

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10203	
<b>Project Title</b>	Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds	
<b>Date of Screening</b>		
<b>STAP member Screener</b>	Ferenc Toth	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Zinta Zommers	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>		Minor issues
		STAP welcomes the idea to tackle climate change adaptation in the context of integrated watershed management, in combination with reforestation, agroforestry, conservation agriculture and wetland management together and to manage them in an integrated manner. The problem statement identifies severe problems and worsening trends both in the natural resource base (degradation) and in the socio-economic domain. Reversing these trends is the first key step but a lot more is needed with a view to the negative impacts of the looming climate change. Hence an integrated approach is warranted. Auspiciously, a range of ongoing efforts, national and internationally supported, are underway to ameliorate the situation. They seem to comprise a useful basis to build the proposed project on. During project development, STAP encourages the team to develop a Theory of Change to help identify and address underlying drivers of change. For example, population growth is mentioned as a threat to forests under the proposed alternative scenario. What measures can be taken to mitigate this risk? The climate sensitivity of alternative livelihoods should also be evaluated. Livelihoods such as fruit production may be vulnerable to changing rainfall patterns, for example. Finally the sustainability of investments in early warning systems should be evaluated. The PIF notes that the durability of improvements in early warning system has depended on donor funding. Could the private sector play a role or user fees be applied to help generate revenue for long-term maintenance?
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		The project is well-conceived, comprising an internally consistent set of efforts to produce tools, build human and institutional capacities, and demonstrate promising practices that, taken together, have the promise of achieving multiple objectives such as improving food security, better biodiversity protection, reduced exposure to current vagaries of weather, and improved adaptive capacity to future climate change. Minor improvements are suggested in the table below.
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	STAP recommends that the proposers consider implementing major improvements in the following items: theory of change and contingency plan, innovation, risk assessment and management, knowledge management.	
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Properly described.

	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Reasonable likelihood.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Properly described. Yes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Regrettably, no formal theory of change; see below.
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Not a MFAP.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Baseline involves many valuable activities to build on but little is presented in terms of quantified benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Possibly yes.
	For multiple focal area projects:	Not a MFAP.
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	Not a MFAP.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Not a MFAP.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Not a MFAP.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Regrettably, no explicit theory of change is presented. Yet the components intend to produce outcomes, emerging from 3-4 outputs produced in corresponding activities. This logical framework is expected to lead to generating the intended results.

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Properly described. Yes, the project seeks to strengthen capacity and awareness, increase information for action and also then implement changes on the ground. Combined they are likely to increase resilience although the team should be sure that activities are layered and integrated so communities can benefit from all three areas.
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Properly presented
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	The baseline scenario includes respectable efforts, but complementary investments are needed to make them really effective. No attempt is made at preparing an incremental cost reasoning.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes. During project preparation the team may wish to further study and validate the scale to ensure the benefits are sufficiently widespread to influence resilience in the watershed.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Main focus is on local / regional benefits but some may well spill over and produce GEBs.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	No.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	A range of institutional and physical measures in proper combinations.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Addressing climate change adaptation in the context of integrated watershed management is a novel approach in this region. A declared objective is to develop innovative tools and adaptation technologies and transfer them to farmers and communities. There is indication of plans for scaling up but they are somewhat vague. More specific action plans would be useful. Additionally, the project could improve innovation by capitalizing on innovations in early warning systems, for example, exploring the use of forecast based finance or partnerships with private sector and use of ICT technology to provide communities with warnings.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Very little and rather vague. A plan for maintenance of investments (e.g. hydromet stations) should be created and should include information about long term funding.

	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The plan is to work within the current structures and programs and to gradually scale up through integration with national development programs. Clear and determined actions will be needed to pursue truly transformative changes beyond the current boundaries.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided.
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes, although formal partnership should be made between different government Ministries. For example the Met Agency is not an official executing partner but is critical to Outcome 3. Have they agreed to partner with the Ministry of Agriculture? Who will control the funds? Further the project should link to regional groups, such as the Regional Climate Outlook Forums and actors working in early warning systems in East Africa. There is significant scope for learning and collaboration, as many of the groups active here have long worked to strengthen early warning systems.
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	Roles propely designed.
<b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Gender issues have been considered but no specific response measures are presented.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Such hindrances are not mentioned.

<p><b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>The identified risks are valid but their scope is rather limited, most are outside the project's control. A range of risks associated with current climate variability and extreme events as well as future climate change are mentioned but not assessed in detail. In general, a more systematic, broader scope social and environmental risk assessment would be needed. Climate risks will need to be assessed for the baseline and the alternative scenario so that proper measures can be designed and implemented to enhance climate resilience, reduce climate vulnerability and thus improve adaptive capacity. Greater attention could be paid to risks to the durability of investments over the long term, after GEF funding has ended.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p>	<p>The focus is on reducing the region's vulnerability to climate risks.</p>
	<p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>Initial impact assessment is OK but will need to be improved further in the next project stage. In addition, some of the alternatively livelihood activities should also be screened for sensitivity to climate factors.</p>
	<p>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p>	<p>Yes, considered. Institutional and physical capacity improvements.</p>
	<p>· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</p>	<p>A broad range of capacity enhancements considered.</p>
<p><b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?</p>	<p>Documents, reports, and personal interactions.</p>
	<p>Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?</p>	<p>Some initial elements are mentioned, but will need to be further improved.</p>

<p><b>8. Knowledge management.</b> Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>The knowledge management plan is rather weak and needs a major improvement. No KM mechanism is specified in the PIF but the intention is there. Developing practical guidelines and a few other ideas are mentioned about KM. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a more detailed KM plan, including KM indicators and metrics. The related STAP document Managing knowledge for a sustainable future <a href="https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20KM.pdf">https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20KM.pdf</a> is a good source of guidance.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>See KM comments above.</p>
<p><b>STAP advisory response</b></p>	<p><b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b></p>	
<p><b>1. Concur</b></p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <b><i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i></b></p>	
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>	
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>	
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	

<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	