



Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds

Basic Information

GEF ID

10203

Countries

Uganda

Project Title

Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds

GEF Agency(ies)

AfDB

Agency ID**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

The project is aligned with objectives CCA 1 and 2 of GEF 7's programming strategy for LDCF. **The project, however, refers to alignment with CCA 3 on enabling environment which is not apparent from the project scope. The agency is requested to review this and appropriate LDCF budget for the relevant objectives accordingly.**

The project also does not specify the name of the Executing Agency. The agency is requested to provide this information in the PIF. In the stakeholders section, MWE, Climate Change Unit is proposed to be the implementation partner. However, in the LDCF consultation meeting, the OFP team indicated that Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries will be the execution agency. Please clarify and provide information in the portal.

The project will support improved resilience of climate vulnerable population in the Awoja catchment of Uganda focusing on four watersheds in Bukedea District. It adopts an integrated approach for strengthening the resilience of vulnerable population and ecosystem. The project aims to integrate climate resilience in the agriculture value chain using a watershed management approach. To support holistic resilience, the project aims to improve management of forest land, range land and agriculture land by supporting wetland management, afforestation, river bank protection, agro-forestry and other water and soil conservation measures within the watersheds. Addressing a critical driver of climate vulnerability, the project will support strengthening of climate information and early warning systems for resilient livelihoods and infrastructure.

The project will mainstream climate resilience in investments provided by AfDB and Uganda government to strengthen agriculture sector in Uganda thereby making the investment more sustainable and effective for overall economic growth and poverty alleviation in the country.

May 2: The agency is requested to revise the program objective as it reflects that the LDCF project is just for supporting the AVCP program while the project scope is quite wide and integrated. Please correlate the comment with the comment under section 1 of part II.

Agency Response

The LDCF budget and relevant text has been revised to remove alignment with CCA-3 objectives.

The Executing Agency name is now included in the Portal.

As noted by the OFP the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries will be the project executing agency, this has been updated accordingly in the PIF

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

The project includes four components to achieve the program objectives. However, the components described in Table B is not consistent with the components described in details under the alternative scenario. The agency is requested to review and revise accordingly.

The agency is also requested to align project outcomes and outputs with the components. For example, in Table B, outcome 1.2 is increased climate resilience of rural infrastructure. However, none of the project outputs are linked with resilient infrastructure design or implementation. Instead the outputs are on afforestation, agro-forestry and alternative livelihoods. Also, the outcome 1.2 and Component 2 reads similar but with different activities/outputs. In addition, in the detailed description, the project refers to strengthening 25 km of river bank which is not included in Table B. For the river bank strengthening, the agency is requested to elaborate how climate information will be used for resilient design.

The Components 3 and 4 are quite clear. It is recommended that components 1 and 2 are reviewed by the Agency in and possibly categorize the interventions more systematically , for example:

- Climate resilient watershed planning (**Technical Assistance**)
- Policy support and capacity building of communities and institutions (**Technical assistance**)
- Ecosystem based solutions e.g. wetlands, afforestation, range land management, soil and water conservation, etc. (**Investment**)

- Building resilient infrastructure e.g. resilient river banks, resilient water and sanitation system. Within this, the agency is requested to elaborate why GEF investment is sought in water supply and sanitation infrastructure. While this is indeed important basic infrastructure, the use of LDCF in its construction is not clear. **(Investment)**

- Alternative livelihoods **(Investment)**

The Technical Assistance activities could be under a component, say, "**Improved capacity of communities and institutions for climate resilient planning in four watersheds**".

The Investments could be under a component, say, "**Climate resilient infrastructure implemented for enhanced livelihoods**".

These are possible options, the agency may retain their existing classification with a more systematic alignment of outputs as suggested above.

May 2: No further comments.

Agency Response

Project activities and components have been revised to ensure consistency. Outcomes and outputs were also reorganised so that investment activities are now listed under Component 1 and technical assistance activities under Component 2 as suggested.

Relevant historical trends and projections on climate vulnerability and trends will serve inform the design of the river bank protection works. Further, climate vulnerability and hazard maps will also be analyzed to inform the design and location of the works to guarantee resilience and sustainability of construction. Furthermore, it is expected the sustainability and resilience of the design will be enforced by ecosystem maintenance activities envisaged under Component 1. The steps to integrate climate information in the river bank works will be further detailed in the CEO document.

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

Yes. Detailed description is provided which is consistent with the requirements.

May 2: The agency is requested to classify the government co-finance as **recurrent expenditure**. It is currently blank in the portal.

Agency Response**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

The total amount including fees and PPG sums up to 10,019,000 which is higher than the total LDCF allocation of \$10 million for Uganda. The agency is requested to revise the budget accordingly.

Agency Response The budget has been revised accordingly. The agency fee has been adjusted and the project total now sums up to \$10M,

The STAR allocation?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is aligned with LDCF funding guidelines and policies. Please correlate with the comment on funding size above.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response**Focal area set-aside?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

Agency Response**Impact Program Incentive?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

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

Yes. The PPG is within the allowable cap. With the PPG fees, the project is exceeding the cap of \$10 million. The agency needs to revise the budget accordingly.

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**

The agency is requested to provide information on the core indicators in the format shared by the GEFSEC for LDCF and SCCF.

Agency Response The core indicator excel sheet is attached to the Portal submission

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 The project is tagged as CCM 1 of Rio Marker. However, the mitigation component of the project is very minimal. The agency is recommended to classify the project as CCA 2 only.

Agency Response The CCM Rio Marker has been revised accordingly, and the project is now classified as CCA 2 only.

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

The project has defined the climate vulnerability of the target region well with sufficient evidence.

Frequent dry spells, major flood events, and significant shortage of water supply in last two decades due to climate change along with unsustainable agriculture, overgrazing, poor land use, encroachment of wetlands, etc. are identified as critical underlying drivers of climate vulnerability in the region. Weak institutional capacity to factor in climate change, limited alternative livelihood options and limited access to climate and weather information is further restricting people's capacity to adapt to climate change.

May 2: The agency is requested to revise the following paragraph under section 1-1:

This Project Identification form is for a project on Strengthening Adaptive Capacity and resilience for the Agricultural Value Chain Development Programme (AVCP) in Uganda. The Agricultural Value Chain Development (AVCP) Program (2017-2022) which is a baseline project to this project is financed by the African Development Bank following a request from the Government of Uganda.

Please align it to reflect the new title and keep it more broad rather than linking the project only with the AVCP program. The LDCF funds cannot be solely used to support a baseline or co-finance project. we suggest the following:

The PIF is for a project on strengthening adaptive capacity and resilience of communities in four highly vulnerable watersheds in the Bukedea district, within the Awoja catchment of Uganda. The project will be co-financed by the AVCP project in Uganda which is funded by the African Development Bank following a request from Government of Uganda.

May 3: The Agency is requested to address the comment above.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes- the baseline projects AVCP of African Development Bank is described well.

May 2: Apologies for not pointing this out earlier. The baseline scenario should include other baseline projects in the region which will inform the program. It could include the co-finance project AVCP but needs to include other projects also. There are a few projects listed in the coordination section which could be included as baseline projects. In addition, if there are any government schemes which could form the baseline, the agency is requested to include those in the baseline project.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The outcomes and components are described. However, these need to be consistent with Table B. Please refer to the comments under Question 2 in Part 1 in this regard.

Agency Response These have been adjusted accordingly.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Overall, the project is aligned with LDCF programming strategy to improve resilience of vulnerable communities through improved planning, technology transfer and climate mainstreaming.

Agency Response

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

The additionality of the project is defined satisfactorily.

In absence of LDCF funding, a huge opportunity will be lost to mainstream climate change in a big investment planned in the country with a potential of transformational change. The proposed project will ensure that future investment in agriculture and watershed in the region will contribute to climate resilience of the communities and the ecosystem. In absence of the project, critical actions such as holistic climate compatible watershed planning, access to climate information and early warning systems, protection of critical wetlands and making a key river bank climate resilient for flood protection would not be implemented in the business as usual scenario. These investments are critical to ensure investment by Uganda government in agriculture and other livelihoods more sustainable.

Agency Response

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

The agency needs to provide information about adaptation core indicators in the template shared by the GEFSEC. Since the indicators are not yet available in the portal, the agency needs to upload the filled template as a separate document.

Agency Response The filled template is attached to this submission.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

While the sustainability aspect is elaborated in details, there is very limited description of what innovative approaches will be adopted under the project. Also, how the results will be scaled-up across the country is not elaborated.

May 2: The agency is requested to edit the response to delete the unwanted text if possible. The response is satisfactory though.

Agency Response <!-- /* Style Definitions */ p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal {mso-style-unhide:no; mso-style-qformat:yes; mso-style-parent:""; margin:0in; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:12.0pt; font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} .MsoChpDefault {mso-style-type:export-only; mso-default-props:yes; font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} @page WordSection1 {size:8.5in 11.0in; margin:1.0in 1.0in 1.0in 1.0in; mso-header-margin:.5in; mso-footer-margin:.5in; mso-paper-source:0;} div.WordSection1 {page:WordSection1;} /* List Definitions */ @list l0 {mso-list-id:244456238; mso-list-template-ids:-892422538;} @list l0:level1 {mso-level-start-at:2; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:25.0pt; text-indent:-25.0pt;} @list l0:level2 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:7.0pt; text-indent:-25.0pt;} @list l0:level3 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:0in; text-indent:-.5in;} @list l0:level4 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.25in; text-indent:-.5in;} @list l0:level5 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\.%5\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.25in; text-indent:-.75in;} @list l0:level6 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\.%5\.%6\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.5in; text-indent:-.75in;} @list l0:level7 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\.%5\.%6\.%7\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.5in; text-indent:-1.0in;} @list l0:level8 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\.%5\.%6\.%7\.%8\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.75in; text-indent:-1.0in;} @list l0:level9 {mso-level-text:"%1\.%2\.%3\.%4\.%5\.%6\.%7\.%8\.%9\."; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:-.75in; text-indent:-1.25in;} -->

The project is innovative in itself by building climate resilience in Uganda's watersheds and wetlands, a country which has been classified by the Center for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) as one of the most unprepared and vulnerable countries in the world and as such with the least adaptive capacity to the impacts of climate change. Moreover, the project will be supporting the implementation of ecosystem-based adaptation measures, such as conservation agriculture and agroforestry, which are practices that are currently not widely adopted in the Ugandan context. Additionally, the four Community Action Plans (CAP) at the watershed level will define activities with a focus innovative and sustainable land and water management measures. With regards to scaling up project results, Component 4 activities will serve to ensure dissemination of results and good practices to build the rationale on the potential for replication of the successful approaches and demonstrate their potential for wider adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices throughout Uganda.

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Yes. Detailed information on stakeholder engagement is provided.

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

Yes. A detailed gender action plan has been proposed to be developed for implementation of the project.

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

The private sector engagement approach needs to be more specific. How private sector will be engaged across different project components and to support any innovation is not described. The project does provide good opportunity to engage with private sector which the agency may like to elaborate further. For example, in the agriculture value chain local entrepreneurs and private sector industries could be engaged. Similarly, with improved climate and hydromet forecast systems, private sector can play an important role in disseminating climate and weather information to communities and businesses.

The agency is requested to elaborate a bit more and also proposed a few private sector organizations who will be engaged (they could be part of the AVCP project also).

Agency Response This section will be further refined in the CEO document and more specific opportunities to engage with the private sector in the agriculture value chain will be explored based on stakeholder consultations to be conducted during the PPG phase with the private sector, particularly the Private Sector Foundation Uganda (PSFU) which convenes Uganda's micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs). The baseline ACVP project already includes the provision of Business Development Support Services to SMEs actors in its activities. During the PPG phase the potential to mainstream climate adaptation considerations into this business development support activities will be explored.

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

Risks are identified and mitigation strategies are proposed. The Agency is also requested to elaborate on project delivery or execution risk by the execution agency. Is there a capacity gap in the execution agency to influence, deliver and scale up the results of the project? How will the project mitigate this risk.

Agency Response

The AVCP project will have a PIU, due mostly to inadequate technical staff within MAAIF. The same PIU will serve the GEF project, which will also strengthen coordination and complementarity between both projects. With regards to mitigating the execution risks, these were examined during the preparation of the ACVP, which included an assessment of procurement risks at the Country level for the project and the output served to inform the decisions on the procurement regimes and the appropriate mitigation measures and costs have been included in the procurement capacity development action plan (CDAP) under the baseline project.

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

It is defined well. The agency is requested to specify the execution agency name in the portal in Part 1 under Executing Partner.

May 2: No further comments.

Agency Response

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

Yes. The project is consistent with national strategies such as NAP, Vision 2040, INDC, etc.

Agency Response

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

A specific component on knowledge management is included in the project design and sufficient detail is provided.

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

Yes.

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**

May 2: The agency is requested to address the additional comments as above.

May 3: The agency is requested to address the comment in section 1 part II.

May 3: All the comments have been satisfactorily addressed and the project is being technically cleared. The PPG is also recommended as it is deemed necessary and is in line with GEF's policy guidelines.

May 3: Please specify the Execution partner type.

May 3: Execution partner now specified as Government.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project has immense potential for private sector engagement and innovation for large scale impact. At the CEO Endorsement stage, the Agency is requested to elaborate more on these aspects in the project design.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		5/1/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		