

# Promoting integrated landscape management approach for conservation of the Mount Elgon ecosystem in Eastern Uganda

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10463

**Countries**

Uganda

**Project Name**

Promoting integrated landscape management approach for conservation of the Mount Elgon ecosystem in Eastern Uganda

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

6/2/2021

**Review completed by PM**

12/7/2021

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF ☐

### CEO Endorsement ☐

**Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed. The project duration has been fixed in the portal at 60 months. Project start and end have also been adjusted.

**October 5th, 2021**

- The third point is forwarded to the Portal IT team. However, please note that according to the Expected Implementation Start (01/31/2022) and the Expected Completion Date (12/31/2026), the project duration should be 59 months, please advise.

- The first two points are addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

**Rio Markers:** the project cannot be CCM 0, as there are AFOLU activities and benefits. Moreover, the project is partially financed by the IP incentive, including CCM resources  
- we suggest CCM1. Please, revise.

**Table A:** focus all the resources on the FOLU IP Objective "Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration."

The other Focal Area Objectives should be removed. Please, revise.

**Project Duration:** The project duration is expected in months (60) and not in years (5).

NB: Some of these elements should also be corrected on the GEF template for CEO endorsement (table A , focal areas).

#### Agency Response

##### **Answer for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

the Expected start Date has been revised to 01 January 2022 and the completion date to 31 December 2026, in the portal making it 60 months

##### **Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>Rio Markers:</b> the project cannot be CCM 0, as there are AFOLU activities and benefits. Moreover, the project is partially financed by the IP incentive, including CCM resources - we suggest CCM1. Please, revise.</p>	<p>Rio Markers: has been Revised in the portal to capture CC1</p>
<p><b>Table A:</b> focus all the resources on the FOLU IP Objective "Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.".</p> <p>The other Focal Area Objectives should be removed. Please, revise.</p>	<p>Table A has been revised to cover FOLUR IP only The other Focal Area Objectives have been removed</p>
<p><b>Project Duration:</b> The project duration is expected in months (60) and not in years (5).</p> <p>NB: Some of these elements should also be corrected on the GEF template for CEO endorsement (table A , focal areas).</p>	<p>Its not possible to edit the duration field from the Agency level. Will request GEF ICTS to update the field to 60Months.</p> <p>The correction has no space in the CEO ER template.</p>

## **Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- We welcome the introduction of Randomized Control Trials (RCT) to evaluate the behavioral changes.
- We take note of the adjustment of the pmc and the cofinancing. The pmc cofinancing ratio is higher than the project average cofinancing ratio (1:9.37 vs. 1:8.66, for a average ratio of 1:8.69)

Cleared.

**June 18, 2021**

Table B, Result Framework (and logical framework, annex 4)

- Several outputs are formulated as outcomes (with a past participle verb) and are not Specific, Reachable, quantified, and will be difficult to evaluate. We would prefer more operational formulations, reflecting the value for money of planned activities, including quantities. See the OECD glossary on result based management, if needed (<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>). However, some useful information in the annex on the result framework allows to better understand the result framework.
- OK for the component 1.

Component 2:

- The outcome 2.1 'increase in adoption of sustainable production practices' is included two times (in the column of outcomes and the column of outputs). The outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 under the outcome 2.1 are missing. Please, correct.
- We are not seeing clearly how the proposed outputs can reach 1,630,000 beneficiaries and allow CSA and SLM on 56,000 ha of coffee and staple crops. Please, clarify.

Component 3:

- The output 3.1.2 is included two times: please remove the 3.1.2 in the column of outcomes
- Please, explain the strategy, the activities, and the monitoring/evaluation under the output 3.1.2. about 'awareness' and 'understanding' of the benefits of restoring degraded forests.
- We suggest including some innovations and specific monitoring actions, as randomized evaluations or Randomized Control Trials, RCT, as UNEP did under the GEFID 5718 in Uganda on PES.

#### Component 4

- A clear linkage with specific activities and a budget with the FOLUR is missing; especially in connection with the global platform and the Kenya project developed by FAO (GEFID 10598 'Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya'. The Kenya project is mentioned in the text, but without clear activities and budget.
- The output 4.1.3 is the establishment of 'multi-stakeholder platforms (AFR 100)'. While AFR100 is not mentioned in the baseline scenario, the role and composition of these platforms are unclear such as their articulation and added value of AFR100 in the context of the project. Please clarify how concretely these platforms and AFR100 will contribute to the project objectives.

#### Project management costs

- The pmc reach 5% in the table 4, but are the double in the budget. Please, revise.
- The whole project presents a cofinancing ratio of 1:9; the pmc presents a cofinancing ratio of 1:7; See if you can slightly increase the cofinancing closer to 1:9.

#### Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

#### **Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

Component 2:	
<p>- The outcome 2.1 'increase in adoption of sustainable production practices' is included two times (in the column of outcomes and the column of outputs). The outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 under the outcome 2.1 are missing. Please, correct.</p>	<p>The problem was with the entry in the portal but has been corrected. The outputs have been removed from the column of outcomes. The outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 under the outcome 2.1 have been added in the portal</p>

<p>- We are not seeing clearly how the proposed outputs can reach 1,630,000 beneficiaries and allow CSA and SLM on 56,000 ha of coffee and staple crops. Please, clarify.</p>	<p>The number of direct beneficiaries has been adjusted to 191,275 men and 192,764 women, as derived from Table 6 in the ProDoc. Indirect beneficiaries have been estimated at 1,630,000 persons, representing adult farmers in the nine project districts of the Elgon landscape. This has been elaborated in Outcome 2.1 and also as a footnote for Annex F ?Core Indicator Worksheet?.</p>
<p><b>Component 3:</b></p>	
<p>- The output 3.1.2 is included two times: please remove the 3.1.2 in the column of outcomes</p>	<p>Output 3.1.2 has been removed from the outcome section in the portal. The problem was in the entry on the portal but has been corrected;</p>
<p>- Please, explain the strategy, the activities, and the monitoring/evaluation under the output 3.1.2. about ?awareness? and ?understanding? of the benefits of restoring degraded forests</p>	<p>A strategy and activities to evaluate/monitoring, stakeholders? awareness and understanding of the benefits of restoring degraded forests, fragile lands and unstable slopes to communities, local economies and nature have now been included under output 3.1.2. The plan is to establish Randomized Control Trials (RCTs) involving two groups: one (the experimental group) receiving the intervention that is being applied, and the other (the comparison group or control) receiving no or an alternative intervention. Observations will be made to assess the effectiveness of the project intervention in raising awareness and changing local community attitudes.</p>
<p>- We suggest including some innovations and specific monitoring actions, as randomized evaluations or Randomized Control Trials, RCT, as UNEP did under the GEFID 5718 in Uganda on PES.</p>	<p>innovations and specific monitoring actions have now been included under output 3.1.2. see above</p>
<p><b>Component 4</b></p>	
<p>- A clear linkage with specific activities and a budget with the FOLUR is missing; especially in connection with the global platform and the Kenya project developed by FAO (GEFID 10598 ?Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya?. The Kenya project is mentioned in the text, but without clear activities and budget.</p>	<p>The specific synergistic activities and budget which link with the Kenya project have been included in Component 4 (Output 4.1.3 and 4.1.4).</p>

<p>- The output 4.1.3 is the establishment of "multi-stakeholder platforms (AFR 100)". While AFR100 is not mentioned in the baseline scenario, the role and composition of these platforms are unclear such as their articulation and added value of ARF100 in the context of the project. Please clarify how concretely these platforms and AFR100 will contribute to the project objectives.</p>	<p>The relevance of the AFR100 initiative under the Bonn Challenge is mentioned in the baseline (section 4.6 "Regional Networks") as one of the platforms relevant for sharing experiences and for learning as well as create synergies for leveraging and scaling up and out.</p> <p>Output 4.1.3 has been revised to read "Best practices and lessons learned shared at landscape, national and regional levels to inform uptake of ILM practices and policy". The activities will include among others, the establishment of the Mt Elgon landscape platform, national level platform. It will also include participation in the AFR100 as detailed in the CEOER and the prodoc.</p>
<p>Project management costs</p> <p>- The PMC reach 5% in the table 4 but are the double in the budget. Please, revise.</p> <p>- The whole project presents a co-financing ratio of 1:9; the pmc presents a cofinancing ratio of 1:7; See if you can slightly increase the cofinancing closer to 1:9.</p>	<p>PMC has been reduced to slightly below 5% in the budget, in the portal and in the CEO ER.</p> <p>It is also now in the ratio of 1:9 with co-financing</p>

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response Answer = N/A

Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
November 4th, 2021

Addressed. To be confirmed at Quality Control.

## **October 5th, 2021**

- The definition of 'investments mobilized' needs to be clarified under the cofinancing table.
- If the investments from the Ugandan governments were identified through the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework, we are wondering if the cofinancing should not be classified as 'public investments'. Please, clarify.
- It is difficult to understand how the proportion of NEMA cofinancing in-kind can be considered as 'investments mobilized', and not 'recurrent expenditures'. Please, clarify and correct.

## **June 18, 2021**

- The letters of cofinancing are available.
- Please, note that the cofinancing to the pmc is not not proportional to the GEF contribution. Please, remove, or justify.

## **Agency Response**

### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The 'Investments Mobilized' was clarified to mean 'those investments that were identified through the analysis and enumeration of existing and future investments of the project stakeholders that will contribute to the attainment of the project objective and outcomes. These investments are mainly contained in programs and projects which are currently in operation and/or in the pipeline for the duration of the period of project implementation. Public investments are those that were identified from the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) budget allocations for the participating ministries and District Local Governments.

The co-financing from NEMA has been clarified and corrected to 'recurrent expenditure'

### **Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

PMC has been reduced to 5% in the budget, in the portal and in the CEO ER.

It is also now in the ratio of 1:9 with co-financing

## **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

- The letter of endorsement mentions a GEF project grant of \$9,433,027 while the project grant mentioned in the portal is \$9,333,027. The difference of \$100,000 comes from the BD focal area. While it is possible to develop a project with values under those reflected in the LoE, we wonder if there is a justification. Please, confirm.
- The amounts requested from BD and incentive do not match those at PFD stage (50k difference in BD and in incentive). Please, clarify.
- See the comments on the budget below.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

The project cost both in the portal and in the CEO ER has been revised to \$9,433,027 to be the same as that in the LOE

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Yes, but please, provide a list of studies and assessments developed under the PPG.

Agency Response

Cleared on 5th October 2021

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

The minutes of meetings, workshop reports and baseline study reports have been uploaded in the portal and also herewith attached as annexes.

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- The points related to the indicator 3.5 and 3.6 are addressed.
- There is no response to the comment made to the Core Indicator 4.3 (510,000 ha under SLM). Please, address in the portal, the request for CEO endorsement, and the project document, including the annex 4 on the result framework. In the prodoc, see paras 126 and 127 in which 300,000 of CSA and SLM are mentioned.
- The number of beneficiaries has not been updated in the annex 4 (result framework).

**Carbon calculations**

- In the portal, about the GHG emissions, enter start year of accounting and the duration of accounting: it should respectively be 2022 and 20 years, please confirm).
- In the prodoc, the Annex 18 on carbon calculation provides 2 Excel documents including each a series of tables corresponding to different sources/sink of GHG with their emission factors and a result. We are facing difficulties to understand the reasoning:
  - o Some tables have a 0 result. Why including them?
  - o The unit used in the table is not mentioned.
  - o When we sum all the results, we get a positive (=emission) number of 94 million... We don't see the overall result of 7,641,541 t CO<sub>2</sub>e reported as CI 6.1 and we can't understand the calculation only with this Annex.

- The agency needs to provide a synthetic table with a calculation including each of the considered land uses in the project and showing as a result the target reported for the core indicator 6.1.
- In the details of Annex 18, each table says in line 6: "Duration: 4 years?". Please ensure the calculation is done over a 20-year period in total (5 years during the project + 15 years after).

## June 18, 2021

- The target for the core indicator 3.1 (area of degraded agricultural lands restored) is 55,000 ha in the portal. However, in the result framework (annex 4), 55,000 ha of restored forests are mentioned under the outcome 3.1 and 56,000 ha of agricultural lands under CSA and SLM are mentioned. Please, make the targets coherent, correct the target under 3.1 and if needed, also fill in the indicator 3.2 (area of forest and forest land restored).
- You included 510,000 ha under the core indicator 4.3 (area of landscapes under SLM in production landscapes), but this target is not reflected in the result framework (annex 4). Please, explain how you obtain this target of 510,000 ha, explain the activities that are connected, and if needed, correct.
- The methodology for the estimation of the GHG emission mitigated is missing. Please provide the method and calculation used.
- Please, explain how you calculated the number of beneficiaries (more than 1.8 million). This number seems high in comparison with similar projects.

## Agency Response

### Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:

The information on Core Indicator 4.3 has been updated in portal, the CEO ER and the ProDoc. Paragraph 126 and 127 have been updated and now reflect 510,000 ha of land under CSA and SLM. The Core Indicator worksheet and the Results Framework have all been updated accordingly.

The number of beneficiaries has been updated in the result framework.

### Carbon calculations

The GHG emissions have been recalculated using FAO EX-ACT tool, with 2022 as the base year for a period of 20 years (2022 ? 2042). The following data (generated by the Trends. Earth Toolbox) were considered in the computation, considering 510,000 ha for improved management, i.e. Afforestation/Reforestation of degraded land (19750 ha), Restoration of degraded wetlands (250 ha) and farmlands (35,000 ha). The calculations also considered improved practices through CSA/SLM of coffee (100,000 ha), Maize (100,000 ha), Potatoes (25,000 ha), Beans and Pulses (25,000 ha) and 50,000 ha of bananas. The calculation also considered 155,000 ha of grazing/pasture land on the

lower slopes of the landscape. The estimated carbon dioxide sequestered is therefore expected to be - **10,834,692 tCO<sub>2</sub>e**.

A synthetic table as well as the original excel workbook indicating the detailed inputs are included as Appendices 18a and 18b respectively

**Response for the GEF review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?</b> Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p><b>June 18, 2021</b></p> <p>- The target for the core indicator 3.1 (<u>area of degraded agricultural lands restored</u>) is 55,000 ha in the portal. However, in the result framework (annex 4), 55,000 ha of <u>restored forests</u> are mentioned under the outcome 3.1 and 56,000 ha of <u>agricultural lands</u> under CSA and SLM are mentioned. Please, make the targets coherent, correct the target under 3.1 and if needed, also fill in the indicator 3.2 (area of forest and forest land restored).</p>	<p>The entry of core indicator 3.1 in the portal has been revised to 56,000, while that of core indicator 3.2 has been captured as 55,000ha. These are now matching with the figures in the logframe of annex 4.</p>
<p>- The methodology for the estimation of the GHG emission mitigated is missing. Please provide the method and calculation used.</p>	<p>The estimation of GHG mitigation was computed using the Carbon Benefit Project tool <a href="https://cbp.nrel.colostate.edu/">https://cbp.nrel.colostate.edu/</a>. The specific calculations used to derive the estimated GHG emissions are provided in Output 2.1.3 of the CEO ER and ProDoc. Detailed reports of the baseline and project scenarios are provided in calculations sheet Appendix 18 Carbon Benefit Project tool calculations sheet.</p>
<p>- Please, explain how you calculated the number of beneficiaries (more than 1.8 million). This number seems high in comparison with similar projects.</p>	<p>The actual number of direct beneficiaries is 191,275 men, 192,764 women and has been recorded in the portal as that. The originally recorded figure of more than 1.8 million was a reference to indirect beneficiaries (the number of adults in the nine project districts).</p>

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response Cleared on June 18, 2021

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- See item 3 and the comment on the SCCF project. We are seeing a connection with the sustainability issues raised below. Sustainability issues'(and then the establishment of financing mechanisms) seem probably a key-point to explore with a partnership with Nespresso. Please, complete.

**June 18, 2021**

It is not the first project in Mont Elgon, on coffee, or on integrated landscapes. Please, provide the lessons from past and ongoing portfolio, including:

- The GEFID 490 ?Kibale Forest Wild Coffee Project?,
- the GEFID 3683 ?Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon?,
- the GEFID 5718 developed by UNEP on PES in Uganda,
- and more recently the LDCF ID 10432 under preparation ?Reviewing High Quality Coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming? with IUCN; IUCN being an operator in this FOLUR project, some connections may be expected.
- We take note that ? Expansion of farmland is therefore closely associated with vast deforestation, wetland degradation and loss of biodiversity? but the description of the global importance of the environment and its degradation remains vague to justify the relevance of the targeted landscape. In particular we don?t know the deforestation rate. A clearer presentation of this aspect is needed. Please, complete.
- There is the need to demonstrate the international connection of the coffee value chain in the targeted landscape (linkages to the export markets for these coffee crops). This connection is still unclear in the proposal;

- The baseline scenario is focused on the government initiatives and related projects.  
Please clarify further how the private sector is engaged in sustainability practices either linked with Government initiatives or independently.

## Agency Response

### Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:

The potential areas of collaboration and synergies between the two projects in the Mt. Elgon landscape are included in the CEO ER (section 1.2.2(d), pg. 28) and the ProDoc (section 2.7(d) as: (i) Training of at least 8,000 farmers on improved and climate smart practices, such as agroforestry. (ii) Promotion of the uptake of resilient farming practices on at least 8,000 hectares of land. (iii) Creating at least 2 new business opportunities for rural entrepreneurs and MSMEs related to on-farm diversification and coffee plant nurseries in Mt. Elgon;

(iv) Creating synergies and leveraging with at least 2 partnerships to support climate adaptation initiatives with partners, with whom Nespresso already have a relationship; and (v) Enabling access to climate adaptation security schemes / technologies such as micro-insurance, weather forecasting and savings products

### Response for the GEF review of 18th June 2021

#### 2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**June 18, 2021**

It is not the first project in Mont Elgon, on coffee, or on integrated landscapes. Please, provide the lessons from past and ongoing portfolio, including:

- The GEFID 490 ?Kibale Forest Wild Coffee Project?,
- the GEFID 3683 ?Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon?,
- the GEFID 5718 developed by UNEP on PES in Uganda,
- and more recently the LDCF ID 10432 under preparation ?Reviewing High Quality Coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming? with IUCN; IUCN being an operator in this FOLUR project, some connections may be expected.

Additional details have been captured (in section 1.2.2 of the CEO ER and 2.7 of the ProDoc) of lessons provided from four GEF projects, viz.

- a). The GEFID 490 ?Kibale Forest Wild Coffee Project? (USD 4,150,000),
- b). The GEFID 3683 ?Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon? (USD 9,250,320),
- c). The GEFID 5718 ?Developing an Experimental Methodology for Testing the Effectiveness of Payments for Ecosystem Services to Enhance Conservation in Productive Landscapes in Uganda? (USD 1,232,400),
- d). The GEFID 10432, ?Reviewing High Quality Coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities? under preparation by IUCN and Nespresso (GEF USD 1,146,790 and co-financing USD 1,900,393) under the GEF/LDCF Challenge Programme. The limitations of the four projects which the proposed GEF project aims to surmount are also provided.

<p>- We take note that ? Expansion of farmland is therefore closely associated with vast deforestation, wetland degradation and loss of biodiversity? but the description of the global importance of the environment and its degradation remains vague to justify the relevance of the targeted landscape. In particular we don't know the deforestation rate. A clearer presentation of this aspect is needed. Please, complete.</p>	<p>The global importance of the Mt. Elgon landscape has been provided in section 1.1a of the CEO ER and 2.2 of the ProDoc.</p> <p>The extent/rates of degradation have been provided (in section 1.1a of the CEO ER and 2.3.1 of the ProDoc), with statistics over a two year period (2018-2020) from data from Trends Earth showing that the region experiences extensive impacts of land degradation in the form of loss of tree cover, severe erosion, increasingly frequent occurrence of landslides and excessive soil nutrient depletion with accompanying loss of carbon stocks. Net downward trends downward trend in soil carbon stocks in grasslands, croplands and wetlands are provided.</p>
<p>- There is the need to demonstrate the international connection of the coffee value chain in the targeted landscape (linkages to the export markets for these coffee crops). This connection is still unclear in the proposal;</p>	<p>The international connection of the coffee value chain (and the other food crops i.e. maize, irish potatoes and bananas) has been elaborated in Component 2 (specifically under Outcome descriptions 2.1 and 2.2).</p>
<p>- The baseline scenario is focused on the government initiatives and related projects. Please clarify further how the private sector is engaged in sustainability practices either linked with Government initiatives or independently.</p>	<p>The involvement of the private sector, especially in market provision and capacity building of the coffee and other food crop farmers has been included in both the CEO ER (section 1.2.2) and the ProDoc (section 2.7).</p>

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- Thanks: the component 2 now reflects better the involvement of smallholder farmer unions, women groups, agroforestry companies to 1) promote the restauration of

agroforestry parklands with native species (also to reduce GHG emissions from land degradation) and 2) increase funding for sustainable coffee production through the establishment of credit financing mechanisms.

- In terms of coordination with other initiatives, we take note of the mention of the SCCF project. However, we would like to see 1) a confirmation of contacts with the SCCF project and 2) a specific plan to coordinate with this project and Nespresso (see *GEFID 10432, ?Reviewing High Quality Coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities?* developed by IUCN and Nespresso ). We are seeing a unique opportunity to bring a prominent private sector partner, in a vision very aligned with the FOLUR IP and a value chain approach. Please, complete.

#### **June 18, 2021**

- Yes, but we would have expected a better focus on the coffee and staple crop value chains in connection with capacity building and empowerment of the private stakeholders. Please, develop.

- The proposed interventions focus on both coffee and staple crops production but the relative importance of each one in the project is unclear while the key targeted value chain should be the coffee one. Please demonstrate a clear priority for the coffee value chain.

- Land tenure security is considered among the root causes of land degradation. Nevertheless this problem does not seem to be addressed in the alternative scenario. Please clarify how the project will ensure this problem will not undermine the project results and their sustainability.

- The articulation with the FOLUR project in Kenya is very important as the complementary of both projects is an excellent opportunity for a greater impact at landscape level and along the value chains. Nevertheless in the alternative scenario, the proposal is unclear how the cooperation between both projects will operate and with which expected results. Please elaborate further on this important element of the project.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The LDCF/SCCF funded project (*Reviewing High Quality Coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities*) developed by IUCN and Nespresso is very pertinent to this project. In addition, IUCN is one of the crucial partners on this GEF-TF funded project (and has already committed their participation as well as co-financing. It is therefore recognized that experiences from the SCCF project will be very useful for the GEF TF project. In view of this, the following text was included to



indicate the potential areas of collaboration and synergies between the SCCF project and this project (*Promoting integrated landscape management approach for conservation of the Mount Elgon ecosystem in Eastern Uganda*) [see section 1.2.2(d), pg. 28 of the CEO ER, and section 2.7 of the ProDoc:

- (i) Training of farmers on improved and climate smart practices, such as agroforestry.
- (ii) Promotion of the uptake of resilient farming practices on at least 8,000 hectares of land.
- (iii) Creating new business opportunities for rural entrepreneurs and MSMEs related to on-farm diversification and coffee plant nurseries in Mt. Elgon;
- (iv) Creating synergies and leveraging with partnerships which Nespresso already has relationships to support climate adaptation initiatives;
- (v) Enabling access to climate adaptation security schemes / technologies such as micro-insurance, weather forecasting and savings products; and

Creating the basis for a Reviving Origins program structure to further scale the model and open new product markets

### **Response for the GEF review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?</b>          Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  <b>June 18, 2021</b></p> <p>- Yes, but we would have expected a better focus on the coffee and staple crop value chains in connection with capacity building and empowerment of the private stakeholders. Please, develop.</p>	<p>The skills enhancement of the private sector (especially the small scale processors of coffee and other food crops such as maize) has now been elaborated in Outcome 2.1 (Output s 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3), as well as Outcome 2.2 (Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2)</p>
<p>- The proposed interventions focus on both coffee and staple crops production but the relative importance of each one in the project is unclear while the key targeted value chain should be the coffee one. Please demonstrate a clear priority for the coffee value chain.</p>	<p>The priority for the coffee value chain has been clarified in Component 2 (Outcome 2, especially Output 2.1.3)</p>

<p>- Land tenure security is considered among the root causes of land degradation. Nevertheless this problem does not seem to be addressed in the alternative scenario. Please clarify how the project will ensure this problem will not undermine the project results and their sustainability.</p>	<p>In the Mt. Elgon region, customary land tenure is the prevalent system. Under this tenure, land is divided among clans, which in turn divide it among households. Households holding land under customary tenure are expected to bequeath land to their children. This contributes to land fragmentation. Under component 1, the project will implement activities that will develop comprehensive land use plan(s) as a basis for integrated land management, while respecting the prevailing tenure rights of the landowners. The project will utilize participatory approaches to develop and mainstream the land use plans into district development plans (Outputs 1.1.1 ? 1.1.3). To ensure smooth operation of the land use plans, the project will strengthen the institutional and governance systems (Outcome 1.2).</p>
<p>- The articulation with the FOLUR project in Kenya is very important as the complementary of both projects is an excellent opportunity for a greater impact at landscape level and along the value chains. Nevertheless, in the alternative scenario, the proposal is unclear how the cooperation between both projects will operate and with which expected results. Please elaborate further on this important element of the project.</p>	<p>The complementary relationship between the two FOLUR projects (Uganda and Kenya) has been elaborated in Component 1 (Output 1.1.2) and Component 4 (Output 4.1.3).</p>

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- Probably to amend to include common exercise with the SCCF project, IUCN, and Nespresso. Please, complete.

**June 18, 2021**

See above, about the component 4, the connection with the FOLUR Global Platform and the Kenya project.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

A further elaboration of the alignment with the LDCF/SCCF project of IUCN and Nespresso has been made and included under section 1.4 of the CEO ER and section 3.1 (para 89) of the ProDoc.

##### **Response for the GEF review of 18th June 2021**

<b>4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?</b> Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request <b>June 18, 2021</b>  See above, about the component 4, the connection with the FOLUR Global Platform and the Kenya project.	The project alignment with focal area/impact program strategies is presented in detail in sections 1.4 and 1c of the CEO ER, as well as
---	---

##### **5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Cleared on June 18, 2021

##### **6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- Comment still valid for the core indicator 6 (carbon calculations), indicator 4.3, and indicator 11 (beneficiaries).

**June 18, 2021**

yes, but some targets should be verified and explained.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The information on Core Indicator 4.3 has been updated in portal, the CEO ER and the ProDoc. Paragraph 126 and 127 have been updated and now reflect 510,000 ha of land under CSA and SLM. The Core Indicator worksheet and the Results Framework have all been updated accordingly.

(see Output 2.2.3 in the CEO ER and ProDoc).

##### Carbon calculations

Under Indicator 6, the carbon calculations have been estimated at - **10,834,692 tCO<sub>2</sub>e** over a 20-year period.

Under indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender has been updated to 191,275 males and 192,764 females in 75,754 households, giving a total of 384,039 direct beneficiaries.

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

- We suggest including the action plan with Nespresso (SCCF project) in the sustainability aspects about the value chain approach.

**June 18, 2021**

The sections about innovation, sustainability, and scaling up could be better;

- As mentioned about the result framework, some innovations in terms of impact evaluation could be explored (impact of awareness, behavior change, adoption of new CSA/SLM practices).
- Sustainability aspects should also be explored through the coffee and staple crop value chains in connection with the empowerment of the private sector. Please, revise.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The potential for collaboration with Nespresso has been included in the ProDoc (section 3.8) as well as section 1.7.2 of the CEO ER.

**Response for the GEF review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?</b></p> <p>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request <b>June 18, 2021</b></p> <p>The sections about innovation, sustainability, and scaling up could be better;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- As mentioned about the result framework, some innovations in terms of impact evaluation could be explored (impact of awareness, behavior change, adoption of new CSA/SLM practices).</li></ul>	<p>The section of 'innovation, sustainability and scaling up' has been improved with additional text, especially on innovativeness and environmental sustainability (section 1.7 of the CEO ER and section 3.8 of the ProDoc).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sustainability aspects should also be explored through the coffee and staple crop value chains in connection with the empowerment of the private sector. Please, revise.</li></ul>	<p>Sustainability aspects have been improved with additional text, especially on innovativeness and environmental sustainability (section 1.7 of the CEO ER and section 3.8 of the ProDoc).</p>

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response Cleared on June 18, 2021

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Yes, but component 4 to be improved.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

<b>Child Project</b>  <b>If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?</b> Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, but component 4 to be improved.	Cleared on 18 June 2021 The contribution of the project to the overall program impact is provided in section 1.C of the CEO ER. In addition, a specific output (4.1.4) has been created to provide for activities to achieve sharing of lessons learned at regional and global program meetings including the Kenya Mt Elgon project.
---	--

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Cleared on June 18, 2021

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,**

**does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**November 4th, 2021**

Addressed.

**October 5th, 2021**

The gender action plan indeed includes a strategy to mainstream gender issues in view of reducing inequalities. Our point was to make these aspects more prominent in the text of the full project document and not only limited/separated in an annex.

We take note of the involvement of the Ministry in charge of Gender, Labor, and Social Development.

**June 18, 2021**

Yes, but one point to improve: The gender aspects could be better mainstreamed in the text related to the outputs and activities. We need more than disaggregate information, but proactive actions to reduce inequalities (access to lands, access to project resources and financing...). Please, revise.

Agency Response

**Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The aspects on gender mainstreaming that are contained in the gender action plan have been integrated in several sections of the ProDoc and CEO ER (see Output 1.1.1, Activity 2; Output 1.1.2, Activity 2; Output 1.1.3, Activity 2; Output 1.1.4; Output 1.2.2; Output 1.2.3; Output 2.1.1; Output 2.1.3; Output 2.2.1; and Output 3.1.1).

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

and the Gender mainstreaming has been done in the activities outlined in the project implementation strategy. A detailed strategy of gender mainstreaming is provided in Appendix 16: Gender Mainstreaming Plan

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 5th, 2021**

- Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

- Yes, as mentioned above, the role and empowerment of the private stakeholders could be better highlighted to emphasize the importance of value chain approaches. The private sector is relatively poorly described in the Portal entry. There is a need to better describe the private sector engagement (including a presentation of each kind of stakeholders) and the considered value chains.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

The section of Private Sector Engagement (section 4 of the CEO ER) has provided further elaboration of the private sector organizations and their contribution to the specific value chains.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**



- We would like to see more elaborated risks at short term, long term, and eventually opportunities, related to the current pandemic, as well as appropriate mitigation measures. Please refer to the following information:  
<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>; Please, revise.
- Same comment on the risks related to climate change. Please, complete.

#### Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>Risks to Achieving Project Objectives</b></p> <p><b>Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?</b> Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p><b>June 18, 2021</b></p> <p>- We would like to see more elaborated risks at short term, long term, and eventually opportunities, related to the current pandemic, as well as appropriate mitigation measures. Please refer to the following information: <a href="https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future">https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future</a>; Please, revise.</p>	<p>This has been done in section 5 (CEO ER) and section 3.5 (ProDoc) by elaborating in more detail the risks (short and long term) and mitigation measures and opportunities that the current pandemic present to the activities and outputs from the project.</p>
<p>- Same comment on the risks related to climate change. Please, complete.</p>	<p>Clarification of the short term and long term measures to mitigate against climate change have been clarified in section 5 (CEO ER) and section 3.5 (ProDoc).</p>

#### Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

We take note that the field officers are not budgeted anymore. They have been replaced by technical officers on NRM, agriculture, and communication. Their respective budget is now spread among different components. Cleared.

**June 18, 2021**

- Could you please elaborate the role of three field officers (for the three conventions?)?

### Agency Response

#### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The project will require the services of a **Natural Resource Management Specialist** (*ecosystem restoration, climate change mitigation and adaptation, integrated natural resource planning*), **Agricultural Specialist** (*Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA), Sustainable Land Management (SLM), on farm diversification and development and operationalization of coffee and staple crops value chains*) and a **Communications Specialist** (communicating project results and lessons learned to stakeholders in a simple language that is understandable to even non-scientists). The detailed roles of these specialists have been elaborated in Appendix 11 ? Terms of Reference for key personnel

#### **Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

The focus on the three conventions in the recruitment of the field officers has been revised. Being a multi-focal project that covers the areas of biodiversity conservation, agricultural production and climate change, it will be important to recruit experts in these fields including communication. In that regard, we propose that the project will require the services of a **Natural Resource Management Specialist** (*ecosystem restoration, climate change mitigation and adaptation, integrated natural resource planning*), **Agricultural Specialist** (*Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA), Sustainable Land Management (SLM), on farm diversification and development and operationalization of coffee and staple crops value chains*) and a **Communications Specialist** (communicating project results and lessons learned to stakeholders in a simple language that is understandable to even non-scientists). The detailed roles of these specialists have been elaborated in Appendix 11 ? Terms of Reference for key personnel.

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

We would have expected a more detailed analysis of the LDN targets adopted in Uganda. See [https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn\\_targets/2019-10/Uganda%20LDN%20Country%20Commitments.pdf](https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn_targets/2019-10/Uganda%20LDN%20Country%20Commitments.pdf) and [https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn\\_targets/Uganda%20LDN%20TSP%20Country%20Report.pdf](https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn_targets/Uganda%20LDN%20TSP%20Country%20Report.pdf).

Please, complete.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

A detailed analysis of land degradation neutrality is provided in section 1.6 (CEO ER) and section 3.1 (ProDoc).

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Yes, please, see the comments on the component 4 above.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

This has been addressed by making several elaborations to component 4, including the introduction of a new Output 4.1.4

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response Cleared on June 18, 2021

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Thanks. Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Yes, but there is a missed opportunity to bring some innovations and make a demonstration about the role of awareness and incentives on behavioral change (see the work of King Climate Action Initiative, MIT, [King Climate Action Initiative \(K-CAI\) | The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab](#)).

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

Additionally, Innovative interventions such as CSA & SLM, farm diversification, incentives (revolving funds and credit schemes), sustainable market linkages and responsible value chains for reduction of vulnerability of local community to natural disasters and climate change and empowering them to conserve HVCF and therefore maintaining or enhancing carbon stocks and biodiversity conservation as well as mitigating the impacts of climate have now been included in the section of ?innovativeness? of the proposal (section 1.7.1 ? CEO ER).

## **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request November 4th, 2021**

We take note of the baseline information on the state of the vehicle fleet, as well as the need for (at least) three vehicles. We find the reasoning acceptable. The budget for the drivers has been decreased down to three likewise. Cleared.

Other budget issues: To be Confirmed at Quality Control.

### **October 5th, 2021**

In the Excel Budget:

- In the note 4, we should read 244,800, and not 24,4800.
- Quarterly and annual report (\$32,000)? Could you please, clarify the nature of these activities to justify \$32,000 for project reports?
- Bank charges are not eligible as activity per se: please, remove.
- Still, we recommend removing the notion of ?project coordination? in technical outputs, or the control quality may ask to move this item to pmc.
- We take note of the explanations about the need for three vehicles and the fact that no new vehicle can be purchased from cofinancing. However, the different partners (Ministries, private sector) are currently using some vehicles. Please, provide the number of active vehicles from the cofinancing partner.

### **June 18, 2021**

- About the annex E on the budget: Please include in the portal 1) a budget summary and 2) a budget per component. Pay attention at the format and the margins.

Budget:

- For a project amount of \$9,333,027, the project management costs should not go beyond 5%, or \$444,429 and the rest (\$8,888,597) should feed the technical components. Please, revise.
- Please, explain and justify the three Senior Project Officers positions.
- Please, move the drivers to the pmc.
- We take note of the rationale for the four 4x4 vehicles. However, 1) we would like to see an estimate of the baseline situation, with the vehicles currently used by the executing and cofinancing partners; 2) Please, explore cofinancing opportunities to cover some of vehicle costs (or recurrent vehicles).
- Without anticipating the number of vehicles that will be acceptable at the end of the review, please note that the vehicles should not be covered by pmc. Please, revise.
- Please, clarify the budget item 50 ?Project coordination and restoration of fragile ecosystems- NEMA?. Any budget related to project coordination should be moved to pmc.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response for the GEF review of 5th Oct 2021:**

The figure has been adjusted to 244,800 in the budget notes (Note 4)

The budget for production of quarterly and annual reports has been adjusted to USD 8,000 (at USD 2,000 per year).

Bank charges have been deleted from the budget.

Project coordination has been removed from the responsibility of NEMA under technical outputs (and left only ?Restoration of degraded ecosystems i.e. wetlands, river banks, unstable slopes and hilltops).

The project partners include 6 government ministries/agencies, 2 NGOs, 9 local governments and 7 private sector agencies.

During PDA, a discussion on vehicles revealed that, apart from project vehicles which have their specific duties and routines without any flexibility to work on other projects or assignments, government agencies may have about 5 vehicles that are used by assigned officers. These vehicles normally have run over 300,000 km and simply cannot operate in the Mt. Elgon terrain. Deploying such vehicles to such a terrain is a recipe for stalling on project progress through exorbitant repair costs.

The private sector agencies which are in partnership in this project are not any better. Apart from UCDA whose officers drive personal cars on an arrangement with their organizations, the rest of the private sector players do not even own a car for their businesses.

ICRAF and IUCN each has 3 and 9 vehicles respectively. However, even these are project vehicles and are deployed on their respective project activities

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

<p><b>Annexes</b></p> <p><b>Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?</b>          Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  <b>June 18, 2021</b></p> <p>- About the annex E on the budget: Please include in the portal 1) a budget summary and 2) a budget per component. Pay attention at the format and the margins.</p>	
<p>Budget:</p> <p>- For a project amount of \$9,333,027, the project management costs should not go beyond 5%, or \$444.429 and the rest (\$8,888,597) should feed the technical components. Please, revise.</p>	<p>1) a budget summary and 2) a budget per component and per year have been added in portal</p>
<p>- Please, explain and justify the three Senior Project Officers positions.</p>	<p>The PMC budget has been revised and fixed at \$448,000 (0.049%)</p>
<p>- Please, explain and justify the three Senior Project Officers positions.</p>	<p>Justification for the three project officers has been done in section 5.1 (CEO ER) and section 4.4 (ProDoc) as well as in Appendix 11 (Terms of Reference for key project personnel).</p>
<p>- Please, move the drivers to the pmc.</p>	<p>The drivers have been moved to PMC</p>

<p>- We take note of the rationale for the four 4x4 vehicles. However, 1) we would like to see an estimate of the baseline situation, with the vehicles currently used by the executing and co-financing partners; 2) Please, explore co-financing opportunities to cover some of vehicle costs (or recurrent vehicles).</p>	<p>The number of vehicles has been reduced to three (3). Their rationale and baseline situation justifying their need has been presented in the budget notes.</p> <p>To ensure the success of the project, it is critical that three all-terrain vehicles are dedicated to the project, based on the following factors: The terrain and landscape of the Mt. Elgon region has been a critical factor in ease of transport for all projects that have been implemented in the area. In most cases, many projects have failed to achieve all their objectives by the close of project time due to inadequacies in transport. This project aims to achieve all the project outputs on time by ensuring that all project areas are reached on time. The project has been structured so that there are concurrent activities in Land use and management, biodiversity conservation and management, and climate change and vulnerability management. This requires dedicated vehicles to assist the project teams in these three project focus areas to implement the project without any transport impediments. These three vehicles will solely be dedicated to field work. In addition, the PMU requires a vehicle for coordination and management work. This need for readily available and flexible transportation during project implementation was duly discussed with the project partners during co-financing discussions. All the partners noted the need for this but were only able to provide co-financing in the areas they indicated due to funds commitments which had already been made. The request is therefore for GEF to facilitate this critical component, given the challenges in the mountainous Elgon region and ensure that this project does not go the way of previous projects due to transportation bottlenecks.</p>
<p>- Without anticipating the number of vehicles that will be acceptable at the end of the review, please note that the vehicles should not be covered by pmc. Please, revise.</p>	<p>The budget for the vehicles has been removed from PMC</p>
<p>- Please, clarify the budget item 50 ?Project coordination and restoration of fragile ecosystems-NEMA?. Any budget related to project coordination should be moved to pmc.</p>	<p>This has been clarified in the budget notes, as this budget is earmarked for restoration of fragile ecosystems, and not for coordination</p>



**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response cleared on 18 June 2021

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

N/A

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Even if there is no specific comment on Uganda from STAP and Council, some general comments apply to all the Child Projects and should thus be addressed under the Annex B in the Portal entry. Please, check these comments under the PFD #10201 and respond appropriately.

Agency Response

**Cleared on 5th October 2021**

**Answer for the review of 18th June 2021**

<b>Council comments</b>	<b>Response to council comments is below</b>
-------------------------	--

<p><b>? France Comments</b></p> <p>? France of course supports this project which aims at the sustainable management of land and forests and the greening / sustainability of value chains by targeting large producer countries.</p> <p>? It would be interesting to explore potential coordination with the French national strategy to combat imported deforestation (SNDI), the European strategies on the subject, and with the alliance for tropical forests.</p> <p>? (Note that translation in English from French is by the GEF Secretariat)</p>	<p>The Uganda child project will promote several initiatives that integrate coordination and/or collaboration with several European initiatives on deforestation. Through support of deforestation-free commodities, High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss will be avoided while climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices and an increase in vegetation cover across landscape will be promoted. Appropriate restoration strategies will be used to restore degraded natural ecosystems. Participate in the AFR100 regional and global meetings and conferences to identify, and tap into technical support and financial resources to support upscaling of priority restoration efforts, and drive sector investments in zero deforestation agriculture, food security and climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>
<p><b>? Germany Comments</b></p> <p>Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:</p> <p>? Germany asks to clarify the following aspects in the final project proposal: How will local governments and civil society organizations in the respective countries be strengthened as change agents of an enabling environment? What are country specific risks and mitigation strategies with regards to current political priorities and institutional capacities (esp. with regard to environmental, civil society and indigenous issues)? How is the LDN response hierarchy addressed (priority on avoiding land degradation) in order not to incentivize degradation through restoration support?</p> <p>? In addition, Germany recommends taking into account ongoing initiatives of the German ONE WORLD - No Hunger Initiative regarding the Green Innovation Centres for the Agriculture and Food Sector (i.a. in Nigeria, India) as well as regarding Soil Conservation and Soil Rehabilitation for Food Security (India).</p>	<p>The Uganda child project will be implemented in partnership with all the nine district local governments in the Mt. Elgon landscape. Under Component 1, the project will support the mainstreaming of Integrated Landscape Management approaches and biodiversity conservation into the district development plans. In addition, the strengthen the institutional and organizational capabilities of district extension workers, key local government leaders and civil society through training in governance, law enforcement and compliance monitoring to improve the regulatory environment, tenure rights and security of land rights holders, and encourage multi-stakeholder engagement. In order not to incentivize degradation through restoration support, the respective LDN hierarchy (Avoid, Reduce and Reverse) is addressed through: (i) using practices that increase land use/management planning, or climate smart agriculture [Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4 and 2.1.1], (ii) Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices [Outputs 2.1.1], and (iii) restoration or rehabilitation of degraded unproductive land (Output 3.1.3).</p>

<p><b>? Canada Comments</b></p> <p>? We recommend that Fundacion para la Conservacion del Bosque Chiquitano (FCBC) be invited to be a stakeholder in this GEF project. FCBC is a non-profit organization based in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, whose geographic scope includes the entire department of Santa Cruz and focuses on the ecosystems with the greatest environmental vulnerability, especially the Chiquitano Dry Forest, the Cerrado and the Chaco. FCBC has promoted the design and implementation of around 500 projects and initiatives at different scales, especially in the Chiquitania region, both with the public and private sectors and in close collaboration with the social actors and authorities of the region and with different local and national and international partner organizations.</p>	<p>Not applicable to Uganda</p>
<p><b>? United States Comments</b></p> <p>? We support the FOLUR program and these addenda and have some additional comments for improvement. First, our understanding of the phrase and concept of ?food systems? and ?transforming food systems? refers to a holistic, systems-approach to food and agriculture, including very prominently, nutrition and diet. The lack therefore, of mention of nutrition and diet in the projects is of concern, and we recommend that these important concepts not be isolated from broader transformative work on the biodiversity and ecosystem, and overall environment sustainability considerations of food system transformation discussions. ? Additionally, we will closely track the performance of both Nucafe and the Bugisu Co-op, which we believe will benefit from close monitoring.</p>	<p>We welcome this comment and take note of its importance. We relate this to the inclusion of food crops (maize, banana, beans and Irish potato) production systems, in addition to the main target i.e. coffee production system (see Outcome 2.1 of the ProDoc, Section 1.3 of the CEO ER). These crops were selected for, among other reasons, food security and nutrition, in harmony with Uganda?s Vision 2040 and the third National Development Plan (NDP III) (2020/2021?2024/2025). Additionally, the private sector organization NUCAFE was not able to join in the partnership, due to other commitments on the development of a similar project in Uganda. However, three other private sector organizations (Kalaa Mugosi Women Empowerment Ltd, Mt. Elgon Agroforestry Communities Cooperative Enterprise Ltd and Bushika Integrated Area Cooperative Enterprise Ltd) showed interest and joined the project partnership. These will benefit from close monitoring.</p>

#### STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 5th, 2021**

Addressed.

**June 18, 2021**

Even if there is no specific comment on Uganda from STAP and Council, some general comments apply to all the Child Projects and should thus be addressed under the Annex B in the Portal entry. Please, check these comments under the PFD #10201 and respond appropriately.

Agency Response [Cleared on 5th October 2021](#)

Answer for the review of 18th June 2021

### Annex B: Response to STAP comments in the Project Reviews

#### Guidance from STAP

Comment/Question	Response from the Uganda child project
<p><b>STAP Overall Assessment</b></p> <p>More detail should be provided during full program development regarding systematic risk identification and assessment of risk management options and strategies.</p> <p>Gender equality aspects merit deeper analysis during full program preparation, particularly regarding barriers to gender-equitable resource access and tenure rights, and to inclusive decision-making in landscape-level planning and policy formulation.</p>	<p>Risks have been systematically identified in a participatory approach with stakeholders and are specified in section 3.5 of the ProDoc and section 5 of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>A detailed analysis of barriers hindering gender equitable resource access and tenure rights was carried out during the PPG phase and is presented in the description of the gender barriers section 2.3 of the ProDoc and section 1.1 of the CEO Endorsement Request. In addition, further gender analysis will be conducted as a focus for Output 1.1.4 (<i>Barriers hindering gender (women, men, people with disabilities (PWDs), youth, vulnerable groups etc.) from participating in ILM approaches identified and addressed</i>), resulting into a specific Gender Action Plan, which will guide implementation of actions to equitable gender participation and decision making in ILM. In addition, a gender mainstreaming plan has been developed as Appendix 16 of the ProDoc</p>
<b>The proposed alternative scenario</b>	

<p><b>What is the theory of change?</b></p> <p>Given the breadth of the program, it would be advisable to additionally develop, in consultation with key partners, a particular theory of change for each of the value chains, drawing upon a common language of the overall program theory of change. This would both clarify the change pathways that each constellation of value chain and country partners will pursue, and it would enable comparative analysis and exchange across these groupings.</p>	<p>The Uganda child project will specifically address the coffee crop value chain and production system. The theory of change for the Uganda project therefore mainly focuses on coffee as the main strategic crop for the global FOLUR project. Therefore, the ToC provide change pathways for: a) Development of Integrated Landscape Management Systems, b) Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible commodity value chains, i.e. CSA in coffee, banana, maize, Irish potato production; c) Restoration of natural habitats (forests); and d) Knowledge management</p>
<p><b>Is there recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</b></p> <p>Possible adaptations not addressed as part of the theory of change but later as part of the risk assessment and risk management plan.</p>	<p>Adaptations required during project implementation are recognised and have been planned for. These include: 1) mainstreaming of mitigation and adaptation strategies/plans into national and district development plans; 2) strengthening the institutional and organizational capabilities of sub-national and national institutions for the implementation of ILM through training and organisational management; 3) participatory land use management planning process leading to effective land use plans.</p>
<p><b>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</b></p> <p>The main emphasis is on local and regional benefits, and the resulting GEBs. Little attention is devoted to trade-offs and possibly negative side effects, though social and environmental risks are mentioned in the Risks section. There is little explicit attention to power dynamics, including potential winners and losers from the changes envisioned and how potential conflicts may be addressed. This will be essential to address explicitly during the course of full program development, with regards to each value chain and country project.</p>	<p>The power dynamics, potential winners and losers are presented in a carefully considered risk identification form (Appendix 10), in which the mitigation measures are also considered. A detailed conflict (grievances) resolution mechanism is provided in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix 15).</p>

<p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p> <p>Climate resilience not addressed in detail, though mentioned in the section on risks. The proposed response to climate change is quite general at this level; more detail expected in development of country projects and in program-level monitoring and targeted capacity support functions.</p>	<p>The project specific activities that will be implemented to promote climate resilience are provided in great detail in Component 2 (Output 2.1.1) and Component 3 (Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2). In addition, climate screening was carried out during the PPG phase and the report of this exercise (Appendix 9) provides measures for promoting climate resilience during project implementation.</p>
<p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> <p>The program is innovative in its concept, structure, and the combination of global and country-level engagements. Specific innovations are expected to emerge from CPs. Emphasis is on policy and institutional innovations. More thinking about possible technological, financing, and business model innovations would be desirable, from which each country and the IP as a whole could benefit. The theory of change relies strongly on the interactions between innovations at landscape / country level and in regional / global value chains. Therefore, attention is needed during full program development to explicitly identify innovations at each of these levels. Given the broad geographic and value chain coverage of the program, a hallmark contribution may be innovative approaches to rapidly scale tested solutions ? working across countries and value chains. Moreover, a view on the different ways to scale (see notes on scaling out, up or deep in STAP priority criteria document) would also ask whether there are cultural norms or other cultural barriers which require innovative responses as well, for example, in areas such as consumer demand, rule enforcement, or indigenous peoples' rights. These may not be the most salient barriers, but it is useful to explicitly consider these</p>	<p>The Uganda child project has been designed in to deliver innovative interventions such as CSA &amp; SLM, farm diversification, incentives (revolving funds and credit schemes), sustainable market linkages and responsible value chains reduce the vulnerability of local community to natural disasters and climate change and empowers them to conserve HVCF which maintains or enhances carbon stocks and biodiversity conservation and mitigates impacts of climate change. In addition, initiatives such as promoting the Community Environment Conservation Fund (CECF) and sustainable agriculture production is an innovative incentive finance scheme for forest landscape restoration (FLR) which has the full support of government to integrate it into planning for sustainability. With respect to cultural barriers, these have been carefully considered in the risk analysis (section 3.5 of the ProDoc and section 5 of the CEO ER) and measures have been put in place in the design of the project to avoid any conflict in this area.</p>

<p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p> <p>Given the geographic and commodity coverage of this IP, scaling up beyond country-level outcomes is integral to planned program-level outcomes, targeting fundamental transformation in food systems. Achieving these outcomes at scale is likely to be more difficult than it seems to be depicted. In particular, the scaling potential relies significantly on shifting patterns of investment, with the intent that ?policy and coordination platforms will crowd-in investment,? but it remains unclear how this will be achieved. Barriers to adoption of innovations at landscape level and in value chains are addressed well, if still at a general level, in the discussion of governance issues and in program risks. But explicit barriers to scaling and transformation are less well-covered. The program design brings the advantage of planned engagement with key industry platforms, partnerships and global initiatives that, collectively, bring a vast range of experience, including experience confronting barriers to scaling and system transformation. The PFD notes plans for in-depth consultation during full program development. This should offer an excellent opportunity to probe this experience, including participatory processes to surface emergent lessons that may not yet have been explicitly identified and documented.</p>	<p>The Uganda child project provides a detailed and well-articulated pathway for knowledge management (sharing, learning and scaling up) through which improved Integrated Landscape Management approaches at landscape, national and regional levels is expected to be realized. The Project will contribute to lessons learned and good practices for wider adoption, replication, leveraging and dissemination of FOLUR IP actions and results through landscape, country, regional and global platforms and knowledge networks in collaboration with the Global Platform. This will be achieved by delivering on four gender-responsive outputs and activities: (i) developing and operationalizing an interactive M&amp;E system for purposes of scaling out in similar areas in Uganda (Output 4.1.1), (ii) documenting best practices and lessons learned and training key stakeholders in that respect for sustainability purposes (output 4.1.2) and, (iii) sharing of best practices and lessons learned through multi-stakeholder platforms linked to AFR 100 to inform uptake of ILM practices and policy (Output 4.1.3), and (iv) sharing best practices and lessons learned through regional and global FOLUR partners and CPs meetings and conferences (Output 4.1.4).</p>
--	---

<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p> <p>Yes, including strong identification of relevant multi-stakeholder platforms and initiatives. Multi-stakeholder interactions and collaboration are at the heart of the program design. Various types of interactions are discussed, but in the next stage of program development these should be presented more specifically to assess their feasibility and potential effectiveness. In particular, it will be essential to describe the value addition of the IP in relation to existing platforms and initiatives, and to validate (from the perspective of actors engaged in these) the demand for specific inputs, knowledge products, policy dialogue activities, or other services. Moreover, it will be essential to show plans for ensuring that all child projects are appropriately engaged with the appropriate global and regional platforms during the period of full project design. If this is done in particular with an eye to testing and validating for each country project the barriers, planned innovations and theory of change, this can help bring critical insights to project design that will aid subsequent scaling at the program level.</p>	<p>Yes, all the key stakeholders have been identified in a comprehensive and detailed exercise which took place during PPG. The full trail of the consultations is provided as annexes in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix 15).</p>
<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p> <p>All key public and private sector actors assumed to join in following their respective mandates and commitments. Expected engagement of civil society actors is dependent upon existing networks and platforms.</p>	<p>A detailed description of the stakeholders roles is provided in section 2.5 of the ProDoc and section 2 of the CEO ER. The roles will vary and include receiving and disbursing project funding, technical guidance on climate change, climate smart agriculture, forest and restoration, value chain development and value addition, knowledge management, planning, compliance with statutory and policy requirements, gender equity, tree planting, forest restoration and conservation, wildlife management and conservation, community-based natural resource management including livelihood activities, promotion of sustainable coffee production, increased quality coffee production and marketing, market acquisition for smallholder farmers livelihoods, training and research.</p>



<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p> <p>Yes, including strong intention to develop action plans that address linked dimensions of access to productive assets, inclusive decision-making, and benefit sharing. Gender sensitive indicators are missing ? but dimensions above indicate a suitable framework. Consider applying indicators and measurement protocols of Women?s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI).</p>	<p>Yes, gender differentiated risks and opportunities have been identified and an action plan of their mitigation has been developed as a gender mainstreaming plan (Appendix 16).</p>
<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p> <p>No hindrance indicated, but this merits deeper analysis during full program preparation, particularly regarding barriers to gender-equitable resource access and tenure rights, and to inclusive decision-making in landscape-level planning and policy formulation.</p>	<p>Yes, gender hindrances, such as lack of equal access to and ownership of property (including land) have been indicated, but a deep analysis has been performed during the PPG, and several mitigation measures and opportunities have been identified (see the Gender mainstreaming plan ? Appendix 16). The project plans to reinforce this by conducting a detailed gender gap analysis at the outset and using these lessons to reinforce the gender mainstreaming plan.</p>
<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>Various kinds of policy, government and other stakeholder risks are mentioned (such as policy change, non-delivery of agreed contributions). While generic policy and governance risks are noted, there is inadequate explicit attention to political and economic interests that could (and are likely to) oppose desired changes.</p>	<p>Yes, several social and environmental risks with the potential to affect the project have been identified. These include gender inequity and inequality; low environmental impact awareness; biodiversity loss; and diminishing carbon stocks. Several mitigation measures contained in section 2.5 of the ProDoc, section 3.5 of the CEO ER, Appendices 9, 10, 15 and 16) have been identified for these risks.</p>

<p>How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p> <p>Although various longer-term drivers are identified (as summarized in the 'contextual factors', theory of change Fig.2), their implications are poorly analysed. FOLUR cannot expect to change these, but it can ensure that all projects are thinking about the significance of these factors and whether they mean different approaches might be more robust to future change. This would consider, for example, if future climate may undermine productivity of (or even demand for) a current staple in a region, then either improved management of that staple is addressed as an explicitly interim strategy while other solutions are developed; or improved management might be aimed at a different crop that is robust to the expected change in climate. Either way, at least the project level activities should include discussion of these possibilities early in design.</p>	<p>The Mt. Elgon region, under a no intervention scenario, expects to experience increased water shortage, crop damage/loss, household food insecurity, soil erosion, water pollution and increased incidences of diseases. The project has, however, identified interventions to address these climate risks through ILM, SLM, CSA, restoration and knowledge sharing.</p>
<p>Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p> <p>No climate impact assessment is presented; only the possibility of climate change impacts on productivity and resilience is alluded to. Since impacts will be region and location-specific, climate impact assessments and response strategies will need to be developed in the country projects.</p>	<p>Yes, a rapid climate change assessment has been performed under the CRISTAL tool. This has identified drought, landslides and flooding as the major risks for the Mt. Elgon landscape.</p>
<p>Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p> <p>Climate mitigation and adaptation goals are well integrated in the high-level program description, and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices and technologies are integral to the planned landscape-level responses. Yet, assessment of program-level sensitivity to climate impacts is not presented.</p>	<p>Yes, climate mitigation and adaptation measures have been considered in the project. These include CSA practices as well as other interventions such protection of water sources and river banks (Output 3.1.3), promotion of drought resistant and early maturing crop varieties (Output 2.1.1), development of food storage infrastructure (Outcome 2.2), Contour/grass bunds (Output 2.1.1).</p>

<p><b>What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</b></p> <p>Only generic reference to national climate change action plans is made. Systematic climate impact and adaptation assessments will require atmospheric/climate scientists to produce a range of plausible scenarios of regional climate change for the next few decades, and ecological, technology / economic experts to assess the potential impacts on climate-sensitive ecosystems and sectors together with various types of vulnerability and adaptation options under those scenarios. In addition, the Risk table mentions possible but significant social and environmental risks posed by the country projects but does not indicate what risks; only the Global Coordination Project is mentioned to undertake risk assessment and mitigation advisory service. More detail should be provided during full program development regarding systematic risk identification and assessment of risk management options and strategies.</p>	<p>The project will collect the following information to address the climate risks and resilience enhancement measures: i) land use, ii) vulnerability to climate change impacts, iii) integrated natural resource management technologies and good practices, iv) ecosystems (water, forests, pasture land, agricultural land, wetlands, rivers, etc.), v) local livelihoods, strengths and weaknesses, and vi) gaps in local government development plans on land use planning, climate change and vulnerability. This information will be a starting point for: a) identifying suitable adaptation and resilience measures that reduce vulnerability, increase adaptive capacities and decrease sensitivity to climate variability and change; b) developing indicators for tracking changes in climate change vulnerability over time; c) monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) of adaptation/resilience measures, and d) generating additional knowledge on the effectiveness of the adaptation/resilience measures applied.</p>
<p><b>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</b></p> <p>KM is a central element of the program. One of the three pillars of the global platform is explicitly devoted to KM and communications. Yet no KM indicators and metrics are specified; these will be needed to prepare more specific KM plans and actions. As noted in the main STAP screen, KM is a central element of the program, and the explicit focus of one of the three global platform pillars. Yet no KM indicators and metrics are specified; doing so will be important to help prepare more specific KM plans and actions. development. Also, although learning is discussed, it is not yet clear how this learning will be applied to support adaptive management in program implementation, for example using a regular review of the nested theories of change at program and project levels as a structured approach to this. See, for example, Thornton et al (2017) for description of such an approach. Thornton, P.K., Schuetz, T., Forch, W., Cramer, L., Abreu, D., Vermeulen, S. &amp; Campbell, B.M. 2017 Responding to global change: A theory of change approach to making agricultural research for development outcome-based. <i>Agricultural Systems</i> 152, 145-153.</p>	<p>Knowledge management has been considered by the Uganda child project as a very important and distinct component. The approach taken by the project to facilitate and enhance knowledge management (sharing, learning and scaling up) is through an interactive M&amp;E system to track implementation of ILM in Mt. Elgon landscape for purposes of scaling out in similar areas in Uganda and beyond. This will result into the following indicators: i) better understanding, amongst local farmers, of the connection between farmland productivity and ecosystem health (reduced land degradation, restored watersheds, increased crop yields), ii) improved local level policies on agriculture and related other sectoral policies, iii) enhanced learning at local to national levels, through better access to information, networking, capacity building and leadership development, and iv) community interaction and peace building.</p>

<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p> <p>Proposed plans for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results are presented at a general level. They include a global platform for transferring knowledge and information in multiple directions: from country programs up, from the global dissemination platform down, and through fostering South-South exchange. The planned focal activities (testing methods, learning, capturing, sharing lessons) are reasonably identified at this stage. The specified objectives are also sensible but a more detailed operational plan would be needed during full program development.</p>	<p>The plans that have been proposed for sharing, dissemination and scaling up of results, lessons and experience include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <b>Uganda ? landscape level:</b> (a) exchange visits for farmer associations and groups within Mt. Elgon Ecosystem, (b) exchange visits for farmer associations and groups with their counterparts implementing similar interventions in the Mt. Rwenzori Ecosystem and Lake Albert Water Management Zone (areas with similar coffee production systems with Mt. Elgon, (c) inter-sector and multi-stakeholder participatory monitoring and evaluation missions, (d) Mt. Elgon Stakeholders? Forum Annual General Assemblies, and Awoja Catchment Annual Catchment Management Committee (CMCs) meetings, (e) National events e.g. Annual Water Week, the Mountain Ecosystem Forum Annual conference and Annual Joint Sector Review meetings involving CSOs, PSOs and GoU Policy Makers.</li> <li>2) <b>Uganda-Kenya landscape level:</b> (a) exchange visits for farmer associations and groups with their counterparts in the Kenya GEF child project, (b) exchange visits for key project technical staff with their counterparts in the Kenya GEF child project,</li> <li>3) <b>Africa (AFR100) level:</b> regional and global meetings and conferences.</li> <li>4) <b>Global Platform level:</b> (a) meetings of global FOLUR country projects and partners, (b) linkages and synergies with the Global Platform on training and technical assistance, (c) linkages and synergies with the Global Platform in documentation and sharing of best practices and success stories.</li> </ol>
---	---

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response **Cleared on 18 June 2021**

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response **Cleared on 18 June 2021**

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

N/A

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Response to Control Quality comments of 8<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

GEF QC Comment	Agency Response
----------------	-----------------

**December 8, 2021**

Thanks for the corrections but not all comments have been addressed.

- We noted that some terms or expressions have changed between the main documents and annexes. It is ok when it is a response to a comment in the review. However, it would be fair to alert us and highlight any change you may have processed without a comment or a request from our part (by providing tracked change versions for instance). Please, confirm that no other change was made (than the names of the positions) or please describe them.

- (see the Comment 3 below): We found the expressions "Field Based Officers" (NRM, Agriculture, Communication), "Project Field Officers", an Field Officers between the portal, the section 6.1 on the project internal structure and the project document. Please make the position titles coherent in the different documents, including the budget, annex 1 in the document, and annex E in the portal - it is written "Senior Project Officers" in the annex E and the notes. This comment about the budget was made at the last round and not addressed. Please, follow the same expressions in the different sections. December 1st, 2021

3. Budget: The justification for the three technical/thematic positions is taken. However, note that the names of the positions (?Field Officers? instead of ?Senior Project Officers?) have to be modified in the budget table (both: the one in Annex E in Portal and the other appended to the documents? tab).

The terms have been harmonized between prodoc, CEO ER and annexes.

We confirm that no other changes were made other than the names of the positions. The position titles have been made coherent in the different documents, including the appendices and have been highlighted in yellow as appropriate in the prodoc, the CEO ER and the relevant appendices as detailed below:

In Section 6.1 of the CEO ER ? project internal structure, ?field-based officers? has been changed to ?field officers?.

In the organogram in section 6.3(d) of CEO ER, ?project field officers? has been changed to field officers

In paragraph 223 in the ProDoc, page 97, ?Field-based Officers? has now been changed to ?field officers?.

In Appendix 1 ? the GEF budget. We have removed the phrases of ?Natural Resources Management specialist, Agricultural specialist and Communications specialist? from the budget notes.

In Appendix 2 ? Co-financing budget. Under project personnel, ?Senior Project Officers? has been changed to ?field officers?.

In Appendix 8 ? Project Implementation Arrangements, under project internal structure, ?project field officers? has been changed to ?field officers?.

In the organogram, Appendix 8, ?project field officers? has been changed to ?field officers?.

In Appendix 11 ? Terms of Reference for Key Personnel, ?thematic project specialists? has been changed to ?field officers?.

In Appendix 12 ? Procurement plan, ?project field officers? has been changed to ?field officers?.

3. Budget: the names of the positions (?Field Officers? instead of ?Senior Project Officers?) have been corrected in the budget table (both: the one in Annex E in the Portal and the other appended to the documents? tab).

### Response to Control Quality comments of December 1st, 2021

GEF QC Comment	Agency Response
<p>1. We also recommend including in the prodoc's table of contents a list of annexes, mentioning the file where they are located: There are 18 numbered annexes in the prodoc, there are annexes with letters in the request for CEO endorsement. These annexes are merged in different files. It is very difficult to verify these annexes. Please, correct.</p>	<p>A list of appendices has now been included in the Table of Contents of the project document. In addition, the separate files that contain the appendices have also been uploaded in the portal.</p> <p>The Annexes in the CEO ER have been included at the end of the CEO ER that has been uploaded in the portal and also attached, for ease of verification.</p>
<p>2. Comment on discrepancy between M&amp;E Budgeted table in Section 9 and M&amp;E column in budget table in Annex E: in the Review Sheet the Agency responded that <i>"M&amp;E budget in section 9 has been aligned with the budget table in Annex E now reads \$434,375"</i> (see screenshot below)</p> <p>However, per the screenshots below, not only the M&amp;E budgeted table was removed from Section 9 impeding the comparison, but also the figure under the M&amp;E column in the budget table in Annex E has a different figure (\$410,375) ? please ask the Agency to amend</p>	<p>The M&amp;E table in section 9 of the CEO Endorsement request has now been included in the attached CEO ER and also in the portal (for ease of comparison). The response to the review comment has been amended to indicate that the correct figure for the M&amp;E budget is \$410,375 as indicated in the Budget Table.</p> <p>M&amp;E budget in section 9 of the CEO ER has been added and aligned with the budget table in Annex E and now reads \$410,375.</p> <p>Reporting costs have been reduced from \$32,000 to \$8,000</p>
<p>3. Budget: The justification for the three technical/thematic positions is taken. However, note that the names of the positions (?Field Officers? instead of ?Senior Project Officers?) have to be modified in the budget table (both: the one in Annex E in Portal and the other appended to the documents? tab).</p>	<p>The names of the positions (?Field officers? instead of ?Senior Project Officers?) have been modified in the budget table, and also in annex E in the Portal, as suggested</p>

### Response to points identified by the Control Quality on 17 Nov 2021



GEF review Comment	UNEP Agency Response
<p><b>November 17th, 2021</b></p> <p>Thanks for the modifications. However, some points have not been correctly addressed:</p> <p>- Please, incorporate a readable budget in the portal (not in an attached document) with the requested details. This request is included in the para 2, p42 of the guidelines. The budget per category and component is enough. You can cut the budget per year. Be careful that the table enters well into the margins.</p>	<p>The budget per category and component has been included in the portal as requested</p>
<p>- About the SRIF: the SRIF document accessible from the portal is still a non-signed document (and the rating is low). In the document attached under the Documents Tab, the SRIF is signed by Jane Nimpamya (we understand she is also the Safeguards Officer, please, confirm), but the rating is "moderate" while a "low" rating is included in the portal and the request for CEO endorsement. We did not clearly find the information in the project document. Please, explain, and make the information consistent in the different documents.</p>	<p>The correct and duly signed SRIF has been uploaded. The rating in the portal has been changed to Moderate/medium to conform with the SRIF rating. This has been made consistent in section 3.5 of the prodoc and section 5 of the CEO endorsement request</p>

**Response to points below identified by the Control Quality of 15 Nov 2021**

GEF review Comment	UNEP Agency Response
<p>1. M&amp;E budget in section 9 shows \$362,375 while M&amp;E column in the budget table under annex E is \$434,375:</p>	<p>1. M&amp;E budget in section 9 has been aligned with the budget table in Annex E now reads \$434,375:</p>
<p>2. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B do show some differences between components as following:</p> <p>? Component 1 in Budget table: \$1,108,300; Component 1 in Table B: \$1,100,000</p> <p>? Component 2 in Budget table: \$2,179,255; Component 2 in Table B: \$2,180,000</p> <p>? Component 3 in Budget table: \$4,796,660; Component 3 in Table B: \$4,796,000</p> <p>? Component 4 in Budget table: \$447,786; Component 4 in Table B: \$500,000</p> <p>? M&amp;E in Budget table: \$434,375; M&amp;E in Table B: \$409,027</p> <p>? M&amp;E in Table B: \$448,000</p> <p>? PMC in Budget table: \$466,651;</p>	<p>2. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B are now harmonized and provide the same figures:</p> <p>? Component 1: \$1,123,300</p> <p>? Component 2: \$2,194,255</p> <p>? Component 3: \$4,796,660</p> <p>? Component 4: \$471,786</p> <p>? M&amp;E: \$410,375</p> <p>? PMC: \$436,651</p>

<p>3. The budget table lacks details that prevents an analysis of the budget lines (i.e. project personnel, evaluation, operating and other direct costs) <i>vis-à-vis</i> the sources to cover these budget lines (components, M&amp;E, PMC). For example, with the current budget table (see below screenshot) one does not understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) which positions are included in the project personnel which ?per Guidelines? has to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC;</li> <li>(ii) why printing production is partially charged to M&amp;E;</li> <li>(iii) which cooperating agencies and supporting organizations will be engaged with the subcontracts (for 5.2 million and 1.5 million respectively) and what the purpose of these subcontracts is;</li> <li>(iv) why some meetings and teleconferences for 236 K are charged to M&amp;E, among others. We will be in position to provide further comments by the resubmission.</li> </ul>	<p>The detailed budget table has now been attached as Appendix 1 and shows details of budget lines and sources/components to be charged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the attached excel budget shows which personnel to be paid with GEF</li> <li>(ii) printing production costs have all been put under component 4 on knowledge management</li> <li>(iii) the attached detailed budget (appendix 1) gives details of which cooperating agencies and supporting organizations will be engaged with the subcontracting budget lines</li> <li>(iv) the breakdown of meetings can be found in the detailed budget (appendix 1). There are some meetings that are for M&amp;E purposes such as Project Steering/Technical Committee meetings, Semi-annual M&amp;E Review meetings, Annual Review and Planning meetings. Other meetings for implementation of substantive project activities are charged under their respective components</li> </ul>
<p>4. Co-financing (comment provided by Seo-Jeong):  ? IUCN: Source ? change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Donor Agency?.  ? World Agroforestry Research Center: Source ? change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Other?.</p>	<p>This has been amended as suggested</p>
<p>5. Environmental and social safeguards (comment provided by Gabriella): We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) in Appendix 10. However, the Table 9 Risks and risk management measures in the ProDoc (page 71-71) identified traditional and cultural considerations, health, and climate change as medium risk. It also identified inadequate consideration for social inclusion, gender equity and women?s right in project implementation and outcomes as high risk. These risks are not fully consistent with the SRIF?s safeguard risk summary and overall ESS risk that is classified as low.</p> <p>In addition, in the section on ESS in the GEF Portal suggests that ?a safeguard risk assessment has been performed and is attached as Appendix 9.? However, there is no Appendix 9 in the Portal or in the ProDoc.</p> <p>Furthermore, SRIF does not include the signature of Safeguard team, Safeguard Review Summary, and Safeguard Recommendations as usual practice of UNEP. Please ask UNEP to resubmit accurate and consistent safeguard information for both SRIF and ProDoc.</p>	<p>The following risks, ?traditional and cultural considerations, health, and climate change as well as social inclusion, gender equity and women?s right in project implementation?, in the table 9 in the prodoc have been amended to have low impact on the project. This is now consistent with the safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) which involved an in-depth assessment of these risks.</p> <p>Appendix 10 is attached as a Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) while table 9 on risks assessment is in the prodoc and in section 5 of the CER</p> <p>The SRIF has been signed by the Safeguard officer</p>

## **GEFSEC DECISION**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**December 20, 2021**

The project is recommended for technical clearance and Council consultation.

**December 8, 2021**

Thanks for the corrections but not all comments have been addressed.

- We noted that some terms or expressions have changed between the main documents and annexes. It is ok when it is a response to a comment in the review. However, it would be fair to alert us and highlight any change you may have processed without a comment or a request from our part (by providing tracked change versions for instance). Please, confirm that no other change was made (than the names of the positions) or please describe them.

- (see the Comment 3 below): We found the expressions "Field Based Officers" (NRM, Agriculture, Communication), "Project Field Officers", an Field Officers between the portal, the section 6.1 on the project internal structure and the project document. Please make the position titles coherent in the different documents, including the budget, annex 1 in the document, and annex E in the portal - it is written "Senior Project Officers" in the annex E and the notes. This comment about the budget was made at the last round and not addressed. Please, follow the same expressions in the different sections.

December 1st, 2021

**December 1st, 2021**

You will find below comments from the quality control.

1. We also recommend including in the prodoc's table of contents a list of annexes, mentioning the file where they are located: There are 18 numbered annexes in the prodoc, there are annexes with letters in the request for CEO endorsement. These annexes are merged in different files. It is very difficult to verify these annexes. Please, correct.
2. Comment on discrepancy between M&E Budgeted table in Section 9 and M&E column in budget table in Annex E: in the Review Sheet the Agency responded that *?M&E budget in section 9 has been aligned with the budget table in Annex E now reads \$434,375?* (see screenshot sent by email and available in attachment).

However, per the screenshots you will see in the attached document (and sent by email), not only the M&E budgeted table was removed from Section 9 impeding the comparison, but also the figure under the M&E column in the budget table in Annex E has a different figure (\$410,375) ? please ask the Agency to amend.

3. Budget: The justification for the three technical/thematic positions is taken. However, note that the names of the positions (?Field Officers? instead of ?Senior Project Officers?) have to be modified in the budget table (both: the one in Annex E in Portal and the other appended to the documents? tab).

#### **November 22th, 2021**

A budget table has been included in the portal under the annex E.

The available SRIF is now signed by Yuneae Yi (document prepared by Dr. Samson Gwali) with the date of November 16th, 2021. The rating in the portal is now coherent with the SRIF: moderate.

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

#### **November 17th, 2021**

Thanks for the modifications. However, some points have not been correctly addressed:

- Please, incorporate a readable budget in the portal (not in an attached document) with the requested details. This request is included in the para 2, p42 of the guidelines. The

budget per category and component is enough. You can cut the budget per year. Be careful that the table enters well into the margins.

- About the SRIF: the SRIF document accessible from the portal is still a non-signed document (and the rating is low). In the document attached under the Documents Tab, the SRIF is signed by Jane Nimpamya (we understand she is also the Safeguards Officer, please, confirm), but the rating is "moderate" while a "low" rating is included in the portal and the request for CEO endorsement. We did not clearly find the information in the project document. Please, explain, and make the information consistent in the different documents.

**November 10th, 2021**

Please, address the points below identified by the Control Quality.

1. M&E budget in section 9 shows \$362,375 while M&E column in the budget table under annex E is \$434,375:

- **M&E Budget:**

The table below provides a costed monitoring and evaluation plan for the project:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Inception Meeting	NEMA (PMU), UNEP	40,000	21,000	Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report	NEMA (PMU)	0	0	1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and global level	NEMA (PMU), PSC	24,455	30,000	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform Indicators: annually
Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP	NEMA (PMU), PSC	22,000	30,000	Within 1 month of the end of reporting period i.e. on or before 31 January and 31 July
Project Steering Committee meetings and National Steering Committee meetings	NEMA (PMU), PSC	150,000	30,000	Once a year minimum
Reports of PSC meetings	NEMA (PMU), PSC	0	0	Annually
PIR	NEMA (PMU), PSC	0	0	Annually: part of reporting routine
Monitoring visits to field sites	NEMA (PMU)	45,920	0	As appropriate
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	NEMA (PMU), PSC, Consultant	40,000	40,000	At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	NEMA (PMU), PSC, Consultant	40,000	40,000	Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Project Final Report	NEMA (PMU), PSC	0	0	Within 2 months of the project completion date
Co-financing report	NEMA (PMU)	0	0	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	NEMA (PMU), PSC	0	60,000	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
<b>Total M&amp;E Plan Budget</b>		<b>362,375</b>	<b>251,000</b>	

- **Budget table:**

Umoja Budget Class/Purpose	Expenditure by project component/activity						
	1	2	3	4	M&E	PMC	Total
<b>10 – Staff and Other Personnel Costs</b>							
Project personnel	16,681	16,681	19,081	51,720	85,920	402,237	592,320
Consultants	180,000	120,000	130,000	30,000	-	30,000	490,000
Evaluation	-	-	-	-	80,000	-	80,000
<b>120 – Contractual Services</b>							
Printing production costs	-	-	-	18,214	24,000	-	42,214
<b>125 – Operating and Other Direct Costs</b>							
Operating and Other Direct Costs	-	-	-	-	8,000	17,547	25,547
Group training	200,000	160,000	90,000	40,000	-	-	490,000
<b>135 – Equipment Vehicles and Furniture</b>							
Expendable equipment	-	-	47,600	-	-	16,867	64,467
Non-expendable equipment	55,039	55,039	55,039	-	-	-	165,117
<b>140 – Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)</b>							
Sub-contracts (cooperating agencies)	473,696	708,173	3,820,126	205,908	-	-	5,207,903
Sub-contracts (supporting organizations)	38,804	960,082	516,720	-	-	-	1,515,606
<b>160 – Travel</b>							
Travel on official business	-	45,000	-	45,000	-	-	90,000
Meetings/Conferences	144,080	114,280	118,094	56,944	236,455	-	669,853
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,108,300</b>	<b>2,179,255</b>	<b>4,796,660</b>	<b>447,786</b>	<b>434,375</b>	<b>466,651</b>	<b>9,433,027</b>

2. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B do show some differences between components as following:

- Component 1 in Budget table: \$1,108,300
- Component 1 in Table B: \$1,100,000
- Component 2 in Budget table: \$2,179,255
- Component 2 in Table B: \$2,180,000
- Component 3 in Budget table: \$4,796,660
- Component 3 in Table B: \$4,796,000
- Component 4 in Budget table: \$447,786
- Component 4 in Table B: \$500,000
- M&E in Budget table: \$434,375
- M&E in Table B: \$409,027
- PMC in Budget table: \$466,651
- M&E in Table B: \$448,000

Purpose/Activity	Expenditure by project component/activity						
	1	2	3	4	M&E	PMC	Total
Multi-stakeholder platform meetings	-	-	118,094				118,094
Project Steering/Technical Committee meetings	-	-			150,000		150,000
Semi-annual M&E Review meetings	-	-			22,000		22,000
Annual Review and Planning meetings	-	-			24,455		24,455
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>144,080</b>	<b>114,280</b>	<b>118,094</b>	<b>56,944</b>	<b>236,455</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>669,853</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,108,300</b>	<b>2,179,255</b>	<b>4,796,660</b>	<b>447,786</b>	<b>434,375</b>	<b>466,651</b>	<b>9,433,027</b>
Table B in Portal entry	1,100,000	2,180,000	4,796,000	500,000	409,027	448,000	9,433,027
Differences with budget table	8,300	- 745	660	- 52,214	25,348	18,651	-

3. The budget table lacks details that prevents an analysis of the budget lines (i.e. project personnel, evaluation, operating and other direct costs) *vis-?-vis* the sources to cover these budget lines (components, M&E, PMC). For example, with the current budget table (see below screenshot) one does not understand: (i) which positions are included in the project personnel which ?per Guidelines? has to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC; (ii) why printing production is partially charged to M&E; (iii) which cooperating agencies and supporting organizations will be engaged with the subcontracts (for 5.2 million and 1.5 million respectively) and what the purpose of these subcontracts is; (iv) why some meetings and teleconferences for 236 K are charged to M&E, among others. We will be in position to provide further comments by the resubmission.

## ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

See the uploaded file for details. Below is the summary per component and per year

Table 10. Planned project GEF budget by component and outcome

Umoja Budget Class/Purpose	Expenditure by project component/activity						
	1	2	3	4	M&E	PMC	Total
<b>10 – Staff and Other Personnel Costs</b>							
Project personnel	16,681	16,681	19,081	51,720	85,920	402,237	592,320
Consultants	180,000	120,000	130,000	30,000	-	30,000	490,000
Evaluation	-	-	-	-	80,000	-	80,000
<b>120 – Contractual Services</b>							
Printing production costs	-	-	-	18,214	24,000	-	42,214
<b>125 – Operating and Other Direct Costs</b>							
Operating and Other Direct Costs	-	-	-	-	8,000	17,547	25,547
Group training	200,000	160,000	90,000	40,000	-	-	490,000
<b>135 – Equipment Vehicles and Furniture</b>							
Expendable equipment	-	-	47,600	-	-	16,867	64,467
Non-expendable equipment	55,039	55,039	55,039	-	-	-	165,117
<b>140 – Transfers and Grants Issued to Implementing Partner (IP)</b>							
Sub-contracts (cooperating agencies)	473,696	708,173	3,820,126	205,908	-	-	5,207,903
Sub-contracts (supporting organizations)	38,804	960,082	516,720	-	-	-	1,515,606
<b>160 – Travel</b>							
Travel on official business	-	45,000	-	45,000	-	-	90,000
Meetings/Conferences	144,080	114,280	118,094	56,944	236,455	-	669,853
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,108,300</b>	<b>2,179,255</b>	<b>4,796,660</b>	<b>447,786</b>	<b>434,375</b>	<b>466,651</b>	<b>9,433,027</b>

### 4. Co-financing:

- IUCN: Source ? change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Donor Agency?.

- World Agroforestry Research Center: Source ? change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Other?.

5. Environmental and social safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) in Appendix 10. However, the Table 9 Risks and risk management measures in the ProDoc (page 71-71) identified traditional and cultural considerations, health, and climate change as medium risk. It also identified inadequate consideration for social inclusion, gender equity and women's right in project implementation and outcomes as high risk. These risks are not fully consistent with the SRIF's safeguard risk summary and overall ESS risk that is classified as low. In addition, in the section on ESS in the GEF Portal suggests that ?a safeguard risk assessment has been performed and is attached as Appendix 9.? However, there is no Appendix 9 in the Portal or in the ProDoc (the only



appendix we found is "a Rapid Climate Screening Report for the Mt. Elgon landscape"). Furthermore, SRIF does not include the signature of Safeguard team, Safeguard Review Summary, and Safeguard Recommendations as usual practice of UNEP. Please ask UNEP to resubmit accurate and consistent safeguard information for both SRIF and ProDoc.

#### **November 4th, 2021**

All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement (and Council consultation).

#### **October 5th, 2021**

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the pending comments above.

#### **June 18, 2021**

Not yet. Please, address the comments above.

#### **Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>6/18/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/5/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/4/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/22/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### **CEO Recommendation**

#### **Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**