP) and related Irrigation Development Master Plan (IDMP), developed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security with support from JICA, are highly relevant to the project and

include a number of priority projects for implementation, including Aweil/East Aweil states. The plans do not indicate which projects have or will receive funds from donors for their implementation. Most of the government interventions and investments in South Sudan are funded through donor funding.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes. However, please consider the following:

(1) As mentioned above, please explain in the PIF whether the recipient country is pursuing Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets and if so, will the project help the country achieve its targets?

(2) Please describe in more detail in the PIF how the project, e.g. through afforestation and agro-forestry activities, will contribute to community safety nets and diversified/alternative livelihoods, to reduce the vulnerability of the communities?

DS, April 27, 2019:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

(1) South Sudan is developing LDN targets with the UNCCD, but they have not been made public as of yet. Should the voluntary targets be made public during the PPG, the ProDoc will aim to align land restoration measures with LDN targets.

(2) Additional elements were added in the three components in section 1.5 to better present the adaptation benefits of the chosen measures. Afforestation activities have the advantage of providing clear land restoration results with adaptation co-benefits by making ecosystems more resilient and providing new livelihood opportunities for communities.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please clarify baselines as indicated above.

DS, April 27, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

Baseline clarified, all the baseline projects were chosen for their relevance to the chosen states.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please provide indicators as requested above.

DS, April 29, 2019:

Land Degradation indicator needs to be provided - see comment above.

DS, May 5, 2019:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

Addressed, the core indicators and land degradation STAR indicator will be entered on the portal.

UNDP/UNIDO, May, 1, 2019: We will address it in the portal.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes. The project is innovative and targets the new "Climate and Security" entry point of the LDCF Strategy.

Agency Response**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

JS, October 31, 2019, based on inputs from PPO:

Although geo-coordinates were provided, please also provide a map.

JS, Nov 1, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response UNDP/UNIDO, 1 November 2019: A map showing Aweil and Aweil States has been added.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please describe whether there is any potential for ethnic tensions to impact project implementation and/or sustainability, including potential risk mitigation measures.

DS, April 27, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

While the Peace agreement is currently holding, the risk of conflicts and ethnic tensions remains high. This is reflected in the risk table with potential mitigation measures in case of localized conflict in the project area (relocation of project activities to other pre-identified sites) or more widespread conflict in the agro-ecological zone targeted by the project. The risk section has been further clarified and detailed in the PIF.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 27, 2019:

As per the Guidelines on Project and Programme Cycle Policy (GEF document GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01), at the latest by the time of CEO Endorsement submission, the documentation must include a request signed by the GEF OFP indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of implementing/executing partners, including any execution activities provided by the GEF Agency. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform.

DS, May 5, 2019:

Letter needs to be shared with GEF Secretariat or alternatively the execution arrangement changed in the PIF.

Nov 7, 2019 (JS with input from PPO):

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement

Nov 11, 2019 (JS):

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, May, 1, 2019: Noted, the documentation will include those justifications.

UNDP/UNIDO, Nov 11, 2019: Noted. The agencies will consider other execution options and provide justifications. The discussion on execution arrangement with the GEFSEC, initiated during the PIF preparation, will be resumed early during the PPG.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

JS, Oct 28, 2019:

Comments by Agency on Oct 23, 2019 are cleared.

Agency Response

In response to the following:

GEFSEC - 21 October 2019 (JS and JMS):

South Sudan was part of the LDN Target Setting Programme. We would like, at minimum, seeing a reference about LDN targets in the national strategies and documents. To the extent possible, please also elaborate more on how this project may contribute to the implementation of LDN targets. If required, please contact the General Mechanism of the UNCCD for further information.

UNDP/UNIDO, Oct, 23 2019: South Sudan is still in the process of setting their voluntary LDN targets as part of the Target Setting Programme. After communicating with the UNCCD focal point for South Sudan, we have been allowed to make reference to the draft LDN document prepared by the government, noting that LDN targets are indicative at this stage until included in the UNCCD annex. Several activities under outcome 3 will contribute to these LDN targets once they are effective, those are the activities on sustainable land management, improvement of soil productivity and rehabilitation of degraded land. The indicators to be developed during the PPG will also be chosen to ensure that this project's contribution to LDN targets are captured and can be used by the government to track their progress against their national LDN targets once they are effective. The PIF has been revised to include more references to the LDN and related targets in section 1.4 Alignment with GEF focal area and section 7. Consistency with National Priorities.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 10, 2019:

Please attach the Letter of Endorsement in GEF Portal.

DS, April 27, 2019:

Cleared.

JS, October 31, 2019, based on input from PPO:

The OFP endorsement letter does not include the table specifying GEF/LDCF financing amounts, including PPF requirements. Please coordinate with the OFP to resubmit an endorsement letter following the usual format including indication of the financing amounts table. Please also provide a separate letter from the OFP indicating their desire for UNDP/UNIDO to responsible for day-to-day management of the project involving project execution functions.

JS, Nov 1, 2019:

The OFP endorsement has been provided in the correct format, and an additional letter from the OFP is provided indicating their desire for UNDP/UNIDO to responsible for day-to-day management of the project involving project execution functions.

Agency Response

UNDP/UNIDO, April, 24, 2019:

The LoE will be attached in the GEF portal along with the core indicator sheet.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, May 7, 2019:

Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF for technical clearance and PPG.

The UNDP/UNIDO/MTF project (GEF ID 10178), *Watershed Approaches for Climate Resilience in Agro-pastoral Landscapes*, will build resilience to climate change risks amongst agricultural and pastoral communities of South Sudan. The project was developed as a result of consultations with the GEF Secretariat on the new programming strategy, whereas the pipelined project from the GEF-6 period was dropped. The project aims reduce risks of crop failure through improved seeds, multi-cropping, crop diversification, crop-livestock systems and agro-forestry. The project will establish farmer field schools (FFS) and community-based organizations such as women self-help groups to facilitate local adoption of low-cost climate-resilient agriculture techniques such as micro-irrigation, tillage and soil moisture conservation. Additional activities include water points from shallow boreholes to increase resilience against droughts. Drawing on indicative co-financing of US\$ 29.5 million from the government and development partners, this project is expected to yield significant adaptation benefits, including: 75,000 direct beneficiaries (40,000 female); 15,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient management; 34 policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience; and 4,000 people trained (1,500 female).

GEFSEC - 21 October 2019 (JS and JMS):

The Secretariat requests further clarification on the following points in order to be able to recommend this PIF for technical clearance:

- South Sudan was part of the LDN Target Setting Programme. We would like, at minimum, seeing a reference about LDN targets in the national strategies and documents. To the extent possible, please also elaborate more on how this project may contribute to the implementation of LDN targets. If required, please contact the General Mechanism of the UNCCD for further information.
- We note that 15,000 ha are mentioned under 4.1 in relation to terrestrial areas managed for Biodiversity. Is this an error, and are the 15,000 ha intended to be included under 4.3 for Sustainable Land Management?
- We take note that the cofinancing is indicative at PIF level, and we understand that it is challenging to find high cofinancing in South Sudan. However, the cofinancing for the Land Degredation aspects is low (1:3), and an effort would be welcome to strengthen these aspects.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

As per the Guidelines on Project and Programme Cycle Policy (GEF document GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01), by the time of CEO Endorsement submission at the latest, the documentation must include an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of implementing/executing partners, including any execution activities provided by the GEF Agency. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the GEF Agency may perform.

At CEO endorsement stage, the complementarity of the project with the NAP process in South Sudan needs to be explained in detail.

GEFSEC 18Nov2019:

All comments have been addressed. This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/10/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2019	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

undefined