

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

Reporting from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR

1. Instructions in blue are directed to Task Managers / Administrative Officers
2. Instructions in red are directed to Project Managers and Executing Agencies
3. When filling up the respective cells, use the Normal style from the template. The text will look like this.
4. Fields in green are new additions since last year's PIR.

1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1. Project details

This entire table is to be prepared by Task Managers

Identification Table	GEF ID.: 8035	Umoja WBS: SB-014309
	SMA IPMR ID: 42950	Grant ID: S1-32LDL-000045
	Project Short Title: Uganda EbA wetlands	
Project Title	Reducing the climate change vulnerability of local communities in Uganda through ecosystems-based adaptation (EbA) in forest and wetland ecosystems	
Duration months	Planned	60 months
	Age	34 months spent, 26 months remaining
Project Type	Full Sized Project	
Parent Programme if child project		
Project Scope	National	
Region	Africa	
Countries	Uganda	
GEF Focal Area(s)	Climate Change Adaptation	
GEF financing amount	USD 4,350,000	
Co-financing amount	USD 16,600,000	
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	15 July 2019	
UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	27 th October 2020	
Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	11th September 2020	
Date of Inception Workshop, if available	20th May 2021	
Date of First Disbursement	14/12/2020	
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2023	USD 1,003,882	
Total expenditure as of 30 June 2023	USD 774,744.5	
Midterm undertaken?	No	
Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken		
Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	November 2024	
Completion Date	Planned – original PCA	September 2025 (PCA date is March 2025 however error in PCA)

Revised – Current PCA	Insert date as per last revision/ no cost extension if any
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	October 2025
Expected Financial Closure Date	September 2026

1.2. Project description

In Uganda, natural ecosystems such as wetlands and forests contribute considerably to people’s livelihoods and to the national economy. However, rapid population growth has led to the degradation of Uganda’s wetlands and forests as a result of increased demand for firewood, conversion of land for agricultural purposes and the unsustainable harvesting of wetland and forest products. This degradation is of increasing concern as it reduces the ability of these ecosystems to provide valuable ecological and socio-economic services and consequently jeopardizes the livelihoods of dependent local communities. Predicted climate change, including variable rainfall patterns and higher temperatures, will further negatively affect local communities living around wetlands and forests, as well as the ecosystems upon which they depend.

The problem that this project seeks to address is that the vulnerability of local communities in Uganda to climate change is being exacerbated by ongoing degradation of wetlands and forests and an associated reduction in provision of ecosystem services. Thus, the overarching goal of this project is to reduce the vulnerability of communities living around four target wetlands and forests to climate change. The objective of the project is increased capacity of government and local communities in Uganda to implement EbA in wetland and forest ecosystems to reduce vulnerability to climate change.

The executing agency is the Ministry of Water and Environment, and the main government partners are the district local governments of Sironko, Bulambuli, Arua, Arua City, Kitagwenda, Kamwenge, Ibanda, Mbarara, Mbarara City and Isingiro.

The project is being implemented in Eastern Western and Northern in the four wetland ecosystems and associated forests of Rwizi-Mburo and Nakivale in Mbarara, Mbarara City, Isingiro districts; Rwambu-Mpanga in Ibanda, Kamwenge and Kitagwenda districts; River Enyau in Arua City and Arua district and River Sironko in Sironko and Bulambuli districts.

The project has four components including:

Component 1: Capacity Development for EbA in Uganda

This component seeks to improve the scientific and technical knowledge base for identification, prioritization and implementation of EbA strategies and measures and strengthen the technical and institutional capacity of local and national government staff and participating local communities to integrate EbA strategies into wetland and forest management plans. The outcome of this component is (Outcome 1:) Technical and institutional capacity at the local and national level to integrate EbA into existing management plans for wetlands and forests is strengthened.

Component 2: Climate change resilient ecosystems in Uganda

This component focus primarily on implementing concrete on-the-ground EbA interventions – including tailored ecosystem restoration – within wetlands and forests in Uganda. The outcome of this component is (Outcome 2:) Climate change vulnerability of communities living around degraded wetlands and forests is decreased through the implementation of EbA interventions.

Component 3: Climate change resilient communities in Uganda

This component focus on increasing the capacity of communities living at project intervention sites to adopt alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agriculture techniques to decrease their vulnerability to climate change and reduce degradation of wetlands and forests. The outcome of this component is (Outcome 3:) Communities living at the project intervention sites have increased capacity to adopt alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agriculture techniques to decrease their vulnerability to climate change and reduce degradation of wetlands and forests.

Component 4: Knowledge and research on EbA and climate resilient livelihoods

This component Will aim to increase knowledge and awareness of the Benefit of sustainably managed forest and wetland ecosystems to promote sustainable environmental management and the upscaling of

EbA to national level. The outcome of this component is Outcome 4: Increased knowledge and awareness of government officials and communities at Project intervention sites of: i) the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change.

1.3. Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division.
Name of co-implementing Agency	
Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Water and Environment
Names of Other Project Partners	Farm Income Enhancement and Forestry Conservation Programme Project 2 (FIEFOC-2); The Saw Log Production Grant Scheme Phase iii (SPGS-iii); and Global Adaptation Network
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Jessica Troni
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Atifa Kassam
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Bwiza Wameyo Odemba
UNEP Support/Assistants	Ruth Mutinda/ Linda Choge
EA Manager/Representative	Mugabi Steven David mugabisd@gmail.com
EA Project Manager	Jimmy Pule Jimpule@gmail.com
EA Finance Manager	Yesco Alice yescoalice@yahoo.co.uk
EA Communications Lead, if relevant	-

2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW and UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)	Thematic: Climate action
PoW Indicator(s)	Strategic objective 1: "Climate stability". PoW 2022-2023 Indicators: (i) Number of national, subnational and private-sector actors that adopt climate change mitigation and/or adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies and policies with UNEP support (ii) Amounts provided and mobilized in \$ per year in relation to the continued existing collective mobilization goal of the \$100 billion commitment through to 2025 with UNEP support (iv) Positive shift in public opinion, attitudes and actions in support of climate action as a result of UNEP action
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	If the Subprogramme has changed, please indicate previous subprogramme(s)
UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages	UNSDCF: Project contributes to Strategic Priority 2. SHARED PROSPERITY IN A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT 2.1 By 2025, people especially the

	marginalized and vulnerable, benefit from increased productivity, decent employment and equal rights to resources
Link to relevant SDG Goal(s)	<p>Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.</p> <p>Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts.</p> <p>Goal 15 : Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.</p>
Link to relevant SDG Target(s)	<p>5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life</p> <p>13.3 Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning</p> <p>15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements</p> <p>15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.</p>

2.2. GEF Core Indicators: (Uganda LDCF)

GEF Core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results.

Indicators	Targets – Expected Value			Materialized to date Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated indicators.
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total target	
Number of direct beneficiaries		148,000 People (50% female)	148,000 People (50% female)	Vulnerability Impacts assessments have been undertaken in each of the project sites to identify climate risks and appropriate adaption actions. The implementation of these adaptation actions will provide direct benefits to local communities.
Type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to		2400ha of land 240ha of wetland	2400ha of land 240ha of	104 km of wetland have been demarcated. The demarcations of wetlands reduces encroachment and

withstand the effects of climate change			wetland	leads to improved management.
Population benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options		14,800 (50% female)	14,800 (50% female)	A market assessment and livelihoods study have been undertaken to identify appropriate climate-resilient livelihood options. These will be implemented in the coming years.
Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures		8 institutions (with a score of 7)	8 institutions (with a score of 7)	TOR for training national and district level planners and policy-makers on the use RA and VIA outputs in planning and decision making were approved; advertised and bid evaluation is on-going to select best bidder to implement the assignment. TOR for training relevant government staff on integrating climate change adaptation into wetland/forest management plans and district development plans developed, approved, advertised and bid evaluation is ongoing to identify best bidder.

2.3. Implementation Status and Risk

[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]

	FY 20__22__	FY 20__23__	FY 20__	FY 20__	FY 20__
PIR #	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th
Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	MS	MS			
Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	MS	S			
Risk rating (section 4.2)	M	M			

The project has achieved the following within the four outcome areas:

Outcome 1: Technical and institutional capacity at the local and national level to integrate EbA into existing management plans for wetlands and forests is strengthened.

Output 1.1:(Climate Change Risk Assessments (RAs) and Vulnerability and Impact Assessments (VIAs) developed for each project intervention site to identify climate change threats and provide recommendations for climate-resilient planning), Activity 1.1.1-Four consulting firms were contracted to undertake Climate Change Risk Assessments (CRAs) and Vulnerability and Impact Assessments (VIAs) in the wetland and forest systems of R. Sironko; R. Enyau,;R. Rwambu-Mpanga,;and R. Rwizi-Nakivale. The main objective of the studies was to assess the vulnerability of wetlands, forests and dependent local communities to climate change. Some of the key findings included: In Arua the major climate change conditions witnessed include unpredicted rainfall (16.3%), reduction in amount of rainfall (14.7%), changes in seasonality (14.6%),

increase in temperatures (14.4%) and dry spells have become longer (11.4%) and drought has become the most devastating hazard in this area, The agricultural sector in both Sironko and Bulambuli districts is highly sensitive to floods, drought, landslides and soil erosion, Drought was observed across historical period with varying intensity. The highest intensity was recorded during the multi-year drought between 1989-1991 in Kamwenge (13 episodes) and Ibanda (15 episodes) but for Kitagwenda (13 episodes with the highest intensity observed in 1982 and In Isingiro and Mbarara the main ecological impacts are decline in the size of wetlands (55.3%).

Following the completion of the RA and VIA studies, terms of reference have been produced for: i) training of national and district planners and policy makers on the use of CRAs and VIAs in planning and decision-making; and ii) integrating EbA into into community-based wetland and forest management plans. These have been approved and advertised, and the bid evaluation in underway.

Outcome 2: Climate change vulnerability of communities living around degraded wetlands and forests is decreased through the implementation of EbA interventions

Output 2.1 (Protocols for climate resilient restoration of degraded wetland and forest ecosystems will be developed)

A consultant was hired to collate lessons learned and develop a best practice study from ongoing ecosystem restoration projects in Uganda in the Mount Elgon area and other areas to enhance and increase national and local government capacity to plan, implement and upscale EbA to other areas across Uganda. Findings included: The most implemented interventions are related to earthworks in the farmlands followed by income-generating activities.

Conducted Markets and livelihoods Assessment studies: For R Mpanga and R, Rwambu and R.Rwizi. L.Mburo, Nakivale (Western Uganda) for R. Enyau and R. Sironko (North and eastern Uganda) were commissioned in early July 2022. The main objective of the study was: to conduct a market analysis of alternative livelihoods strategies and to design alternative livelihoods strategies for local communities living around degraded wetland and forest ecosystems. Findings showed that 66% of the respondents in Bulambuli district, 98% in Sironko district, 85% in Arua district were engaged in peasant farming, the main crops grown being rice, yams, beans, cassava, maize and irish potatoes, while in Sironko and Bulambuli districts the main crops grown in the wetlands include tomatoes, cabbage, rice, beans, bananas and maize.

Conducted assessment of Multi use tree species for wetland and forest restoration- R. Enyau ecosystem; The main objective was to identify multiple-use and climate-resilient plant species suitable for use in restoring degraded forests within R Enyau system.tree. Recommendations included: Restore degraded riverbanks with any of the following tree species (*Erythrina abyssinica*, Bamboo species, *Khaya anthotheca*, *Milicia excelsa*, *Maesopsis eminii*, *Ficus sycamorus*, *Albizia coriaria*, *Casuarina equisetifolia*, *Melia azedarachta*, *Khaya anthotheca*) to stabilize river banks. Promote agroforestry for fodder, shade, soil erosion control, fuel wood with (*Kyaha anthotheca*, *Gmelina arborea*, *Bathedavia*, *Grevillia*, *Melia azedarachta*, *Ficus natalensis*, *Casuarina equisetifolia*, *Albizia coriaria*, *Grevillea robusta*).

A wetland and forest restoration protocols to guide the implementation of EbA interventions. 1 wetland and forest protocol was developed the protocol developed will be used to guide implementation of EbA interventions.

Output 2.2 (Local communities, CSOs and district technical staff at project intervention sites are trained to implement/sustain the project's EbA interventions) TOR for develop of training program (curricular; manuals) on implementation of EbA was developed approved, advertised bid opening is ongoing to select the best bidder and TOR for identification and selection of CSOs per system was also developed and submitted for approval this TOR will be advertised after formal approval is granted and procurement process will be initiated.

Output 2.3 (Degraded Forest restored using multi-use and climate-resilient species to improve ecosystem services to local communities at project intervention sites) activity 2.3.3. Two community nurseries were identified in Kitagwenda and Isingiro districts. Formalization for support is ongoing.

Output 2.4 (Degraded wetland areas restored using climate-resilient and multi-use species to improve water quality and supply at project intervention sites) activity 2.4.2. Demarcation of a section of R Rwambu-Mpanga. The target was to demarcate 30 km of Rwambu-Mpanga system, however, 73.95 km of sections of Rwambu-Mpanga in Kyarutanga –Kanuka and Ruhagura system were demarcated. With 34.65 km in Kitagwenda district, 27.90 km in Ibanda district and 11.40 km. in Ibanda Municipality. In R Enyau, 30.1 km were demarcated in Arua district and Arua city.

Demarcation of 30 kms of sections of R. Rwizi-Nakivale system in Isingiro district and another 30km of sections of R Sironko system is in process, with initial activities of stakeholder engagement meetings with key stakeholders at the district, sub counties, parishes and villages on going in preparation of the actual demarcation exercise.

Outcome 3: Communities living at the project intervention sites have increased capacity to adopt alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agriculture techniques to decrease their vulnerability to climate change and reduce degradation of wetlands and forests.

Output 3.1 (Community-specific alternative livelihood plans, identifying alternative livelihood options appropriate for each community, are developed and implemented at each project intervention site) and activities 3.1.1; 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 3.1.4; were implemented. Conducted Markets and livelihoods Assessment studies: For R Mpanga and R, Rwambu and R.Rwizi. L.Mburo, Nakivale (Western Uganda) for R. Enyau and R. Sironko (North and eastern Uganda) were commissioned in early July 2022. The main objective of the study was: to conduct a market analysis of alternative livelihoods strategies and to design alternative livelihoods strategies for local communities living around degraded wetland and forest ecosystems. Findings showed that 66% of the respondents in Bulambuli district, 98% in Sironko district, 85% in Arua district were engaged in peasant farming, the main crops grown being rice, yams, beans, cassava, maize and irish potatoes, while in Sironko and Bulambuli districts the main crops grown in the wetlands include tomatoes, cabbage, rice, beans, bananas and maize. The three districts had almost an equal number of respondents that planted their crops in the wetlands, with Arua district and City (39.2%) and Bulambuli district (33%) presenting the highest number of respondents who planted their crops in wetlands. Farmers were found to utilise wetlands for crop production in the drier months of December, January, February and March in both R. Enyau and R Sironko for crop production.

Output 3.1 (Community-specific alternative livelihood plans, identifying alternative livelihood options appropriate for each community, are developed and implemented at each project intervention site) and activity 3.1.4; TOR was developed, approved, advertised and bid evaluation to select best bidders to Implement the alternative livelihood plans in each of the project intervention sites is in final stages.

Output 3.4 (Small scale water supply infrastructure constructed in target communities to improve access to water and reduce agriculture in wetlands) activities 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 A Hydrological Study to Identify and Assess Existing Small-Scale Water Supply Infrastructure to Improve Communities' Access to Water for Domestic Use, Crop Irrigation and Livestock in Enyau Wetland and Forest Ecosystem. The main objective of the study was to assess water potential for small-scale water supply infrastructure to improve communities' access to water for domestic use, crop irrigation and livestock production. Findings: showed that: There is high quality ground water in the Enyau basin but vulnerable to seasonality and there is low amount of surface water especially in low land regions with some rivers and streams drying out in the dry season.

Outcome 4: Increased knowledge and awareness of government officials and communities at project intervention sites of: i) the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change.

Output 4.1 (Monitoring and research programme established in collaboration with relevant national research institution) activity 4.1.1 Draft Research agreement to engage a research institution is being reviewed for approval.

Output 4.3 (Awareness-raising campaign conducted at project intervention sites on the: i) ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change) Activity 4.3.2 Public awareness on EbA in the districts of Kitagwenda, Mbarara, Kamwenge, Ibanda and Isingiro was conducted, geared towards increasing knowledge and

awareness of government officials at project intervention sites of the EbA approach, highlighting on the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests, benefits of functional wetland and forest ecosystems and the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change.

Overall, 358 people (241M,117F) participants including local leaders, technocrats, political leaders, community members were sensitized in the districts of Mbarara city in North, South and Kakukuzi division and Nyamitanga; in Mbarara District-Bubaare, Kashaka and Kamushoko, Ibanda, Kamwenge and Isingiro.

Challenges:

The challenges included;

- Community members have encroached on the wetland for cultivation and with sales agreements and there is high numbers of hectares of cultivated wetlands and forests for food crops such as maize, rice, vegetables, beans, sweet potatoes, sugarcane, yams etc
- Behind the scenes, some local politicians mobilize local communities to demand compensation as a pre-condition for stopping unwise use of Wetland resources.
- Communities claim that wetlands have been leased out to foreign investors who continuously degrade the environment and in particular wetlands through rice schemes and use of agrochemicals with nothing done to evict them.
- Traditional farming methods dominate most communities with very low adoption to eco-friendly practices with better economic returns.

Rating towards outcomes: The rating is Marginally Satisfactory because while the project has conducted various assessments (e.g. VIA, market assessment, livelihood assessment, hydrological assessment) to identify appropriate adaptation actions, for the most part, these have yet to be implemented on the ground. This is attributed to the delays in procurement and approval of project activities.

Rating towards outputs: The rating is Satisfactory. As above, delays caused procurement and approval processes have limited the on-the-ground implementation of identified activities. However, TORs for various CSOs and consultancies to implement these activities have been prepared, and on-the-ground activities are expected to take place during the next reporting cycle.

Overall risk rating: The rating is Medium for this project. This is mainly because in two out of eight instances, communities have been resistant to the wetland boundary demarcation activities proposed by the project. This is because farmers have encroached into the wetlands and are now reluctant to give up their agricultural land. However, in most cases people are willing to voluntarily leave the wetlands if supported with livelihood alternatives. This will be implemented in the next project phase. Communities have shown support for other interventions (e.g. climate resilient agriculture) proposed by the project.

[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]

2.4. Co-financing

<p>Planned Co-finance Total: (16,600,000 USD)</p> <p>Actual to date: Complete (in \$ and %. State the date for which this value is valid)</p> <p>USD 8,681,300 52%</p>	<p>The Farm Income Enhancement and Forestry Conservation Programme (FIEFOC) has been completed with a total disbursement of USD 85, 787, 054 over the project lifespan. Considering that FIEFOC-2 was underway when the project started, it is conservatively estimated that 10% of the total budget (US\$8,578,706) is realised co-financing for this proposed project.</p> <p>Cash co financing has not been realised from the Ministry but support was mobilised from Govt in terms of Office space (estimated at USD 1,200 per months for the last 30 months (USD 36,000), staff time estimated at USD 1,000 per month (USD 30,000), vehicle USD 500 per month (USD 15,000), Boundary markers (USD 21,594) Total estimated in kind co-financing from government to date is approximately USD 102, 594 and this is expected to increase with project life time.</p>
Progress	Farm income enhancement and forestry conservation programme – ADB (USD

	<p>9,100,000) Progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 irrigation scheme constructed in Mobuku Kasese district, Doko in Butaleja district Tochi irrigation Oyam district, Ngeye in Kween district and Wadeli in Pakwach district. • 310 horticulture and 231 Aquaculture enterprises were formed. • 6940 people were trained on horticulture and 1852 on aquaculture. • 103 startup enterprises were established. • 27 SACCOs were trained comprised of 4,276 participants. • 360 VSLAs trained comprised of 7567 participants. • About 470.7km of riverbanks were restored • 9,908 farmers have been trained across the 5 catchment areas <p>Information on other projects below could not be found because they seem to have closed in 2021. Co-financing from these initiatives is therefore not possible: Sawlog Production Grant Scheme Phase III – EU (USD 7,400,000)</p>
--	---

2.5. Stakeholder engagement

Date of project steering committee meeting	<p>Project Steering Committee meeting on 7.02.2023.</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/10e1IKMq8CkCv2rU3rhZGLwL_e6k8ZEKG/edit?usp=drive_link&oid=115278330023648969319&rtpof=true&sd=true</p> <p>Technical Working Group on 16/17.03.2023</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OfdLPFizXIXy43AGmO4Q3oYZSR0z3UZ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=115278330023648969319&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>
Stakeholder engagement	<p>At national and local government level: several inception meetings of different studies were held involving district and national stakeholders’ studies included VIA and RA studies, collate lesson learnt, market assessment and hydrological study. All of these were held at ministry headquarters A key recommendation from the studies was that community engagement and participation should be emphasized in both the planning and implementation phases of the EbA projects.</p> <p>At the local government level: In order to facilitate the demarcation process, the Ministry through Wetlands Management Department teamed with the Kitagwenda, Ibanda, Arua, Sironko, Bulambuli and Isingiro district local governments to arrange and conduct stakeholder engagements at District, sub county, Parish and village levels</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement meetings have been held for demarcation of different wetland boundaries in the districts. These were held between 12th -16 September 2022 for Kitagwenda and Ibanda districts, 10-14 October 2022 for Arua 29-16th June 2023 for Sironko, Bulambuli and Isingiro. Stakeholders involved included: District local leaders, sub county local leaders, community leaders, district technocrats, sub county technocrats. The general objective of this was to create awareness and sensitize stakeholders and communities along wetland system in preparation for boundary demarcation. In general, stakeholders from all levels were willing to engage with the project and discuss wetland boundary demarcation. One challenge experienced was the expectation from certain stakeholders to receive higher allowances to attend these meetings, however, this was overcome by explaining that the project follows Government of Uganda policies and standards regarding the payment of travel allowances.</p> <p>At district and community level: Public awareness on EbA in the districts of Kitagwenda, Mbarara, Kamwenge, Ibanda and Isingiro was conducted, geared towards increasing knowledge and awareness of government officials and communities at project intervention sites of the EbA</p>

	<p>approach, highlighting on the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests, benefits of functional wetland and forest ecosystems and the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change.</p> <p>During the demarcation exercise that started with a launch which was officiated by district officials from Arua City, Arua District, Kitagwenda, Ibanda and Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), (Wetlands Management Department). The city/district leadership planted pillars to show their support and commitment towards the protection and conservation of the wetland and urged the communities to desist from destroying the pillars. After the launch, the demarcation process was undertaken by Local Government and Environment Police Protection Unit plus the local police.</p> <p>Further still, the project carried out district level engagement meetings to enhance the functionality of the district project management committee (DPMCs) in each project intervention district, undertake a detailed district level understanding of EbA project intervention strategies, conduct a detailed assessment of the EbA interventions (riverine demarcation and restoration in light of the prevailing circumstances and to develop detailed assessment criteria for local community based organisations (CBOs) to implement the livelihoods, water for production, restoration components of the EbA project in their respective districts.</p> <p>Outcomes during public awareness meetings: i) identified existing farmers engaged in cultivations in wetlands and other enterprises; ii) identified salient issues for management action in project intervention sites; iii) collected all the relevant environmental baseline information for suitability of the proposed planned interventions, iv) profiled list of the stakeholders in all the districts; and v) identified tree species to be planted in each respective district. Overall, participants actively participated in the public awareness meetings, with most of the participants understanding climate change impacts to their livelihoods and on natural resources.</p> <p>Challenges from stakeholder engagements included: i) community members encroached on the wetland for cultivation and with sales agreements in wetlands and there is a need to engage further with the communities; ii) high expectation from the district leadership and community members in meeting their demand for alternative livelihood; iii) high expectations from the district leadership in terms of allowances and handouts; and iv) inadequate local political will to restore and conserve the ecosystems in light of climate change challenges and food shortages.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>

2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming	<p>Gender dimensions were considered in all our activities to date. During inception meetings, awareness creation meetings, community consultative meetings, and all assessments, particular attention was paid to include women, the elderly, PLHIA, PWD in the various localities of the meetings and studies. These groups were engaged through their representative members to participate in these activities owing to the different and unique ways in which climate change affects these groups and to the unique alternative resilience strategies that could be adopted to cater for these groups.</p> <p>The project has a gender action plan and four actions have been implemented during the VIA studies. Namely, both female and male enumerators and facilitators (preferably 50/50 gender balance) were recruited to reach out to both women and men by the consultant firms.</p> <p>Focus groups were organised with women and men, and women and women's groups have been encouraged to participate in establishing community-</p>

	<p>managed nurseries. A gender expert from the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD) has been identified to work with the project.</p> <p>A lead gender focal point was appointed to lead and coordinate the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. As well The MoGLSD will be supporting the implementation of the Gender Action Plan with its vast network of focal points across sectors and locations.</p> <p>The next gender actions will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Hire a national gender specialist to develop context-appropriate content for inclusion in the EbA upscaling strategy. ii) Make early, regular and formal communication to concerned CSOs and government counterparts on gender targets. iii) Make the gender sessions mandatory for all the major project stakeholders, male and female, especially those that will participate in the EbA interventions. iv) Include social issues when designing the content of the various trainings. <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>
--	---

2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)	<p>Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?</p> <p>No</p> <p>If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?</p> <p>N/A</p>
New social and/or environmental risks	<p>Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>In two out of the eight project areas, communities have been resistant to the wetland boundary demarcation activities proposed by the project. This is because farmers have encroached into the wetlands and are now reluctant to give up their agricultural land.</p>
Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts (to be filled in by TM and EA)	<p>Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?</p> <p>No major complaints have been received, except for dissatisfaction on certain wetland boundary demarcations. Some farmers are claiming government wants to take their land and that the wetland boundaries demarcated have chopped off a big portion of their land that was used for agricultural production, despite there being laws in place for wetland demarcation.</p> <p>The project team are aware of the sensitive nature of this issue and have taken the time to sensitise and consult with district officials, sub-county officials and communities. Wetland demarcation only takes place once consensus has been reached on the placement of the wetland boundary. If no consensus is reached, then the project has not proceeded with the boundary demarcation. Where individuals have had their agricultural land reduced through lawful wetland boundary demarcation, additional livelihood activities planned in the project are geared toward supporting these communities with alternate sources of income. The project team will closely monitor the situation and work with the communities to come up with an appropriate solution.</p> <p>More awareness and sensitisation on wetland use, sustainable wetland resource uses, wetland boundary demarcation, acceptable and unacceptable practises and uses of demarcated portions is ongoing to reduce this anxiety. A grievance redress mechanism is being developed by a specialist at the Ministry of Water and Environment to handle and address such complaints associated with wetland restoration and demarcation. Thus far no grievances</p>

	have been received as the mechanism is still under development.
Environmental and social safeguards management	<p>It is envisioned that the project intervention will have positive environmental impacts by restoring degraded wetland and forest and improving the supply of ecosystem services.</p> <p>The project has carried out climate change vulnerability and risk assessments for all project sites in order to mitigate current and future potential risks associated with climate change, including environmental and social risks. As part of the methodology, the assessment ensured that any risk mitigation measures meant to address the root causes of environmental and social risks are factored in the planning and design of project activities.</p> <p>In addition, a grievance redress mechanism is currently under development by team from MWE. This will be completed by the end of the year. In addition, the project will review the Environmental and Social Safeguards screening done at CEO endorsement in order to understand if there are any additional risks that were not initially foreseen. A mitigation plan will then be set up depending on the screening. This will also be completed before the end of the year.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>

2.8. Knowledge management

Knowledge activities and products	<p>It was envisioned that the proposed project would make use of the learning-by-doing approach. It would also capitalize on lessons learned from baseline and partner projects. Similarly, lessons learned, and new knowledge generated by the proposed project would then be shared through workshops, briefing papers, guidelines and online portals. Consequently, the institutional and technical capacity for planning and implementing EbA interventions at national and district levels would be improved. To date, the project has embarked on a study to document lessons learned and best practices in the ongoing ecosystems restoration projects in Uganda-The Mount Elgon area and other areas in Uganda to enhance and increase national and local government capacity to plan, implement and upscale EbA to other areas across Uganda.,</p> <p>Findings of this study have been shared to stakeholders during workshops and meetings and will form part of the capacity building mechanisms to implement EbA at both the national and district levels.</p> <p>[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]</p>
Main learning during the period	<p>The target communities need to be continuously sensitized about restoration interventions for example the values of trees, tree planting, nursery bed establishment, soil and water conservation, and adoption of climate-smart agriculture.</p> <p>Communities learn better by observing new technologies, and therefore support to the establishment or promotion of demonstration or learning centres in Sironko and Bulambuli EBA learning centers would enhance farmer learning and technology adoption.</p> <p>Use indigenous tree species for restoration of degraded ecosystems. Livestock rearing, small business apiary fish farming art and craft most adopted livelihoods.</p> <p>Involving institutions and local communities enhances project ownership and sustainability.</p>

2.9. Stories to be shared

Stories to be shared	N/A [section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]
-----------------------------	--

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**¹ will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
--------------------------------	-----------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	--	--	------------------------------

¹ For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

² Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
<p>Objective: Project objective: Increased capacity of government and local communities in Uganda to implement EbA in wetland and forest ecosystems to reduce vulnerability to climate change.</p>	<p>Degree to which the technical and institutional capacity of targeted government institutions (WMD and FSSD), district-level stakeholders (6 districts targeted) and local communities (7 parishes/divisions targeted) is strengthened at national and sub-national levels to adapt to climate change using EbA.</p>	<p>Estimated to be 4 for national institutions and 3 for district institutions.</p> <p>Validation of scored determined by the VIA is ongoing.</p>		<p>Each targeted institution progresses by at least 3 points in the capacity score index. (Max 10)</p>	<p>30% progress.</p> <p>Scoring will be completed again at project mid-term.</p>	<p>Four consultancy firms contracted to conduct VIA and RA studies in each project intervention site. (Inception meetings held, data collected, reports compiled and shared for review, final reports approved by Technical Working group members some findings and recommendations have been considered in the next implementation phase. TOR for training national and district level planners and policy-makers on the use RA and VIA outputs in planning and decision making were approved; advertised and bid evaluation is on-going to select best bidder to implement the assignment. TOR for training relevant government staff on integrating climate change adaptation into wetland/forest management plans and district development plans developed, approved, advertised and bid evaluation is ongoing to identify best bidder.</p>	<p>MS</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
Outcome 1.1: Outcome 1: Technical and institutional capacity at the local and national level to integrate EbA into existing management plans for wetlands and forests is strengthened	Number of wetland and forest management plans outside of the project intervention areas that are developed/updated to integrate EbA.	0	50% to be achieved (2 mgt plans out of 4)	4 wetland and forest management plans of the project intervention areas are developed/ updated to integrate EbA.	30% progress (management plans for a section of R Enyau and for a section of Rwambu is in draft form)	2 draft Wetland Management plans for R. Enyau and r Rwambu-Mpanga developed. TOR drafted to onboard consultants for the development of Community Managed wetland and forest management plans for remaining Ecosystems	MS
Outcome 2: Outcome Climate change vulnerability of communities living around degraded wetlands and forests is decreased through the implementation of EbA interventions	Number of hectares degraded wetland restored	22,255 ha	100Ha	At each of the four project intervention sites: 100ha of degraded wetland restored	0	VIAs have been undertaken to identify target areas for wetland restoration. Community engagement towards restoration exercises have continued to take place	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
	Number of hectares degraded forest restored using multi-use and climate-resilient species	.340 ha	200ha	At each of the four project intervention sites: 200 ha of degraded upper slopes reforested. 200 ha of farmland practicing agroforestry . 60 ha of forest around rivers and wetlands restored.	0	VIAs have been undertaken to identify target areas for forest restoration. An assessment has been undertaken to identify appropriate multi-use tree species for forest restoration. The project is working in collaboration with FSSD and NFA teams to source for certified tree nurseries that the project will work with. Community engagement towards restoration exercises is continuously being conducted. Consultations with district political and technical leadership on the establishment of a community tree took place in Bulambuli and Sironko districts.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
	Demarcate the boundaries of wetlands using a combination of climate-resilient and multi-use trees and concrete pillars.	0	60km	120 km (at least 30km at each intervention site) at each project intervention site	104.05 kms	104.05 kms demarcated in R. Rwambu Mpanga and R. Enyau ecosystems. Community engagements are on-going to prepare communities for demarcation of sections of R. Sironko and R. Rwizi-Nakivale systems	S
	Number of CSOs or community groups implementing EbA interventions.	0	2 CSO's	At least 4 CSOs or community groups are implementing EbA interventions.	0	A mapping of existing CSO in the various districts is currently on-going to identify CSOs that are promoting alternative livelihoods options and have climate resilience programs to implement the project livelihoods intervention. A TOR for these CSOs has been developed and is awaiting approval.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
Outcome 3: Communities living at the project intervention sites have increased capacity to adopt alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agriculture techniques to decrease their vulnerability to climate change and reduce degradation of wetlands and forests.	% of households at each project intervention site that know how to use at least one EbA practice, alternative livelihood strategy, or climate-resilient agricultural technique introduced by the project.	0	12.5% HHs	25% of households (50% of which should be female-headed households).	0	VIA/RAs, and Markets and Livelihoods study conducted and determined community vulnerabilities and risks; predicted risks and hazards and alternative livelihood options for community members (HHs). TOR for CSOs to undertake the implementation of alternative livelihood and practices has been developed.	MS
	Number of community-specific alternative livelihood plans developed.	0	4 alternative livelihoods plans	At least 4 community-specific alternative livelihood plans developed	4	4 Plans alternative livelihoods plans have been developed during the markets and Livelihoods study	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
Outcome 4: Increased knowledge and awareness of government officials and communities at project intervention sites of: i) the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change.	% of district government officials within the district technical planning committees at each project intervention site that are aware of EbA and consider climate change adaptation in their daily work.	50.7%	65%	100% of district government officials within the district technical planning committees at each project intervention site are aware of EbA and consider climate change adaptation in their daily work.	Estimated at 60%	<p>District meeting on EbA have been going on; district officials are being prepared to attend training on use of VIA and RA data sets in planning and decision making.</p> <p>Awareness-raising campaign conducted in Isingiro, Ibanda, Kamwenge Isingiro and Mbarara on the: i) ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change. 358 people including political leaders, district technocrats attended.</p>	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2023	Progress rating ²
	% of population at each project intervention sites reached through awareness-raising, training and knowledge sharing on EbA.	0%	30%	50% of population (50% of which should be female) at each project intervention sites reached through awareness-raising, training and knowledge sharing on EbA.	15%	<p>Awareness-raising campaign conducted in Arua, Arua City, Bulambuli and Sironko on the: i) ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change. 182 people (116M,66F) including community leaders, political leaders, district technocrats attended.</p> <p>Communities such Bumufuni, Bukhalu, Bwanyanga, Budadiri, Mutufu, Vura, Ayivu, Kakukuzi, Rugaga and Kashaka were sensitized and existing farmers engaged in cultivations in wetlands and other enterprises were identified.</p>	MS

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Outputs/Activities ³	Expected completion date ⁴	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Progress rating justification ⁵ , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating ⁶
COMPONENT 1: Capacity development for EbA in Uganda.					
Output 1.1: Climate Change RAs and VIAs at the four selected wetland systems to assess the current and predicted vulnerability of wetlands, forests and dependent local communities to climate change.	November 2022	15%	100%	Four consultancy firms were hired and Four (4) Vulnerability Impact Assessment (VIA) and Risk Analysis (RA) studies were commissioned in June 2022 at the four project sites of: i)-R.Enyau system in Arua City and Arua district; ii)-R. Sironko system in Sironko and Bulambuli district; iii)-R.Rwambu-Mpanga system in Kamwenge, Kitagwenda and Ibanda districts; and iv)-R Rwizi-Nakivale system in Mbarara, Mbarara City and Isingiro districts. The main objective of the studies was to assess the vulnerability of wetlands, forests and dependent local communities to climate change. All of these studies have been completed.	S
Output 1.2: Community-based wetland and forest management plans, that integrate EbA, developed for each project intervention site.	September 2023	5%	20%	1 draft for R. Enyau forest and wetland management plan developed. TOR for hiring of consultants to develop management plans have been developed reviewed and approved for advertisement consultancy firms submitted in there technical and financial proposals Evaluation of submitted bids is underway by the Ministry procurement team.	MS
Output 1.3: A strategy developed to upscale, sustain and replicate EbA in wetlands and forests.	September 2025	0	0	Planned for later in the project once EbA Activities have completed.	N/A
Component 2: Climate change resilient ecosystems in Uganda					

³ Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project logframe (and workplan) or in any updated project revision.

⁴ The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision).

⁵ As much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc.

⁶ To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs/Activities ³	Expected completion date ⁴	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Progress rating justification ⁵ , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating ⁶
Output 2.1: Protocols for climate-resilient restoration of wetlands and forests at project sites developed.	October 2022	40%	100%	A consultant was hired to collate lessons learned and best practices from ongoing ecosystem restoration projects in Uganda in the mount Elgon area and other areas in Uganda , this study provided insight into the multi-use tree species and local preference for restoration.	S
Activity 2.1.2 Undertake a market assessment at each of the wetland systems to identify multi-use plant species for wetland and forest restoration that can provide co-benefits	December 2022	10%	100%	2 studies were conducted after onboarding of consultants 1 report reviewed and submitted; 1 other report under review. (This activity was combined with 3.1.1 and executed as one assignment).	S
Output 2.2: Local communities, CSOs and district technical staff at project intervention sites are trained to implement/sustain the project's EbA interventions.	September 2025	0%	15%	No progress as activities under this output are planned for quarter 3 and 4, 2023. However, TOR developed for onboarding of CSOs and evaluation of the bids is ongoing.	S
Output 2.3: Degraded Forest restored using multi-use and climate-resilient species to improve ecosystem services to local communities at project intervention sites.	September 2024	10%	20%	A mapping exercise took place to map, at a fine scale, areas of degraded forest and wetlands at the project intervention sites. A total 340 hectares of degraded forests were identified. Through the completion of the VIAs, assessment of lessons learned /best practice and an identification of appropriate climate-resilient tree species, the project has now identified appropriate methodologies to undertake forest restoration. This will begin during the next reporting cycle.	S

Outputs/Activities ³	Expected completion date ⁴	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Progress rating justification ⁵ , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating ⁶
<p>Output 2.4: Degraded wetland restored using multi-use and climate-resilient species to improve ecosystem services to local communities at project intervention sites.</p>	September 2024	10%	20%	A mapping exercise took place to map, at a fine scale, areas of degraded forest and wetlands at the project intervention sites. A total of 22,385 hectares of wetlands of degraded wetland was identified. Through the completion of the VIAs, assessment of lessons learned /best practice and an identification of appropriate climate-resilient tree species, the project has now identified appropriate methodologies to undertake wetland restoration. Thus far, 104.5 km of wetland boundary demarcated. Stakeholder engagements are ongoing for demarcation of 20 km sections R.Rwizi – Nakivale and 20 kms of R.Sironko.	S
Component 3: Climate change resilient communities in Uganda					
Output 3.1 Community-specific alternative livelihood plans, identifying alternative livelihood options appropriate for each community, are developed and implemented at each project intervention site.	Dec 2024	20%	50%	Conducted Markets and livelihoods Assessment studies: For R Rwambu-Mpanga,, R.Rwizi. L.Mburo, Nakivale, R.Enyau and R. Sironko (were commissioned in early July 2022 and studies were completed in Nov 2022). What remains is the identification of appropriate CSOs in each project intervention site to implement the alternative livelihoods plans.	S
Output 3.2 Relevant government staff, CSOs and local communities are trained on alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agricultural techniques	June 2024	0%	5%	TOR for training relevant government staff, CSOs and local communities on alternative livelihoods and climate-resilient agricultural techniques were developed, approved, advertised. One firm submitted their bid, was evaluated and fell below the pass mark of 75%; TOR will be re-advertised this July-Sept 2023.	S
Output 3.3 Climate-resilient agricultural techniques are implemented in target communities	September 2024	0%	0%	TOR for Implementing alternative livelihoods plans have been developed, approved and in procurement process to on board competent CSOs per project intervention site.	S
Component 4: Knowledge and research on EbA and climate resilient livelihoods					
Output 4.1 Monitoring and research programme established in collaboration with relevant national research institution	September 2025	5%	5%	Draft research agreement for collaboration with a relevant research institution developed and waiting for approval by the Solicitor general of Uganda (Response from Solicitor general delayed since April 2022 to date).	S

Outputs/Activities ³	Expected completion date ⁴	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project target)	Progress rating justification ⁵ , description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress rating ⁶
Output 4.2 Cost-benefit analysis of EbA interventions in wetland and forest ecosystems conducted.	September 2024	0%	0%	To be implemented in 2024	N/A
Output 4.3 Awareness-raising campaign conducted at project intervention sites on the: i) ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests; and ii) benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods and ecosystems to climate change.	September 2025 It is a continuous activity to end of project	30%	40%	Public awareness on EbA in the districts of Mbarara, Kitagwenda, Isingiro, Kamwenge and Ibanda was conducted in Sep/Oct 2022, geared towards increasing knowledge and awareness of government officials at project intervention sites of the EbA approach, highlighting on the ecosystem services provided by wetlands and forests, benefits of functional wetland and forest ecosystems and the benefits of EbA for increasing the resilience of livelihoods to climate change. The meetings drew participation of several district local government including Chief Administrative Officers, Resident District Commissioners, Chair Local Council V, Secretary Local Council production, Secretary Local Council for Environment, District Natural Resources Officers, District Production and Marketing Officers, District Environment/Wetlands Officer, District forestry Officer, District Agricultural Officer, District Community development Officer, District Communications Officer, at lower local government levels (sub county and parish level) the participants included chair Local Council 3, Secretary women affairs, Secretary environmental affairs, Sub county extension officers, Community development officer, Parish Chiefs, Chairperson parish development committee, Parish councillors for women and men. Overall, 358 people (241M,117F) participated while observing the MOH COVID 19 SOPs in all the districts.	S

4. Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the **Risk Help Sheet** for more details on rating.

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1. Management structure – Roles and responsibilities	L/M/S/H (Low)	L
2. Governance structure – Oversight	L/M/S/H (Low)	L
3. Implementation schedule	L/M/S/H (moderate)	M
4. Budget	L/M/S/H (Moderate)	M
5. Financial Management	L/M/S/H (Low)	Divergent ratings from the EA as the TM believes financial management is a risk due to delays with receiving budget revisions and financial reporting from the EA
6. Reporting	L/M/S/H (Low)	L
7. Capacity to deliver	L/M/S/H (Low)	M (Divergent ratings as TM believes there are still risks related to field level interventions and the capacity of these partners to deliver on activities.

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in table B below..

4.2 Table B. Risk-Log

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating							Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2 (This PIR)	MTR	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: Communities do not support interventions and do not adopt ecosystem management activities for adaptation during or after the term of the proposed project because of limited immediate benefits of EbA.	All outcomes & outputs	M	M	M	-				=	In two out of eight instances, communities have been resistant to the wetland boundary demarcation activities proposed by the project. This is because farmers have encroached into the wetlands and are now reluctant to give up their agricultural land. However, in most cases people are willing to voluntarily leave the wetlands if supported with livelihood alternatives. This will be implemented in the next project phase. Communities have shown support for other interventions (e.g. climate resilient

										agriculture) proposed by the project.
Risk 2 Civil strife or social unrest may prevent ecosystem management activities for adaptation from taking place.	All outcomes	L	L	L					=	As above
Risk 3 Failure to establish alternative livelihoods at project intervention sites which causes the continuation of destructive practices and further ecosystem degradation.	All outcomes and Output 3.1	M	L	L					=	Communities already have plans for other alternative livelihoods if supported
Risk 4 Baseline project activities not achieved as planned.	All outcomes	L	M	M					=	Due to delays with the project start up, some baseline projects have closed and it is difficult to get accurate information on what was achieved.
Risk 5 High staff turnover in the government departments and implementing agencies.	All outcomes	L	L	L					=	There is low staff turnover in the government departments
Risk 6 Limited political will to implement and sustain project interventions	All outcomes	L	L	L					=	There are presidential directives on restoration of degraded wetlands to lower local governments and authorities.
Risk 7 Other economic developments, such as mining, agriculture, and human settlement, may compete with the implementation of the project activities.	Outcomes 2 and 3	M	L	L					=	There are strategic environmental inspections by Environment Protection Police, District Local Governments and Resident District Commissioners in the districts and awareness campaigns on the benefits of EbA that go on concurrently to reinforce the adoption of EbA practices.
Risk 8 Livelihoods are threatened through the demarcation of wetland boundaries	Outcome 3	L	L	M					↑	There are legal limits for wetland demarcation. Communities are extensively consulted during wetland demarcation. Communities will be provided with alternative livelihood strategies.
Risk 9 Pests and diseases limit wetland and forest restoration.	Outcome 2	L	L	L					=	No major pests and diseases reported over the last 2 years in the project intervention areas.
Risk 10 Construction of small-scale water infrastructure damages surrounding ecosystems.	Outcome 2	L	L	L					=	The water infrastructure is small-scale and unlikely to cause damage to surrounding ecosystems. Environmental social impact studies will be conducted if there is a threat to surrounding ecosystems.
Risk 11 Pollution from agrochemicals	Outcome 2 & 3	L	L	L					=	Modern agrochemicals are on the market and communities have been sensitized on proper use of these chemicals
Risk 12 Extreme climate events such as floods and droughts could disrupt project activities and/or damage ecosystems and infrastructure.	All outcomes	M	M	M					=	This remains a moderate risk, as there have been: prolonged dry spell across the country, disrupting rain fed agricultural interventions. Floods in Rwenzori region causing loss of lives, increased sedimentation and erosion. In Mt Elgom area, Bulambuli district within the R Sironko system, landslides have

										destroyed properties, crops and people's lives
Risk 13. Benefits of the project are not equitably shared among the recipient communities.	All outcomes	M	M	L					↓	There have been extensive community consultations, and VIAs, to identify appropriate adaptation interventions and ensure that the benefits are equitably shared.
Risk 14. Inadequate local tree seedlings for restoration	Outcome 2	N/A	H	M					↓	Community nurseries will be set up with support of the project. These will improve the supply of local tree seedlings for restoration.
Risk 15: Procurement delays, delaying delivery of Project outputs within stipulated time frame	All Outcomes	N/A	H	M					↓	The team is learning the new procurement system, and there have been fewer delays. However, this remains a concern.
Risk 16: High cost of alternative livelihoods options that are economically viable and that can produce adequate food for Households	All outcomes	N/A	L	L					=	The project will focus on livelihood options that are sustainable, economically viable and requested by the communities.
Risk 17. Extensive budget revisions and changes causing delays in project implementation	All outcomes	N/A	N/A	M						The overall project budget needed to be revised based on delays with project start up and changes in the delivery model/plan of some activities
Risk 18. Delayed financial reporting and issues with financial reporting from the EA	All outcomes	N/A	N/A	M						<i>Rated as Medium</i> due to delays with receiving budget revision information and adequate financial reporting from the EA
Risk 19. Low capacity of community organisations and local groups to deliver on activities in the field.	All outcomes	N/A	N/A	M						There are risks related to capacity of community organisations and local groups to deliver on activities in the field.
Consolidated project risk			M	M					↓	There are no major risks, most risks are of Low risk category with just a few at moderate risk category.

Table B. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here **only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or higher in the current PIR**

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR _{t-1} , MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Risk 1: Communities do not support interventions and do not adopt ecosystem management activities for adaptation during or after the term of the proposed project because of limited immediate benefits of EbA.		Stakeholder engagement and awareness-raising on the benefits of EbA and wetland protection.	Continue to conduct awareness and sensitisation among communities on sustainable wetland resource use, wetland boundary demarcation, acceptable and unacceptable practises in wetlands. Project risk screening to be	December 2023	PMU/CTA

			<p>reviewed and risk mitigation measures identified.</p> <p>Complete the setting up of a grievance redress mechanism at the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>		
Risk 4 Baseline project activities not achieved as planned.		Engagement with FIE-FOC 2 management team to understand the progress that has been made on this project.	Continue to work with the Ministry to obtain information on other baseline projects identified in the CEO Endorsement.	December 2023	PMU
Risk 8 Livelihoods are threatened through the demarcation of wetland boundaries		<p>Conducted awareness and sensitisation among communities on sustainable wetland resource use, wetland boundary demarcation, acceptable and unacceptable practises in wetlands.</p> <p>A grievance redress mechanism is being developed by a specialist at the Ministry of Water and Environment to handle and address complaints associated with wetland restoration and demarcation</p>	<p>Continue to conduct awareness and sensitisation among communities on sustainable wetland resource use, wetland boundary demarcation, acceptable and unacceptable practises in wetlands.</p> <p>Complete grievance redress mechanism at the Ministry of Water and Environment.</p>	December 2023	PMU
Risk 12 Extreme climate events such as floods and droughts could disrupt project activities and/or damage ecosystems and infrastructure.		VIA's conducted at project sites to identify climate risks.	Ensure that the design and implementation of project interventions are informed by the VIAs and take climate risks into account.	Continuously	PMU
Risk 14. Inadequate local tree seedlings for restoration		Identified potential private sector suppliers of seedlings.	Community nurseries will be set up with support of the project. These will improve the supply of local tree seedlings for restoration.	June 2024	PMU
Risk 15: Procurement delays, delaying delivery of Project outputs within stipulated time frame		<p>A detailed workplan 2023 has been developed indicating timelines for each activity</p> <p>Responsible departments within the Ministry have been engaged to implement interventions within their</p>	<p>Hold responsible officers for each activity accountable</p> <p>Continuously engage with procurement and HR team in the Ministry of Water and Environment</p>	Continuously	PMU and PSC

		mandates. TOR have been developed for all activities that need consultants these have been approved and in procurement process.			
Risk 17. Extensive budget revisions and changes causing delays in project implementation		The whole project budget has been reviewed, waiting approval	Budget revision to be finalised and signed	September	PMU/TM/FMO
Risk 18. Delayed financial reporting and issues with financial reporting from the EA		Workplan 2023 has been developed approved and in use There are cash limits above which an individual is not supposed to receive cash that is not more than 1,100 USD Project Stakeholder involved in project activities are only paid after the activity and through e cash	Verification of the payment vouchers by at least six authorities as a control measure All payments are done through Bank of Uganda using EFT Training of finance team in Uganda on UNEP reporting requirements Finance officer to look into feasibility of procuring accounting software for project.	Continuously	Accountant/ TM/ FMO
Risk 19. Low capacity of community organisations and local groups to deliver on activities in the field.		Routine progress update meetings Involvement of competent departmental and Ministry staff in implementation Technical support through PMU meetings	Capacity assessment of CSOs and partners to deliver field activities to be undertaken prior to signing of contract	As per contract basis	PMU/CTA

High Risk (H): There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate Risk (M): There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
Low Risk (L): There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

To be completed by Task Managers

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Results framework | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor project objective change |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Components and cost | <input type="checkbox"/> Safeguards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional and implementation arrangements | <input type="checkbox"/> Risk analysis |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial management | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation schedule | <input type="checkbox"/> Co-financing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executing Entity | <input type="checkbox"/> Location of project activity |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executing Entity Category | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |

[\[Annex document linked to reported minor amendment\]](#)

Minor amendments	[Provide a description of the change that occurred in the fiscal year of reporting]			
	Activities that were identified during the studies have been included in budget and workplan 2023 these include: Establish a Sub national Outlook forum to analyse district based weather forecast and early warning information, support Parish level weather clinics to disseminate and train farmers on use of Climate information and early warning information, Operationalize EbA learning and information centres (training package/materials, technologies and practices) in Bulambuli and Sironko-including Mutufu Apiary demo center). Procure appropriate EbA equipment and materials to support community EbA technologies And We have done an extensive budget revisions per component see table below			
	Component/outcome	Previous	New-Review	Percentage change
	Component 1	550,000	716,169	30.2%
	Component 2	1,850,000	1,597,318	-13.7%
	Component 3	1,290,000	1,400,913	8.6%
	Component 4	362,858	367,383	1.3%
	Project Management cost	207,142	193,216	-6.7%
Monitoring by UNEP	90,000	90,000	0%	

--	--

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions

To be completed by Task Managers

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original legal instrument					
Amendment 1	Revision				
Extension 1	Extension				

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Overall wetlands, communities, and ecosystems we are working in:

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field <u>if</u> the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Kampala	0.42348	32.6348	Kampala	Capital city	National Government capacity development
Mbarara District	-0.6168	30.6583	Mbarara District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Isingiro District	-0.8570	30.9178	Isingiro District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Kamwenge District	0.1808	30.4489	Kamwenge District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Ibanda District	-0.05988	30.4922	Ibanda District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Arua District	3.0014	31.0093	Arua District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Bulambuli District	1.3494	34.2760	Bulambuli District		Ecosystem-based adaptation
Sironko District	1.1885	34.2950	Sironko District		Ecosystem-based adaptation

Detailed locations of particular sites within the wetlands/districts:

No :	Location Name		Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description		
	District	Sub-county					Observations	Area(Ha)	Distance to be demarcate d(Km)
						Wetland Name			
1	Arua	Vurra	2.8898	30.8766	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Degraded with vegetable growing of maize, yams This is the source of R.Enyaus	190.3	36.3
2	Arua	Vurra	2.9425	30.8908	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Potatoes, beans, channelling	60	8
3	Arua	Vurra	2.9390	30.8915	44332 8	Ajiova inlet stream	Cultivation of potatoes and intact patches	20	4
4	Arua	Vurra	2.9408	30.8959	44332 8	Aduva inlet stream	Channeling, over grazing,tomatoes,potatoes	22	3
5	Arua	Vurra	2.9477	30.8950	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Agriculture	159	22.2
6	Arua	Vurra	2.9602	30.9120	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Motorvehicle washing, sand-mining, waste dumping	69.3	8.2
7	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0194	30.8787	44332 8	Egaa inlet stream	Sandmining, channeling, agriculture	423.6	48.5
8	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0198	30.8161	44332 8	Yeremva/Draju/O kayiva inlet stream	Medium cultivation of potatoes, maize	949.7	88.3
9	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0579	30.8515	44332 8	Abeva inlet stream	Medium cultivation of potatoes, maize	335.5	41.8
10	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0353	30.8928	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Nursery beds, car washing, eucalyptus	418.3	40.1
11	Arua city	Central division	3.0000	30.9098	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Houses, eucalyptus	405	49.3
12	Arua city	Central division	3.0097	30.9074	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Source of city water, NWSC plant		
13	Arua city	Central division	3.0157	30.9049	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Car washing		
14	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0902	30.9051	44332 8	Enyau wetland	Eucalyptus along the banks	292	32.2
15	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0833	30.9010	44332 8	Emvio inlet stream	Cultivation of potatoes and eucalyptus	232	32

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

						FOREST NAME				
1	Arua	Vurra	2.8975	30.8797	44332 8	Ezuku south LFR	Occupied by private tree farmers	1327		
2	Arua	Vurra	2.9063	30.8824	44332 8	Ezuku North LFR	Occupied by private tree farmers	1336		
3	Arua	Vurra	2.9546	30.9173	44332 8	Eruba LFR	Patches of trees			
4	Arua	Vurra	2.9435	30.9250	44332 8	Kuluva LFR	encroached by subsistence cultivation			
5	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0010	30.8861	44332 8	Giligili LFR	Partly stocked with eucalyptus			
6	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0107	30.7971	44332 8	Nyio Bamboo LFR	Partly stocked with eucalyptus	1282		
7	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0537	30.8540	44332 8	Ozu LFR	Partly stocked with eucalyptus			
8	Arua city	Ayivu division	3.0822	30.9102	44332 8	Manibe LFR	Stocked with eucalyptus	1172		
						Wetland Name				
1	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0657	30.4445	77329 01	Kakunyu	sand mining, cultivation of potatoes,yams and farms,eucalyptus			
2	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0659	30.4552	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Fish ponds, private recreation centre	344.8	45.2	
3	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0811	30.4530	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Wild palms			
4	Kitagwenda	Buhanda	-87.3944	122.8981	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Eucalyptus and gardens			
5	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0401	30.4287	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Farms			
6	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0320	30.4216	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Millet,Farms,Bananas, eucalyptus			
7	Kitagwenda	Kitagwenda Town Council	0.0101	30.3975	77329 01	R.Rwambu	Cultivation	170.3	25	
8	Kitagwenda	Kabujogera Town Council	87.4247	-55.2133	77329 01	Kyarutanga	Papyrus			
9	Kitagwenda	Kabujogera Town Council	87.4172	-55.9967	77329 01	Kyarutanga	Degraded on the edges			
10	Kitagwenda	Kabujogera Town Council	87.4108	-55.2970	77329 01	Ruhagura	Forested wild palms,papyrus			
11	Kitagwenda	Rwenjaza	0.1001	30.4518	77329 01	R.Mpanga	Acacia dominated	444	42.2	
12	Kitagwenda	Buhanda	87.3784	-55.8116	77329 01	Kazoonzo	Eucalyptus and gardens			

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

13	Kitagwenda	Buhanda	87.3860	-56.0926	77329 01	Kikoyo	Brick laying, eucalyptus		
14	Kitagwenda	Buhanda	87.3771	-56.7625	77329 01	Kamera	Papyrus dominated		
15	Kitagwenda	Kitagwenda Town Council	-87.3685	122.9142	77329 01	Rubimba	Sugarcanes, Bananas		
16	Kitagwenda	Kitagwenda Town Council	0.0007	30.3636	77329 01	Nyakabaare	washing bay, coffee factory	242.8	34.4
17	Kitagwenda	Nyabbani	0.0580	30.4232	77329 01	Kakabire	Willdenow's Maiden Fern	23	5
						Wetland Name			
1	Mbarara city	Nyakayojo division	87.4818	-41.5578	44335 5	Ruceece	eucalyptus, bananas, farms	72.5	16
2	Mbarara city	Nyakayojo division	87.4947	-42.1125	44335 5	Ruceece	Farms and gardens	233	23.3
3	Mbarara city	Nyakayojo division	87.5365	-41.7854	44335 5	Ruceece	Titled land in the wetlands, farms	265.4	32
4	Mbarara city	Nyakayojo division	87.5094	-42.6329	44335 5	Ruceece	Farms mainly	428.5	25.6
5	Mbarara city	Nyamitanga and Kamukuzi division	87.5591	-42.8338	44335 5	Rwizi	e brick laying, sand mining	573.7	42
6	Mbarara	Bubaare	87.5029	-43.8248	44335 5	Rwizi	Over grazing, Siltation, eucalyptus, Sand mining	341.5	28
7	Mbarara	Bubaare	87.4543	-43.8302	44335 5	Rwizi	Sandmining, farms	3080.4	80
						Wetland Name			
1	Isingiro	Isingiro Town Council	87.7040	-36.1895	70562 85	Nakivale	Sugar canes, rice, eucalyptus, maize, Over grazing	1117.6	67.7
2	Isingiro	Rugaaga, Mbaare	87.8399	-35.7626	70562 85	Kabaare	sugarcanes, eucalyptus, rice, maize, water abstraction point for Nakivale settlement	458.4	20.8
3	Isingiro	Rwanjogyera, Rushasha	87.9962	-34.9754	70562 85	Rukungiri	cultivation of maize, eucalyptus, potatoes, sugarcanes, bananas	199.6	62.1
4	Isingiro	Rwanjogyera	88.0127	-34.1158	70562 85	Akatindo	Yams, Maize, Banana	945.6	49
5	Isingiro	Rushasha	88.0301	-35.5789	70562 85	Bugarama	Farmlands, big drainage channels	1508.9	47.1
6	Isingiro	Rushasha	88.0392	-35.8325	70562 85	Lake Karunga	Land cleared for farms, cultivation of vegetables, potatoes	663.3	18.4
7	Isingiro	Rushasha	87.9717	-36.8119	70562	Kinami	Cultivation in the buffers	365.8	57.8

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

					85				
8	Isingiro	Ngarama, Kashumba	87.7801	-35.9610	70562 85	Kabahinda	Bananas, farmlands	867.6	32.3
9	Isingiro	Isingiro Town Council	87.6482	-36.9219	70562 85	Kayonza-Kibwera	Vegetable growing, eucalyptus, Bananas and other subsistence agriculture	645.5	34.2
10	Isingiro	Kabingo, Isingiro Town Council	87.6681	-38.0997	70562 85	Kabingo	Bananas, buildings, gardens	360.8	39.5
11	Isingiro	Birere and Masha	87.6407	-39.5846	70562 85	Nyamiyanja-Ekigaaga-Kagogo	Bananas, motorcycle washing	186.1	56.8
12	Isingiro	Nyamiyanja, Birere	87.5756	-39.3455	70562 85	Rwekitooma-Kishuro	Eucalyptus, Bananas	125.5	22.7
						FOREST NAME			
1	Sironko	Mutufu Town Council	1.2026	34.2970	44822 3	Mutufu LFR	Partly stocked with eucalyptus and existing community apiary project	1139	
2	Sironko	Budadiri Town Council	1.1719	34.3381	44822 3	Nakiwondwe LFR	Encroached by subsistence cultivation, buildings, and some eucalyptus	1235	
3	Bulambuli	Bumufuri	1.4687	34.4012	80305 73	Kaptokoi LFR	Heavily encroached on with rice gardens, grazing	1081	
4	Ibanda	Ibanda Municipality	87.5083	-54.4334	70562 84	Ibanda Plantations LFR	Under encroachment, degazettment	1435	
5	Mbarara	Bwizibwera Town Council	87.5524	-47.3524	44335 5	Bwizibwera LFR	encroached on with buildings, managed eucalyptus	1479	
						Wetland Name			
1	Ibanda/Kamwe nge	Nyamarebere Bihanga	0.1494	30.6124	70562 84/448 216	Rushangwe	Charcoal burning, area largely dominated by Acacia	944.7	46.5
2	Ibanda/Kamwe nge	Nyamarebere	0.1601	30.5951	70562 84/448 217	Rushangwe	Dominated by Acacia		
3	Ibanda	Rushango Town Council	0.1212	30.5806	70562 84	Karambi	Charcoal burning, area largely dominated by Acacia, brick making	145.7	30.1
4	Ibanda	Ishongororo Town Council	0.1003	30.4641	70562 84	Mpanga	Acacia trees in Kiburara farm land	107.3	26.3
5	Ibanda	Rwenkoba Town Council	-87.4394	122.6773	70562 84	Bigyera	eucalyptus, cultivation in the buffer	571	55
6	Ibanda	Bisheshe division	87.4626	-56.0961	70562 84	Bigyera	eucalyptus, cultivation in the buffer		
7	Ibanda	Kijongo	0.0339	30.4562	70562 84	Bigyera	Frams, eucalyptus		

8	Ibanda	Kijongo	0.0128	30.4025	70562 84	R.Rwambu	Mega fisheries project owned by Bafaki Charles and Byoka Ambrose	180.2	31.4
9	Ibanda	Kijongo	0.0316	30.4217	70562 84	R.Rwambu	cultivation along the banks		
10	Ibanda	Kijongo	0.0092	30.4038	70562 84	Kiryabishoro	eucalyptus, cultivation in the buffer	22.8	8
11	Ibanda	Kagogo division	87.4288	-55.4591	70562 84	Omukabaare	Brewing, euclyptus, grazing	79	18
12	Ibanda	Kagogo division	87.4249	-55.2287	70562 84	Kyarutaanga	Brick laying, cultivation		
13	Kitagwenda	Bihanga,Nkoma,Nkoma TC	0.2142	30.6173	77329 01	Kakinga	Subsistence agriculture and majorly farms	1365.7	87
14	Kamwenge	Kabambiro,Kamwenge,Kamwenge TC	0.1618	30.4913	77329 01	Mpanga	Subsistence agriculture and majorly farms	757.5	75.3

R. Enyau wetland boundary

ID	LOCATION/VILLAGE	COORDINATES		LAND BEING USED BY;
		EASTINGS	NORTHINGS	
1.	Orivu	263966	319567	Okasero Ram
2.	Orivu	264008	319596	Bayo
3.	Orivu	264055	319799	Alion Milton
4.	Orivu	264113	319939	Obeti Samuel
5.	Orivu	264159	320099	Asikoa James
6.	Orivu	264381	320227	Mundwa Francis
7.	Orivu	264105	320310	Aduma Enoka
8.	Orivu	264084	320127	Aduma Enoka
9.	Orivu	264019	319958	Ongaribo Nickson
10.	Orivu	263963	319807	Feni Simon

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

11.	Orivu	263884	319683	Okusaru Holder
12.	Orivu	263899	319599	Agote Maron
13.	Orivu	264056	319843	Mary Ozimati
14.	Orivu	264209	320273	Ekima Wadri
15.	Adravu West	264178	322351	-
16.	Adravu West	264330	322405	Ikii Richard
17.	Adravu West	264333	322456	Pirio Zabron
18.	Ocevunzenze	264529	322602	Anzilo Kili
19.	Ocevunzenze	264675	322604	Chandiru Betty
20.	Ocevunzenze	264791	322854	Wandia Francis
21.	Ocevunzenze	264835	322809	Anguaminyo Batista
22.	Ocevunzenze	264907	322887	Odoo Matrida
23.	Tivu/Abariva	264963	322988	Alio Salvastore
24.	Tivu/Abariva	264976	323158	Ondema Simon
25.	Tivu/Abariva	265088	323238	Eyotaru Ruth
26.	Tivu/Abariva	265173	323323	Eyotaru Ruth
27.	Tivu/Abariva	265168	323473	Dawa Samuel
28.	Tivu/Abariva	265216	323610	Draman James
29.	Alio	265216	323610	-

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

30.	Alio	265208	323912	Endreonzi Noman
31.	Alio	265131	324026	Adule Simon
32.	Alio	265027	324270	Adule Simon
33.	Alio	265100	324148	Lwmatia Maris
34.	Alio	264982	324417	-
35.	Alio	265165	324702	Madira Peter
36.	Alio	265008	324535	Anguzu Francis
37.	Alio	265017	324631	Anguzu Francis
38.	Alio	265024	324712	Azabo Alex
39.	Alio	265471	325263	Asiku Solomon
40.	Alio	265270	324803	Ofura Samuel
41.	Alio	265341	324901	Emvi Yriisani
42.	Alio	265418	325035	Ejwa Geoffrey
43.	Alio	265418	325035	Arijole Peter
44.	Rondo	265466	325364	Sonia Nason
45.	Rondo	265452	325450	Madira Simon
46.	Rondo	265485	325520	MAsikin Fenahas
47.	Rondo	265594	325529	Pario Norah
48.	Rondo	265670	325448	Andukule Festo

**PIR FY 2023
Uganda LDCF EbA**

49.	Rondo	265806	325519	Ozuetia Florence
50.	Rondo	265870	325602	Malaria Jelly
51.	Rondo	265923	325570	Palio Gipson
52.	Rondo	265894	325713	Eyotia Alfred
53.	Rondo	265941	325759	Echone Daniel
54.	Rondo	266044	325656	Apngo Ronald
55.	Rondo	266073	325780	Iyiki Osbone
56.	Opevu	266077	325878	Ayuku Simon
57.	Opevu	266076	326006	Ayuku Simon
58.	Opevu	266103	326117	Adriko
59.	Opevu	266134	326258	Ajua Tomas
60.	Opevu	266171	326258	Ajua Tomas
61.	Opevu	266204	326324	Dunia Abel
62.	Opevu	266272	326397	Obatre Killion
63.	Opevu	266372	326478	Emualia Magret
64.	Rendo	266625	326802	Wadia Geoffrey
65.	Rendo	266673	326866	Econi Samuel
66.	Rendo	266747	326970	Okufura Church
67.	Rendo	266855	327085	Okufura Church

68.	Rendo	266944	327090	-
69.	Rendo	267052	327095	-
70.	Odiandyadri	267118	327062	-
71.	Odiandyadri	267189	327028	-
72.	Odiandyadri	267279	327061	-
73.	Odiandyadri	267368	327079	-
74.	Odiandyadri	267471	327053	Onjoma Alex
75.	Odiandyadri	267720	327172	
76.	Odiandyadri	267783	327249	-
77.	Odiandyadri	267879	327300	-
78.	Odiandyadri	268047	327383	-
79.	Odiandyadri	268191	327333	-
80.	Odiandyadri	268236	327481	-
81.	Ombeva	268199	327589	-
82.	Ombeva	268086	327651	-
83.	Ombeva	268002	327692	-
84.	Ombeva	267976	327762	-
85.	Ombeva	268038	327863	-

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. *

[Annex any linked geospatial file]

[Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate]
Map showing intervention sites



DEMARCATION MAP: RIVER ENYAU WETLAND, VURA SUB-COUNTY SECTION, ARUA DISTRICT



