



Fostering water security and catchment resilience in Uganda's Cattle Corridor

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11696

Countries

Uganda

Project Name

Fostering water security and catchment resilience in Uganda's Cattle Corridor

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

9/19/2024

Review completed by PM

9/29/2024

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes. However, output 1.3.2, should include gender aspects in the formation of the water committees to manage the clean water as women play a key role in water collection.

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

In the Results Framework, output 1.3.2 has been revised to mainstream gender, and women as follows: ***Output 1.3.2: Gender-responsive and inclusive water user associations/committees, with at least 40% women representation, established and/or strengthened to manage the established water systems in the micro-catchment***

Paragraph 38: The description of output 1.3.2 has been updated to mainstream gender and women. Additionally, Output Indicator 1.3.2 and Target 1.3.2 have also been updated by mainstreaming gender and women as follows:

Output Indicator 1.3.2: Number of gender-responsive and inclusive water user associations/committees, with at least 40% women representation, established

and/or strengthened to manage the established water systems in the micro-catchment

Target Output 1.3.2: At least 10 gender-responsive and inclusive water user associations/committees, with at least 40% women representation, established and/or strengthened, to manage the established water systems in the micro-catchment

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

d). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes. Although there is a structural presentation in a PowerPoint (uploaded), there is no description of who does what in the portal. Please provide textual description of the institutional arrangement.

b). The Agency has no role in the execution of the project.

c). Yes

d). Yes

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

a) The description of the institutional arrangement has been added to Annex G.

b) Based on preliminary stakeholder mapping in Uganda's cattle corridor, key local actors appear capable of executing project activities. As a GEF Agency, our model focuses on building the technical and institutional capacity of local organizations to ensure sustainability and ownership of results. For now, at PIF stage, we have indicated that Conservation International will serve as the implementing agency, leveraging in-house expertise to oversee and support the in-country organizations to deliver project activities while building their capacity. During the PPG phase, we will reassess whether CI will remain solely the implementing agency or take on implementing and executing functions. The final decision regarding CI's role will also be informed by the outcome of the financial due diligence of the organizations that would have been identified to execute.

c) Clearance noted.

d) Clearance noted.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes. However, the META information indicates that this project will contribute 40% to nature based management sector and 60% to what resources management, yet, almost the whole of component 1 describes outcomes and outputs that address agriculture. Please revise and indicate the contribution of this project to the agricultural sector.

b). Yes

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

a) META information is retained as 40% nature-based management sector and 60% to water resources management. Our justification is as follows: Component 1 is focused on the adoption of climate-resilient water technologies and infrastructure to improve access to safe and clean water. While this of course will be helpful to agriculture as well as household consumption, the focus is mainly on improving water resource management, which is an area of concern in this landscape. Therefore, we believe the current META information indicators are appropriate and are well-aligned with the priority of the Government and community.

In order to show the contribution of this project to the agricultural sector, we have re-phrased this output as follows:

Output 1.2.1: Resilient micro-irrigation systems established and/or rehabilitated and adopted by smallholder farmers (at least 49% Females) to foster agricultural production in the target sites.

b) Clearance noted.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes. However, there is no explanation of how the project will align with the identified national policies and plan. Please address.

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Descriptions of how the proposed project is aligned with the identified national policies, strategies, and plans are provided in paragraph 81.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes, (Targets 8,10, 11, 14, 20, 22, and 23).

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes, however, no date for those consultation has been provided.

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

A column for the dates of stakeholder consultation has been added in Annex K.

We have uploaded the PIF Stakeholder Consultation report as well as the PIF Validation Workshop Report as Annex M.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes, However, there is inconsistency between the amount in the LoE and the amount provided in the portal. For example, the LoE does not indicate PPG and PPG fee and the designated column seems to have been deleted. Please ask the OFP to issue a new LoE and make sure that the amount entered into the portal matches those listed in the LoE.

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Revised LoE secured and uploaded. The amount in the Portal and LoE are now aligned.
8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes. However, the attached Environmental and Social Safeguard Screening Form (ESSSF) and the overall ESS risk of the program is classified as high/substantial, with an explanation of potential mitigation measures. Nevertheless, it is not clear what exactly the Agency wants to prepare during the PPG stage before the CEO Endorsement. Please provide a clear plan of the environmental and social impact assessment and mitigation measures/risk management plan of the environmental and social risks that will be prepared during PPG stage.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

A **safeguards analysis report**, which is informed by the safeguards screening has been uploaded. The safeguards analysis report outlines the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) that have been triggered by this project as well as the ESS Plans that will be developed during the PPG Phase. Furthermore, per the safeguards analysis report, the project will be required to conduct an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) during the implementation phase and subsequently prepare the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) that will respond to the comment raised regarding the "environmental and social impact assessment and mitigation measures/risk management plan of the environmental and social risks". This information is also provided below.

ESS1. Environmental & Social Impact Assessment: The project is proposing activities that could have adverse impacts i.e. establishment of small or micro-irrigation schemes, construction of boreholes, valley tanks of about 10,000 ? 20,000 m² and water reservoirs, repair and rehabilitation of the selected old water systems. To this end, the project needs to undertake a limited ESIA and prepare an ESMP (See Appendices II and III of the CI-GEF/GCF ESMF v7 for details). This is currently planned as an activity under Component 1 and will therefore take place during the Implementation Phase.

ESS3. Resettlement and Physical and Economic Displacement: As part of the ESIA, the project must investigate and determine if the construction of irrigation schemes or

boreholes will displace local communities and/or disrupt their traditional livelihoods and social structures. As a reminder, CI-GEF does not support projects involving the involuntary displacement of people and communities (refer to CI-GEF ESMF Exclusion list).

ESS4 and ESS6. Indigenous (Traditional) Peoples and Cultural Heritage: The project is required to develop a Traditional Peoples Plan (using the template provided by CI-GEF) which outlines how Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) would be sought as well as how the project will avoid negative impacts on traditional peoples, ensure their full and effective participation in decision making related to the project, and to provide traditional peoples with culturally appropriate social and economic benefits that have been negotiated with them. Additionally, the plan must include provisions for the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from the use of traditional ecological knowledge and practices.

ESS5. Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention: The project should elaborate on the waste management activities to ensure that the waste products are handled in a manner that minimizes or eliminates risks to human health, and the environment. If there are risks to humans and the ecosystem, the project will be required to prepare a Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention Plan as part of the ESIA/ESMP (as indicated under ESS1).

ESS7. Labour and Working Conditions: The project is required to develop Labour Management Procedures for ensuring that contractors for the construction and operation of the infrastructural works (e.g. boreholes, valley tanks, irrigation schemes) abide by the Labour and Working Conditions set out in the CI-GEF's ESMF.

ESS8. Community Health, Safety and Security: The project is required to develop and implement a Community Health, Safety and Security Plan to ensure that risks or potential impacts to the health, safety and security of project staff and project-affected communities are identified, avoided and mitigated. Some of the risks include safety concerns during and after the construction of boreholes and valley tanks, influx of workers during construction which can exacerbate gender-based violence (GBV) and sexual exploitation abuse and harassment (SEAH), escalation of conflict/cross-cultural violence within communities over access and use of water resources, and the creation of vector breeding grounds, among other risks.

Other Plans

Apart from the ESS Policy, the project will be required to comply with the CI-GEF's Accountability and Grievance Policy, Gender Policy, and Stakeholder Engagement Policy by preparing and submitting for review and approval to the CI-GEF during the project development stage, the following plans:

A) Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (AGM): To ensure that the project meets CI-GEF Project Agency's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism Policy, the EA is required to develop an Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that will ensure people affected by the project are able to bring their grievances to the EA for consideration and redress. The mechanism must be in place before the start of project activities, and disclosed to all stakeholders in a language, manner and means that best suits the local context. In addition, the EA is required to monitor and report on the following minimum accountability and grievance indicators:

Number of times/events the AGM is communicated/disseminated to stakeholders; and
Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's AGM that have been resolved.

B) Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP): The GMP should include a gender analysis including the role of men and women in decision-making, and appropriate interventions with gender-related outcomes to ensure that men and women have equal opportunities to participate and benefit from the project. Further, the project should examine the extent of Gender Based Violence (GBV), the likelihood of project activities contributing to/exacerbating GBV, and propose mitigation measures as needed. In addition, the EA is required to monitor and report on the following minimum gender indicators:

Number of persons (disaggregated by gender) who received benefits during the implementation phase; and if relevant
Number of documents (disaggregated by types) derived from the project that included gender considerations or address gender gaps.

C) Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): To ensure that the project complies with the CI-GEF's Stakeholders' Engagement Policy, the EA is required to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan. In addition, the EA is required to monitor and report on the following minimum stakeholder engagement indicators:

Number of stakeholder entities (disaggregated by type) involved during the project implementation phase;
Number of persons (disaggregated by gender) who participated in activities during the project implementation phase; and
Number of engagements (disaggregated by type of engagement) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes, However, there are inconsistencies. For example, the project is stated to mitigate 1 million tCO₂e co-benefits, but the CCM marker reads "No contribution". Additionally, the Biodiversity marker also indicates "No contribution" yet the project will contribute to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Targets 8, 10, 11, 14, 20, 22 and 23.

GEFSEC OCT 15, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

Annex E: Rio Markers updated by marking both Climate mitigation and Biodiversity as Significant (1)

Annex F: Taxonomy Table updated in the Rio Marker section by scoring Mitigation as 1 (Significant)

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF 10/14/2024

No action required.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial

additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC SEPT 27, 2024

The Agency is asked to provide some indicative budget for the Gender Action Plan and related gender-specific activities/outputs.

Agency's Comments
CI-GEF 10/14/2024

During the PPG phase, a gender analysis will be conducted in the five target districts to inform the development of a gender mainstreaming and action plan. Thus, the actual

budget for the implementation of gender mainstreaming and action plans will be developed during the PPG phase.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		