



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

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10203

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

LDCF

CBIT/NGI

CBIT **No**

NGI **No**

Project Title

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

Countries

Uganda

Agency(ies)

AfDB

Other Executing Partner(s)

Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Climate Change

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster risk management, National Adaptation Programme of Action, Least Developed Countries, Livelihoods, Climate resilience, Community-based adaptation, Climate information

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 2

Submission Date

4/5/2019

Expected Implementation Start

2/1/2022

Expected Completion Date

1/31/2026

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

831,643.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
CCA-1	CCA-2 Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact	LDC F	8,949,772.00	90,169,800.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,949,772.00	90,169,800.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To build adaptive capacity of rural communities and reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variability through integrated watershed management, climate-resilient infrastructure and sustainable agriculture

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
1. Climate resilient infrastructure implemented for enhanced livelihoods	Investment	<p>1.1 Climate resilient watershed management reduces the vulnerability of local communities and physical assets and natural systems</p> <p>1.2 Reduced risk of river flooding increases resilience of local communities</p> <p>1.3 Increased climate resilience through improved water access</p>	<p>1.1.1 Afforestation/ Reforestation of an estimated 2,500 ha of forest land</p> <p>1.1.2 Community support for agroforestry practices to an estimated 3,000 ha</p> <p>1.1.3 Community support for conservation agriculture for an estimated 3,500 ha in selected degraded areas</p> <p>1.1.4 Alternative climate resilient livelihood options (fish farm integrated units, fruit orchard, honey production, briquette production, ISSBs) promoting sustainable wetland/watershed management and sustainable resource management and restoration developed and promoted</p> <p>1.2.1 25 km riverbank protection/restoration intervention, including small-scale flood reduction infrastructure in selected areas integrated with ecological measures</p> <p>1.3.1 Climate-</p>	LDC F	6,875,753.00	52,000,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Strengthened capacity of communities and institutions for climate resilient planning in four watersheds	Technical Assistance	<p>2.1 Strengthened capacity of communities to implement measures for wetland and watershed management for climate resilience</p> <p>2.2 Strengthened institutional and planning capacity for climate resilience</p>	<p>2.1.1 One watershed level climate resilient action plan produced for the upper reaches of river Sironko and the 2 existing watershed level plans (Sipi and lake Okolirotom) revised to mainstream climate change resilience</p> <p>2.1.2 Capacity building undertaken for community-driven wetlands & riverbank management, climate change adaptation & mitigation, and forest management.</p> <p>2.1.3 Community awareness for reforestation, forest management, riverbank & wetland management, and soil conservation.</p> <p>2.2.1 Technical advice and support to local governments (district and subcounty level) and sub catchment and micro catchment management committees in integration of climate resilience into development plans</p> <p>2.2.2 Wetlands</p>	LDC F	538,003.00	27,000,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
3. Climate information integrated into development plans & early warning systems	Technical Assistance	<p>3.1 Improved access to climate information and early warning systems at national, watershed and local levels</p> <p>3.2 Efficient and effective use of hydrometeorological information for making early warnings.</p>	<p>3.1.1 Expansion of weather and climate observing network relevant to the project area</p> <p>3.1.2 Expansion of hydrological and Hydrogeological network relevant to the project area</p> <p>3.1.3 Development of Strategy for scaling-up the climate and weather information systems, and enhancement of station operation and maintenance in the long term.</p> <p>3.2.1 Development and installation of a flood and drought early warning and response system for the Kyoga basin</p> <p>3.2.2 Development, packaging and dissemination of weather and climate information for sensitizing vulnerable communities on weather and climate information use</p> <p>3.2.3 Strengthening human resources capacity in weather observing, forecasting and</p>	LDC F	747,223.00	3,969,800.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
4. M&E and Adaptation Learning	Technical Assistance	4.1 Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities, capacity development initiatives disseminated 4.2 M&E apply pursued, and lessons captured and widely disseminated	4.1.1 Knowledge management system in place and operational 4.1.2 Development and dissemination of knowledge and learning materials on climate change, rural infrastructure and ecosystem management through existing networks and platforms. 4.2.1 M&E system designed and implemented at all levels 4.2.2 Compilation of project good practices and lessons learned documented and disseminated to raise awareness on effective adaptive management options for further upscaling.	LDCF	372,137.00	200,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					8,533,116.00	83,169,800.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
		LDCF	416,656.00	7,000,000.00		

Project Management Cost (PMC)

Sub Total(\$)	416,656.00	7,000,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)	8,949,772.00	90,169,800.00

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	AfDB	Loans	Investment mobilized	79,800,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Uganda	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,369,800.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				90,169,800.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

There is a Bank approved agricultural value chains project.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
AfDB	LDC F	Uganda	Climate Change	NA	8,949,772	831,643	9,781,415.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)					8,949,772.00	831,643.00	9,781,415.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required **false**

PPG Amount (\$)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

18,585

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programmin g of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
AfDB	LDC F	Uganda	Climat e Change		200,000	18,585	
Total Project Costs(\$)					200,000.00	18,585.00	218,585.00

Meta Information - LDCF

LDCF true

SCCF-B (Window B) on technology transfer false

SCCF-A (Window-A) on climate Change adaptation false

Is this project LDCF SCCF challenge program?

false

This Project involves at least one small island developing State(SIDS). false

This Project involves at least one fragile and conflict affected state. false

This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector. false

This Project is explicitly related to the formulation and/or implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs). true

This Project has an urban focus. false

This Project covers the following sector(s)[the total should be 100%]:*

Agriculture	5.00%
Natural resources management	20.00%
Climate information Services	10.00%
Costal zone management	0.00%
Water resources Management	55.00%
Disaster risk Management	10.00%
Other infrastructure	0.00%
Health	0.00%
Other (Please specify:)	0.00%
Total	100%

This Project targets the following Climate change Exacerbated/introduced challenges:*

Sea level rise false

Change in mean temperature false

Increased Climatic Variability true

Natural hazards true

Land degradation true

Costal and/or Coral reef degradation false

GroundWater quality/quantity true

[To calculate the core indicators, please refer to Results Guidance](#)

Core Indicators - LDCF

CORE INDICATOR 1	Total	Male	Female	% for Women
Total number of direct beneficiaries	791,300	383,750	407,550	51.50%

CORE INDICATOR 2	
Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	9,000.00

CORE INDICATOR 3	
Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	15

CORE INDICATOR 4		Male	Female	% for Women
Total number of people trained	720	360	360	50.00%

OUTPUT 1.1.1

Physical and natural assets made more resilient to climate variability and change

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical assets	791,200	383,700	407,500

Ha of agriculture land	Ha of urban landscape	Ha of rural landscape	No. of residential houses
9,000.00	0.00	0.00	0
No. of public buildings	No. of irrigation or water structures	No. of fishery or aquaculture ponds	No. of ports or landing sites
20	41	0	0
Km of road	Km of riverban	Km of coast	Km of storm water drainage
0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
Other	Other(unit)	Comments	
39	no	Hydromet stations	

OUTPUT 1.1.2

Livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable populations diversified and strengthened

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	100	50	50

Livelihoods and sources of incomes strengthened / introduced

Agriculture	Agro-Processing	Pastoralism/diary	Enhanced access to markets
false	true	false	false
Fisheries /aquaculture	Tourism /ecotourism	Cottage industry	Reduced supply chain
true	false	false	false
Beekeeping	Enhanced opportunity to employment	Other	Comments
true	false	false	

OUTPUT 1.1.3

New/improved climate information systems deployed to reduce vulnerability to climatic hazards/variability

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries from the new/improved climatic information systems	0	0	0

Climate hazards addressed

Flood true	Storm true	Heatwave false	Drought true
----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Other false	Comments
-----------------------	----------

Climate information system developed/strengthened

Downscaled Climate model false	Weather/Hydromet station true	Early warning system true	Other false
--	---	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

Comments

Climate related information collected

Temperature true	Rainfall true	Crop pest or disease false	Human disease vectors false
----------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Other true	Comments Surface water flows and groundwater levels
----------------------	---

Mode of climate information dissemination

Mobile phone apps false	Community radio true	Extension services false	Televisions true
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------

Leaflets false	Other true	Comments UNMA webpage
--------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

OUTPUT 1.1.4

Vulnerable natural ecosystems strengthened in response to climate change impacts

Types of natural ecosystem

Desert false	Coastal false	Mountainous true	Grassland false
Forest true	Inland water false	Other true	Comments wetlands

OUTPUT 1.2.1

Incubators and accelerators introduced

Total no. of entrepreneurs supported	0	Male 0	Female 0
No. of incubators and accelerators supported	0	Comments	
No. of adaptation technologies supported	0	Comments	

OUTPUT 1.2.2

Financial instruments or models to enhance climate resiliency developed

Financial instruments or models

PPP models false	Cooperatives false	Microfinance true	Risk insurance false
Equity false	Loan false	Other false	Comments

OUTPUT 2.1.1

Cross-sectoral policies and plans incorporate adaptation considerations

Will mainstream climate resilience 0	Of which no. of regional policies/plans 15	Of which no. of national policies/plan 0	
Sectors			
Agriculture true	Fishery false	Industry false	Urban false

Rural
true

Health
false

Water
true

Other
false

Comments

OUTPUT 2.1.2

Cross sectoral institutional partnerships established or expanded

No. of institutional partnerships established or strengthened

0

Comments

OUTPUT 2.1.3

Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation

No. of systems and frameworks

1

Comments

OUTPUT 2.1.4

Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation

No. of systems and frameworks **1**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.2.1

No. of institutions with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance

No. of institution(s) **0**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.2.2

Institutional coordination mechanism created or strengthened to access and/or manage climate finance

No. of mechanism(s) **0**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.2.3

Global/regional/national initiatives demonstrated and tested early concepts with high adaptation potential

No. of initiatives or
technologies **5**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.2.4

Public investment mobilized

Amount of investment
(US\$) **5,787,000**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.2.5

Private investment mobilized

Amount of investment
(US\$) **200,000**

Comments

OUTPUT 2.3.1

No. of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

Total no. of people trained	720	Male 360	Female 360
Of which total no. of people at line ministries	60	Male 30	Female 30
Of which total no. of community/association	510	Male 255	Female 255
Of which total no. of extension service officers	0	Male 0	Female 0
Of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff	50	Male 25	Female 25
Of which total no. of small private business owners	100	Male 50	Female 50
Of which total no. school children, university students or teachers	0	Male 0	Female 0
Other	Comments		

OUTPUT 2.3.2

No. of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

		Male	Female
No. of people with raised awareness	395,600	191,850	203,750

Please describe how their awareness was raised

OUTPUT 3.1.1

National climate policies and plans enabled including NAP processes by stronger climate information decision-support services

No. of national climate policies and plans **0**

Comments

OUTPUT 3.1.2

Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation

No. of systems and frameworks 1

Comments

OUTPUT 3.1.3

Vulnerability assessments conducted

No. of assessments conducted 1

Comments

OUTPUT 3.2.1

No. of institutions with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance

No. of institution(s) 0

Comments

OUTPUT 3.2.2

Institutional coordination mechanism(s) created or strengthened to access and/or manage climate finance

No. of mechanism(s) 0

Comments

OUTPUT 3.2.3

Global/regional/national initiative(s) demonstrated and tested early concepts with high adaptation potential

No. of initiative(s) or technology(ies) 5

Comments

OUTPUT 3.3.1

No. of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

Total no. of people trained	0	Male 0	Female 0
Of which total no. of people at line ministries	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of community/association	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of extension service officers	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of small private business owners	0	Male	Female
		Male	Female

Of which total no. school children, university students or teachers **0**

Other

Comments

OUTPUT 3.3.2

No. of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

	Male	Female
No. of people with raised awareness		
Please describe how their awareness was raised		

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)?

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Potential negative impacts

- ? Impacts associated with land identification and acquisition for some of the proposed Project activities. Particularly, this will be an estimated 2,500 ha for afforestation and reforestation. It is expected that this will largely be within existing degraded protected or communal areas; however, given the rampant

encroachments, this will directly affect the current users/ beneficiaries of such areas. Depending on the finally selected land areas, this could result in both economic and physical displacement and associated negative impacts on the local people's livelihoods.

- ? Impacts associated with waste management. Different forms of waste will be generated from the different Project activities which will include packaging materials, domestic waste, waste materials and other specific wastes depending on the final design of the projects. If not well managed, these wastes will have varying impacts on human health, soil, water resources and livestock health, among others.
- ? Impacts on community health and safety. Risks to community health and safety will be posed by the Project machinery and project workers. Such risks if not well mitigated will rise in a number of impacts such as traffic accidents involving project vehicles/ machinery and the local community members and increased spread of diseases in the host communities as a result of interactions between the programme implementation team/workers from outside the programme area and the local community members especially for communicable diseases such as the current COVID-19 pandemic.
- ? Impacts on biodiversity. Particularly, potential increase in the spread of invasive species. Agroforestry and reforestation as well as land based alternative livelihood activities (fish farming, establishment of orchards, etc) has a potential of increasing the spread of invasive species either as weeds or part of the promoted species if these are not properly identified and managed. Ideally, invasive species should be avoided as much as possible and the spread of existing ones effectively controlled.
- ? Gender Equity and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) risks. Disparities in gender roles, responsibilities and power/authority over property ownership and decision making as per the local tradition and culture have disproportionate impacts on the gender (males and females) in terms of access to resources, development opportunities (including employment opportunities) and impact on the overall success of the programme. For example, in the programme area, men have more authority on land ownership as well as decision making on the land use activities; therefore, if not involved in the planning may negatively impact the success of the programme. On the other hand, women's less authority over land ownership and decision making puts them at a disadvantaged position and may not fully benefit from the programme if specific actions enhance their participation and benefit are not incorporated.
- ? Occupational Health and Safety (OHS). Project activities poses a number of OHS to the project workers which include fatal accidents, injuries (both major and minor), sickness and illnesses due to prolonged exposure to unsafe practices, among others. The specific OHS risks per project will need to be identified once the project details have been fully described and measures put in place to manage them.
- ? Impacts associated with use of chemicals. Some of the program activities may include use of chemical which may result in a number of impacts such as soil and water pollution as well as human health impacts.

Proposed mitigation measures

As guided by both the national laws and regulations, and the AfDB ISS, additional environmental and social assessments will need to be conducted in the next stages of programme planning to fully identify and assess all the impacts associated with it.

In addition, the following general recommendations should be implemented during programme implementation:

- ? As land is a very scarce resource, interventions that empower the local community members to appropriately utilize their land are paramount. In particular, agroforestry, where the local people own the agro-forestry farmlands is commendable since it avoids the need for land acquisition but rather empowers the local community members to benefit more from their land in a sustainable manner.
- ? Any private land that will be required for the programme should be acquired in line with the requirements of the national laws as well as international good practice standards. In particular, appropriate Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) or Livelihood Restoration Plans (LRPs) should be prepared and implemented as needed.
- ? Acquisition of land for programme projects such as afforestation should consider the current land use and its impacts on the current user's livelihoods. Alternative livelihood sources or adequate compensation should be offered to the individuals whose livelihoods will be negatively affected by the programme (specific interventions/actions should be included in the RAPs/LRPs).
- ? Physical displacement should be avoided as much as possible, and where avoidance is not possible, the affected households should be adequately compensated or alternative houses constructed for them (specific interventions/actions should be included in the RAPs).
- ? Once the programme projects/sub-projects have been defined as well as their definite locations, various levels of environmental and social assessments will need to be conducted, the level depending on the details of the sub-projects (refer to Chapter 6 for details on this).
- ? The local community members should be sensitized about good environmental management (training/awareness).
- ? The programme implementation team should undergo training in relevant environmental and social management aspects of the programme for effective implementation (details in Chapter 10).
- ? The selection of agro-forestry trees to promote should consider the current land use practices to further enhance improvements in land productivity.
- ? As much as possible, the programme should incorporate organic practices and where the use of inorganic compounds cannot be avoided, their environmental impacts determined in advance to avoid negative long term environmental impacts such as land and water pollution. **Lastly and most importantly, the project will work through social and traditional structures to avoid undue social disruptions to the beneficiary communities' way of life. Particularly, the age-old power dynamics and social protection systems prevailing at the local level will be respected. Specifically, the needs of the disadvantaged and vulnerable community members and groups among them orphan and vulnerable**

children, the elderly and the handicapped, will be safe-guarded with special provisions made to cater for their needs in the project activities. However, the issue of indigenous communities is not considered relevant since these are communities that have lived side by side for ages and none of the identified ethnic groups are settlers from outside the project area. the project will nevertheless endeavour to address any disputes that may exist as regards access to natural resources including farming and grazing land. Such disputes, if they are found to exist, will best be addressed through national and local systems that have enabled these communities to live together for years and no new project specific measures will be introduced. This approach is important since the project has a short lifespan and it should not disrupt the way of life in the communities since they will continue to live together long after the project has ended.

L

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Project Objective					
To build adaptive capacity of rural communities and reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variability through integrated watershed management, climate-resilient infrastructure and sustainable agriculture.	Core Indicator 1: Total no. of direct beneficiaries (male/female) [GEF Core Indicator 11 - Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF] investment		Total: 791,200 Male: 383,700 Female: 407,500	M&E tools	The Government remains committed to the AVCP and LDCF projects Implementation of project activities will foster investment in strengthening adaptive capacity and resilience of communities Adequate resources mobilized
	Core Indicator 2: Hectares of land under climate-resilient management [GEF Core Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)]		9000 hectares Including 2,500 ha of forest land with implementation afforestation/ reforestation efforts; 3,000 ha community support for agroforestry practices; 3,500 ha of community support for conservation agriculture in selected degraded areas.	M&E tools	
	Core Indicator 3: Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience [GEF Core Indicator 7 - Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management]		1 Watershed-level climate-resilient plan 9 Village-level climate-resilient action plans 3 Wetland management plans to be developed	Policy documents	

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
	Core Indicator 4: Total no. of people trained (male/female) [GEF Core Indicator 11 - Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment]		Total: 720 Male: 360 Female: 360	Training certificates, attendance lists, training reports	
Component 1: Climate resilient infrastructure implemented for enhanced livelihoods					
Outcome 1.1. Climate resilient watershed management reduces the vulnerability of local communities and physical assets and natural systems					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Output 1.1.1. Afforestation/ Reforestation of an estimated 2,500 ha of forest land</p> <p>Output 1.1.2. Community support for agroforestry practices to an estimated 3,000 ha</p> <p>Output 1.1.3. Community support for conservation agriculture for an estimated 3,500 ha in selected degraded areas</p> <p>Output 1.1.4. Alternative climate resilient livelihood options (fish farm integrated units, fruit orchard, honey production, briquette production, ISSBs) promoting sustainable wetland/watershed management and sustainable resource management and restoration developed and promoted</p>	<p>Number of hectares of forest land restored or afforested in the 4 watersheds by end of project</p>	N/A	2,500 ha	Aerial photos, GIS maps, documentation of measures	Provision of sufficient land and cooperation of landowners
	<p>Number of hectares of degraded sites rehabilitated and under erosion control through community support (agroforestry) in the 4 watersheds by end of project</p>	N/A	3,000 ha	Aerial photos, GIS maps, documentation of measures	Provision of sufficient land and cooperation of landowners and farmers
	<p>Number of hectares of degraded areas restored through community support in conservation agriculture in the 4 watersheds by end of project</p>	N/A	3,500 ha	Aerial photos, GIS maps, documentation of measures	Provision of sufficient land and cooperation of landowners and farmers
	<p>Number of entrepreneurs carrying out alternative livelihood activities in the 5 watersheds by end of project</p> <p>% of entrepreneurs are women</p> <p>% of entrepreneurs special are youth</p>	N/A	100 entrepreneurs	Registration of new enterprises	Willingness of entrepreneurs to adapt their business models and respective entrepreneurial spirit
			>50%		
			>25%		

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Outcome 1.2. Reduced risk of river flooding increases resilience of local communities					
Output 1.2.1. 25 km riverbank protection/restoration intervention, including small-scale flood reduction infrastructure in selected areas integrated with ecological measures	Total length (in kilometres) of riverbanks protected/restored along main river and tributaries in the 5 watersheds by end of project	N/A	25 km	Photo documentation, GIS maps, technical reports, planning documents, procurement documents	Expert selection of river sections with increased need for riverbank protection measures not only along the main rivers but also along tributaries
Outcome 1.3. Increased climate resilience through improved water access					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Output 1.3.1. Climate-resilient community water supply systems constructed	Number of climate-resilient community water supply systems designed in the 4 watersheds by end of project	N/A	6 new water supply schemes designed	Feasibility studies, design documents	Coordinated planning with the responsible decentralised units (WSDf-E, eUws) of the MWE for the design and construction of climate-resilient water supply schemes
		N/A	6 new water supply schemes constructed	Handover of water supply systems by WSDf-E and/or TSUs	
	Number of climate-resilient community water supply systems constructed, and	N/A	25,000 people have increased access to safe water supply		
	Number of people with increased supply of water	N/A	20 staff of scheme operators		
	Number of operators trained in O&M	N/A	15 valley tanks each with a capacity of 20,000 m ³ or a combination with earth dams	Training certificates	
Output 1.3.2 Climate-resilient community-based water harvesting, storage and distribution systems (valley tanks/small earth dams) designed/built in the five watersheds (300,000 m ³), based on projected changes in rainfall patterns and intensity.	Number of multipurpose water harvesting infrastructure developed	N/A	300,000 m ³ water storage capacity to provide water supply for an estimated 28,000 livestock	Handover of dams, earth dams by WFPFC East and Kyoga WMZ, planning documents, procurement documents, photo documentation	Qualified siting of valley dams and small earth dam locations including a hydrological study which takes into account inter alia: size of each catchment area, available hydrometrical data for the region, volume of run-off from the catchments for different hydrological years, to assure that even in a dry year the run-off will be sufficient filling the valley tanks;
	total storage capacity (in m ³) of the multipurpose water harvesting infrastructure	N/A	20 staff of operators		
	Number of operators trained in O&M	N/A			
Output 1.3.3. 20 community rainwater harvesting tanks provided for communal use	Number of community rainwater harvesting tanks provided for communal use in the 4 watersheds by mid of project		20 community rainwater harvesting tanks installed	Handover of rainwater harvesting facilities	Not only tanks but also other equipment such as gutters, pipes, and fittings will be provided Training is adapted to the needs of rural population
	Number of water user committees trained to operate and maintain the technology in the 4 watersheds by		20 water user committees trained to operate and maintain the technology (9 members per committee)	Training certificates	

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Component 2: Strengthened capacity of communities and institutions for climate resilient planning in four watersheds					
Outcome 2.1. Strengthened capacity of communities to implement measures for wetland and watershed management for climate resilience					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks	
<p>Output 2.1.1. One watershed level climate resilient action plan produced for the upper reaches of river Sironko and the 2 existing watershed level plans (Sipi and lake Okolirotom) revised to mainstream climate change resilience</p> <p>9 village-level climate-resilient action plans (CRAPs) produced</p>	Number of community-based watershed level plans produced that are gender balanced and climate smart by end of the project	N/A	1 watershed level Climate Resilient Plan developed for the upper reaches of River Sironko	Community Action Plan documents	focus on innovative and sustainable land and water management measures	
	Number of village-level climate-resilient action plans produced that are gender balanced and climate smart by end of the project	N/A	2 existing watershed management plans revised	CRAP documents		
	Number of demo centres established by mid of the project	N/A	9	5 demo centres established	physical	Training is adapted to the needs of rural population
	Number of people trained (gender balanced) in climate change (causes, manifestations, etc) and measures for climate resilience (e.g. reforestation, forest management, soil conservation, etc) in the 5 watersheds by mid of project	N/A	330 people trained 165 female trainees 165 male trainees	institutional and community capacities and information on improved forest rehabilitation and management practices, forest governance, creation of Soil Conservation Committees, production/dissemination of technical and communication support	Training certificates, list of participants, training documentation	
<p>Output 2.1.2. Capacity building undertaken for community-driven wetlands & riverbank management, climate change adaptation & mitigation, and forest management.</p>	Number of drama shows developed and performed by end of project	N/A	15 drama shows performed	Video documentation	Sufficient radio coverage, drama performance groups available in the project region	
	Number of radio shows/programs broadcasted by end of project	N/A	15 radio programs	Audio files		
<p>Output 2.1.3. Community awareness for reforestation, forest management, riverbank & wetland management, and soil conservation.</p>						

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Outcome 2.2: Strengthened institutional and planning capacity for climate resilience					
Output 2.2.1. Technical advise and support to local governments (district and subcounty level) and sub catchment and micro catchment management committees in integration of climate resilience into development plans	Working sessions with district staff by end of the project - - - - -	0 - - - 0	4 - - - 3 wetland management plans developed	Documentation of the working sessions (report, pictures, attendance lists) - - Wetland management plans, list of stakeholders involved	With technical assistance, stakeholders will be able to mainstream climate resilience into existing development plans Stakeholders participate openly and voluntarily
Output 2.2.2. Wetlands Management Plans prepared and implemented	Number of wetland management plans developed in a participatory process involving relevant stakeholders by mid of the project				
Component 3: Climate information integrated into development plans & early warning systems					
Outcome 3.1. Improved access to climate information and early warning systems at national, watershed and local levels					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Output 3.1.1. Expansion of weather and climate observing network relevant to the project area</p> <p>Output 3.1.2. Expansion of hydrological and Hydrogeological network relevant to the project area</p> <p>Output 3.1.3. Development of Strategy for scaling-up the climate and weather information systems, and enhancement of station operation and maintenance in the long term.</p>	Number of existing meteorological monitoring stations automated and number of additional ones installed, relevant to the project area	8	16 additional automated meteorological monitoring stations established/upgrade d by the end of the project	Completion of installation and handover reports	The weather stations must be distributed accordingly in the project area to optimize area interpolations of measured values (e.g. precipitation), also considering existing stations and their functionality
	Number of existing surface water monitoring stations automated and number of additional ones installed, relevant to the project area	4	5 additional automated surface water monitoring stations by the end of the project	Completion of installation and handover reports	The hydrological and hydrogeological stations must be distributed accordingly in the 5 catchments, also considering existing stations and their functionality
	Number of existing groundwater monitoring stations automated, and number of additional ones installed, relevant to the project area	1	5 additional automated groundwater monitoring stations by the end of the project	Completion of installation and handover reports	Smooth co-operation with UNMA, DWRM and other stakeholders
	Development of regional strategy for scaling up the climate and weather information systems by mid of project	N/A	1 strategy document developed	Strategy document	
Outcome 3.2. Efficient and effective use of hydrometeorological information for making early warnings.					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Output 3.2.1. Development and installation of a flood and drought early warning and response system for the Kyoga basin</p>	<p>Flood and drought early warning and response system (FEWS) relevant to the project area tested and operational by end of project</p> <p>Protocol for the flood and drought early warning developed and disseminated, specifying, frequency of information dissemination, communication channels, etc.</p>	N/A	<p>1</p> <p>Increased use of weather and climate information by communities; Quantitative Precipitation Forecasts; Exchange of meteorological information that reduces the vulnerability of selected communities at risk through improved community disaster preparedness, increased flood warning times, and improved planning based on flood mapping and zoning</p>	<p>Project documents, early warning system installed on MWE server</p> <p>MIS</p>	<p>FEWS shall be linked to the existing Awoja catchment hydro model and use real time hydromet data, as well as community-based information and communication systems; A Central System will be specified, procured and installed. The system will use Numerical Weather Prediction and all available data to provide cutting edge products for public weather services, for the flood early warning systems, as well as for climatology and other climate services. The system specifications will be elaborated at full proposal development stage. Local radio stations are interested and have the capacity to air the bulletins</p>
<p>Output 3.2.2. Development, packaging and dissemination of weather and climate information for sensitizing vulnerable communities on weather and climate information use</p>	<p>Monthly Weather and climate bulletins developed and disseminated through appropriate channels e.g. printouts, radio spot messages, WhatsApp groups and phone SMS, and drama (for climate information)</p>	N/A	<p>Monthly bulletins</p>	<p>Copies of the bulletins Stakeholders? confirmation of receipt of the bulletins</p>	<p>Local radio stations are interested and have the capacity to air the bulletins</p>
<p>Output 3.2.3. Strengthening human resources capacity in weather observing, forecasting and information management, surface and groundwater monitoring</p>	<p>Number of gauging assistants, hydrological assistants; meteorological observers, volunteers and technicians/engineers; professional officers (hydrologist, meteorologist,</p>	0	<p>50 trainees 25 female 25 male</p>	<p>Training certificates, list of participants, training documentation</p>	<p>Trainees are from different institutions/units</p> <p>Understanding of the current and future cooperation/communication of the different institutions/units</p>

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Component 4: M&E and Adaptation Learning					
Outcome 4.1. Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities, capacity development initiatives disseminated					
Output 4.1.1. Knowledge management system in place and operational	Knowledge based M & E system in place by end of project year 3	0	1 WRM information and knowledge management guidelines for Uganda specified	Database of Kyoga water management zone installed and populated	Sources of climate adaptation related information and data are made available by all relevant public authorities/institutions
Output 4.1.2. Development and dissemination of knowledge and learning materials on climate change, rural infrastructure and ecosystem management through existing networks and platforms.	Knowledge and learning materials on climate change, rural infrastructure and ecosystem management developed and disseminated through existing networks and platforms by end of project year 3	0	<p>KWMZ database operational</p> <p>Knowledge and learning materials (printed and video) developed and translated into key local languages.</p> <p>Community-level meetings organized once per year in the 9 CRAP villages.</p> <p>Participation and dissemination of Project results at the annual Uganda Water & Environment Week.</p>	<p>Published materials (printed and videos)</p> <p>Community-meetings (participant lists)</p> <p>Presentations and lessons-learned reports</p>	<p>Wide dissemination of learning materials ensured through national, local stakeholders</p> <p>Stakeholders participate openly and voluntarily</p>
Outcome 4.2: M&E apply pursued, and lessons captured and widely disseminated					

Results	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Output 4.2.1: M&E system designed and implemented at all levels</p> <p>Output 4.2.2: Compilation of project good practices and lessons learned documented and disseminated to raise awareness on effective adaptive management options for further upscaling</p>	<p>Number of Project Implementation Reviews (PIR)</p> <p>Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation Reports prepared</p> <p>Lessons learnt summarised and disseminated</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>M&E Plan & Indicators defined and linked to existing M&E system</p> <p>1 MT Report 1 TE Report</p> <p>1 Lessons learnt report</p>	<p>M&E data collection requirements</p> <p>M&E monitoring report templates</p> <p>Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation completed and responded to recommendations</p> <p>Best practices collected and published</p>	<p>Data availability and responsibilities ensured</p> <p>Recommendations are incorporated into future replication activities</p> <p>Lessons learnt will lead to future replication in other regions</p>

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

GEF PPO Comments at CEO Endorsement Request stage:

PPO COMMENT	AGENCY RESPONSE
<p>1. Expected Implementation Start date has past ? please ask the Agency to amend</p>	<p>A start Date has been proposed and added in the Portal. Project is planned to start on 01 Feb. 2022 and ends on 31 Jan. 2026</p>
<p>2. Project audit cost should be charged to PMC and not included in the M&E budget:</p>	<p>This has been done. Refer to budget table.</p>

PPO COMMENT	AGENCY RESPONSE
<p>3. Core Indicators (comment provided by Olha): please indicate which indicators are GEF Core Indicators as we will need to monitor and report on results on project and portfolio levels. Can you please mark GEF Core Indicators in Annex A ?Project Results Framework? and in Core Indicators table? E.g. ?Core Indicator 1: Total Number of Direct Beneficiaries? could be marked as ?Core Indicator 1 (GEF Core Indicator 11): Total Number of Direct Beneficiaries disaggregated by gender?.</p>	<p>This has been done for the four Core Indicators but not for the outcome breakdown.</p>
<p>4. Stakeholder engagement (comment provided by Gabriella): The CEO Endorsement mentions that more detailed plan of stakeholder engagement is provided in Annex I. This Annex I is, however not uploaded in the GEF Portal. Please ask agency to review and upload the correct annex.</p>	<p>Annex I has been uploaded.</p>
<p>5. Gender Equality (comment provided by Gabriella): The project includes information and action plan that would suggest that it has drawn on prior assessments. It is, however, unclear from the submission if a gender analysis actually has been carried out and if so who has been consulted. The GEF Policy on Gender Equality requires projects to carry out a gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement. Please ask agency to provide further and more succinct information related to the gender analysis carried out, with whom and the key findings relevant to the project objective and components.</p>	<p>A Gender analysis report has been uploaded and referred to in the CER.</p>

PPO COMMENT	AGENCY RESPONSE
<p>6. Environmental and Social Safeguards (comment provided by Gabriella): It is noted that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate and that AfDB has attached the completed Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The ESMF mentions ethnic groups, persons with disabilities, and land ownership (page 31, 4.4.2.5 Disability and 4.4.2.6 Ethnicity and page 32, 4.4.3 Land Ownership) highlighting that Iteso constitute the majority of the people in Bukedea District (approximately 95% of the population). The district include, however, other ethnicities such as Bagishu, Banyole, Langi, Baganda, Basoga, Acholi, Acholi Labwor, and Bugwere? and there seems to be some land disputes throughout Bukedea District. The ESMF, however, does not include any details or plans to consult with these ethnic groups and vulnerable local communities. GEF ESS Policy requires to review potential risks related to indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities including persons with disabilities. The CEO Endorsement further reference that a more detailed plan of stakeholder engagement is provided in Annex I. It is seems, however, that Annex I is not uploaded in the GEF Portal. Please ask agency to provide annex 1 and clarify any further consultation with ethnic groups and vulnerable communities and whether the suggested Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will include consultation with all ethnic groups and vulnerable communities, assessment of potential risks to them, and mitigation and management plan of the risks and potential impacts.</p>	<p>An explanation has been provided in the main CER document. The issue of indigenous peoples does not apply as there are no settlers in the project area ? all the population is indigenous. What needs to be given attention is the issue vulnerable groups and ethnic minorities. These issues are best addressed through prevailing dispute resolution mechanisms and new project specific mechanisms should be avoided since the project has a short lifespan and therefore risks disrupting the co-existence between the local communities by showing favour during its lifetime only to leave the communities on their own once it is completed.</p>
<p>7. Status of Utilization of PPG: the Table included in Annex C of the CEO Endorsement Portal view doesn't match in many aspects:</p>	<p>This has been resolved and the figures balance.</p>
<p>i. While the Total approved amount at PIF stage was \$200,000, the total budgeted amount is \$158,733 (in yellow shadow below)</p>	
<p>ii. Amount spent to date + Amount Committed should add to Budgeted Amount ? this doesn't occur in any of the budget lines in the Table (see underlined red and blue below). Please ask the Agency to amend.</p>	<p>The figures now balance: (Budget ? Spent = Committed)</p>
<p>8. Budget table:</p>	<p>The old budget tables have been removed.</p>

PPO COMMENT	AGENCY RESPONSE
<p>i. The Agency did not use the template included in Guidelines (see page 46 of the attached Guidelines), neither included it in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Portal view, only appended a budget in the documents? tab. Please ask the Agency to use this format so instead of presenting components in the rows, they should be in the columns (no need to do it by outcome).</p>	<p>The GEF standard template has replaced the previously inserted tables.</p> <p>The detailed budget in Excel is also attached.</p>
<p>ii. We will provide more comments whenever we get the correct template in both ? same in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Portal view and appended to the documents? tab? (which should be the same budget table ? also the totals per component should match the totals in Table B) ? in the meantime we have some preliminary comments on the budget appended to the documents? tab:</p>	<p> </p>
<p>? There several costs associated with the project?s execution (Procurement & admin support, key expert support & supervision, National Project Coordinator, Project Administration and Accounting, Secretary) which should be charged to PMC, but instead are charged across components ? please also inform the Agency that ?Project Management Activities (NPC)? as well as ?provision for ESMP? with no further explanation is not an activity that can be financed by GEF funds:</p>	<p>These have been removed as budget items.</p>
<p>Component 1:</p>	<p> </p>
<p>Component 2:</p>	<p> </p>
<p>Component 3:</p>	<p> </p>
<p>Component 4 (M&E and PMC):</p>	<p> </p>
<p>? Vehicle purchase is still budgeted at 50% under GEF funding while in the review sheet, it seems PM asked for it to be removed ? same applies for ?drivers?:</p>	<p>These have been removed as budget items.</p>
<p>Budget table:</p>	<p> </p>
<p> </p>	<p> </p>
<p>Review sheet:</p>	<p> </p>

GEF Council Comments at PIF stage relevant for CEO Endorsement Request stage:

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
Germany Comments		

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
	<p>Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to build adaptive capacity of rural communities and reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variability through integrated watershed management, climate-resilient infrastructure and sustainable agriculture in Uganda. Germany appreciates that the project clearly intends to address core aspects of resilient watershed management. The project document demonstrates that the project is well-embedded in the national policy framework, particularly the National Adaptation Program of Action. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed:</p> <p><i>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but requests that the following comments are taken into account</i></p>	
1	<p>Germany strongly emphasizes the necessity to include relevant stakeholders in project design. Major activities proposed under Outcome 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1. fall under the responsibility of the Directorate of Water Resource Management (DWRM) in the Ministry of Water and Environment. For activities related to wetlands the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (Wetlands department) from MoWE is in charge, yet both Directorates are not included. Germany kindly asks that these stakeholders are consulted in the review process of the PIF.</p>	<p>The relevant stakeholders and their roles are described in the Stakeholder Engagement Programme (Annex I of CEO Endorsement Document).</p> <p>Almost all activities are within the responsibility of the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) and in particular of DWRM, wetland department, NFA and UNMA, which is why MWE will be the Implementing Agency for this project. Originally, the PIF considered the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) as the Implementing Agency</p>
2	<p>Regarding stakeholder consultation, Germany kindly asks that the projects includes activities to ensure a close coordination and collaboration between MAAIF and the MoWE. This is important not just on national level but also on regional and district level to make sure that provided funding is used efficiently.</p>	<p>The project will build on the existing multi-sectoral Steering Committee (PSC) of the AVCP Project for regular reviewing and monitoring project execution progress, providing strategic advice, facilitating coordination between project partners, providing transparency and guidance, and ensuring ownership and sustainability of the project results. The PSC is chaired by the Permanent Secretary (PS) of the MWE and co-chaired by the PS at the MAAIF on matters related to the project, to ensure high-level coordination among both ministries leading the implementation of this SACRiAC and the AVCP Projects. The Steering Committee of AVCP comprise technical heads of agencies responsible for implementation of Project activities, i.e. MWE and MAAIF</p>

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
3	<p>Germany invites to integrate existing national strategies on water resources in the project more systematically. Especially the National Strategy for Catchment Based Water Resources Management should be included in all catchment management activities (Component 2). Particular emphasis should be put on harmonising project activities with planning processes (catchment management plans). Germany strongly recommends to include the existing catchment area plan for the Awoja Catchment (focus region of the project) in project activities.</p>	<p>The Awoja Catchment Management Plan as well as the new strategy to operationalize Catchment Based Water Resources Management (CbWRM) and other national strategies (e.g. NDP III, NAPA) have been considered in the PPG Phase.</p>
4	<p>Germany would highly recommend to take existing experiences and lessons learnt from ongoing projects in the area of Integrated Water Management into consideration when reviewing the project. BMZ, EU, World Bank and DFID have provided significant funding to this area. The World Bank alone is currently implementing its Integrated Water Management and Development Project (IWMDP) with a total volume of more than USD 400 million, which touches or directly supports many of these aspect</p>	<p>In the course of the stakeholder consultations and workshops, lessons learnt and ongoing projects were identified and taken into account in the project preparation.</p>
5	<p>Regarding the support provided under Output 1.1.3 to conservation agriculture, Germany would like to request additional information about the specific project activities. Currently, there are only measures for soil- and water conservation listed. They are part of CA but fall mainly in the category of initial options. Otherwise it should be renamed to support soil-water conservation as part of watershed management.</p>	<p>The proposed actions include: contour ridging, restoration of traditional terrace systems use of vetiver grass to reinforce marker ridges</p>

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
6	<p>The full proposal should identify clearly and consistently the capacity building measures under component 2. The capacity building measures should support the investments under component 1 and should take existing Capacity Development Strategies (e.g. water sector) into consideration and then build on identified gaps and needs. The current formulated outputs under component 2 do overlap and are quite broad. While the overarching project objective and the rationale of the project components are well displayed, the proposal would benefit from a review of how outcomes and respective outputs contribute to the individual project components 2 to 4. Germany strongly recommends to review the project design regarding the following aspects:</p> <p>Component 2: The component would benefit if outcome 2.1 focused exclusively on capacity building and outcome 2.2 on planning. For instance output 2.1.1. on community action plans could be included in outcome 2.2. Furthermore, it would be helpful to identify the targeted institutions (outcome 2.2.). In this context, the role of the 'Wetlands Management Units' and their mapping should be clarified. (Outcome 2.2.1).</p> <p>Component 4: While the overall objective of component 4 is well explained, the focus of the two outcomes could be more explicit. In addition, it could be helpful to specify for the two outcomes how results of the M&E framework will ensure ongoing adaptive management of the project.</p>	<p>Component 2: The capacity building component builds on identified needs gaps and initial trainings: For example several trainings were done in 2018 by a joint team of Kyoga Water Management Zone, the District Local Government technical staff and IUCN staff in collaboration with Buginyanya ZARDI, under the WMDP. The GEF funded project will build on such efforts and institutionalize them by supporting the establishment of demo-centers that can continue to offer training after the project is ended. Additional training needs will be determined/confirmed during project implementation.</p> <p>Component 4, M&E: The National Project Coordinator together with the M&E key expert will be responsible for the design of the M&E framework and to provide the necessary capacity building to those involved in the implementation of the M&E framework. The PMU will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR). The PIR provides an opportunity for the PMU to report on the cumulative progress towards achieving the objective and the annual implementation progress. The Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the PSC and the AfDB. Management responses to critical risks, environmental and social grievances and the project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting and reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.</p>

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
7	<p>While the PIF aptly highlights how the project is aligned with priority areas of Uganda's National Adaptation Program of Action, Germany would welcome more explicit references to how the project is contributing to the country's Nationally Determined Contribution (e.g. section 2 of the NDC), specifically in section 7 of the PIF, as well as Uganda's NDC Partnership Plan, with the NDC Partnership being an important vehicle to promote NDC implementation.</p>	<p>The project is in line with the country's NDC and will be contributing towards the priorities related to climate change adaptation in the water sector, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●Managing water resource systems, including wetlands, particularly in cities, in such a way that floods are prevented, and existing resources conserved (through the establishment of an Integrated Water Resources Management system) ●Improving water catchment protection ●Ensuring water supply to key economic sectors, especially agriculture, and domestic use, including water harvesting and storage ●Expanding small scale water infrastructure ●Expanding climate information and early warning systems ●Identifying better drainage plans

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
8	<p>As the main baseline project, the Agricultural Value Chain Development Program, focuses on poverty reduction and economic development, it is recommended elaborate on how agricultural development and climate objectives are aligned, trade-offs avoided and considered in PIF measures.</p>	<p>The AVCP project target districts fully cover the districts of Bukedea, Bulambuli, Kapchorwa and Sironko and communities in these districts will benefit from AVCP project activities.</p> <p>The planned watershed management activities under AVCP project: (i) Institutional strengthening through mobilization of local structures; (ii) Sustainable development and management of forest and tree resources in Bukedea, Bulambuli; and (iii) Establishment integrated soil and water conservation technologies and measures are all complementary to the component-1 project activities.</p> <p>The project has put in place measures to avoid duplication of effort between the two projects. In addition, the construction of a bridge over Sironko River by AVCP project to connect Bukedea and Bulambuli Districts will facilitate transport, enhance communication and facilitate trade between the two districts. This is in support of the watershed management and livelihood activities. Further, AVCP support of genetic improvement in Dairy and Beef cows in the project area will enhance sustainability of the watershed interventions implemented under this component by providing high yield cattle population.</p> <p>The AVCP project intends to create a network and linkage of farmers to agro-processors, traders and markets for farmers using innovative and enduring ICT platforms, that includes digital payment system. The communities engaged in in farming, business, livelihood activities, etc in target districts of SACRiAC project will benefit from this product including creation of a database of processors, large off-takers of maize, rice, and dairy, their village agents and associated farmers for integration onto the ICT platform.</p> <p>The leadership skills and capacity building of farmer organization, civil society organizations, and private sector engaged in watershed management activities including provision of capacity development for farmers, extension agents, and relevant government officials will complement the capacity building activities planned under SACRiAC project.</p> <p>AVCP project being in the course of implementation for more than two years; experiences and lessons learnt in the development and dissemination of knowledge and learning materials on rural infrastructure and ecosystem management (printed and video) will be used to raise awareness under component 4.</p>

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
9	Finally, German would recommend more specific information on how the project aims to ensure long term sustainability and maintenance of infrastructure installed and measures taken.	O & M aspects are partly described in the CEO Endorsement Document under the different infrastructure outputs and in particular for component 1 and component 3.
United States Comments		
Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF. As AfDB prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge AfDB to:		
1	Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with each other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries;	The project will build on the existing multi-sectoral Steering Committee (PSC) of the AVCP Project for regular reviewing and monitoring project execution progress, providing strategic advice, facilitating coordination between project partners, providing transparency and guidance, and ensuring ownership and sustainability of the project results. The PSC is chaired by the Permanent Secretary (PS) of the MWE and co-chaired by the PS at the MAAIF on matters related to the project, to ensure high-level coordination among both ministries leading the implementation of this SACRiAC and the AVCP Projects. The Steering Committee of AVCP comprise technical heads of agencies responsible for implementation of Project activities, i.e. MWE and MAAIF
2	Provide details for the activities that will strengthen hydromet systems through transfer of appropriate technologies, infrastructure, and skills;	The details are described in section ?1.3. The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project? and in particular under component 3 of the CEO Endorsement Document.
3	Expand on suggested activities to increase local awareness of climate change, as a lack of awareness is noted as a barrier to success;	Knowledge and learning materials (printed and video) will be developed and translated into key local languages relevant to the project area. Community-level meetings (barazas) and caravans will be organized to disseminate the developed knowledge and information materials.
4	Provide detailed plans for how the proposed hydrological and meteorological stations will be operated, maintained, and sustained and how staff will be trained to best utilize them;	Described under Component 3: Climate information integrated into development plans and early warning systems of the CEO Endorsement Document.
5	Expand upon how AfDB will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how AfDB will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities;	In the course of the stakeholder consultations and workshops, lessons learnt and ongoing projects were identified and taken into account in the project preparation.

No	Council Comment at PIF Stage	Agency Response
6	Consider how the baseline project may be addressing the non-climate related drivers of land degradation and what steps AfDB plans to take to ensure success in promoting climate resilience in the face of these drivers; and,	Through raising community awareness for reforestation, forest management, riverbank & wetland management, and soil conservation.
7	Expand on the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including if there are any major dissenting groups and if so, how AfDB will work at the community level to mitigate any issues.	The relevant stakeholders and their roles are described in the Stakeholder Engagement Programme (Annex I of CEO Endorsement Document). Stakeholder consultations and several stakeholder workshops were conducted during the PPG phase. District and community representatives of the project region participated in the workshops.
8	Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;	Described in the CEO Endorsement Document under section 3 Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. The document also contains a gender action plan.
9	Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,	Local stakeholders have been included in the PPG phase and will play an important role during the implementation of the project.
10	Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.	This is described under component 4: M&E and Adaptation Learning as well as under section 6 M&E Institutional Arrangement and Coordination of the CEO Endorsement Document.
Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.		

STAP comments at PIF stage relevant for CEO Endorsement Request stage:

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
STAP Overall Assessment		<p>STAP welcomes the idea to tackle climate change adaptation in the context of integrated watershed management, in combination with reforestation, agroforestry, conservation agriculture and wetland management together and to manage them in an integrated manner. The problem statement identifies severe problems and worsening trends both in the natural resource base (degradation) and in the socio-economic domain. Reversing these trends is the first key step but a lot more is needed with a view to the negative impacts of the looming climate change. Hence an integrated approach is warranted. Auspiciously, a range of ongoing efforts, national and internationally supported, are underway to ameliorate the situation. They seem to comprise a useful basis to build the proposed project on. During project development, STAP encourages the team to develop at Theory of Change to help identify and address underlying drivers of change. For example, population growth is mentioned as a threat to forests under the proposed alternative scenario. What measures can be taken to mitigate this risk? The climate sensitivity of alternative livelihoods should also be evaluated. Livelihoods such as fruit production may be vulnerable to changing rainfall patterns, for example. Finally, the sustainability of investments in early warning systems should be evaluated. The PIF notes that the durability of improvements in early warning system has depended on donor funding. Could the private sector play a role or user fees be applied to help generate revenue for long-term maintenance?</p>	<p>A Theory of Change has been included in the project document (refer to section 1.1.4 in the CEO Endorsement Request document) that is addressing the underlying root and immediate causes, project assumption and how the project is to address these, while creating impact and contribution to resolve the development challenge.</p>
Part I: Project Information		<p>The project is well-conceived, comprising an internally consistent set of efforts to produce tools, build human and institutional capacities, and demonstrate promising practices that, taken together, have the promise of achieving multiple objectives such as improving food security, better biodiversity protection, reduced exposure to current vagaries of weather, and improved adaptive capacity to future climate change. Minor improvements are suggested in the table below.</p>	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary	STAP recommends that the proposers consider implementing major improvements in the following items: theory of change and contingency plan, innovation, risk assessment and management, knowledge management.		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.	
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes.	
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Properly described.	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?	Yes	
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?	Reasonable likelihood	
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Properly described. Yes..	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	Regrettably, no formal theory of change; see below.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes	
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Not a MFAP.	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
projects	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Baseline involves many valuable activities to build on but little is presented in terms of quantified benefits.	The section on global environmental benefits and adaptation benefits has been enhanced. It now includes relevant targets and indicators. Refer also to the Annex A Project Results Framework with all relevant indicators addressed through the project.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Possibly yes.	
	For multiple focal area projects:	Not a MFAP.	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	Not a MFAP.	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Not a MFAP.	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	Not a MFAP.	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Regrettably, no explicit theory of change is presented. Yet the components intend to produce outcomes, emerging from 3-4 outputs produced in corresponding activities. This logical framework is expected to lead to generating the intended results.	See above. ToC has been included.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Properly described. Yes, the project seeks to strengthen capacity and awareness, increase information for action and also then implement changes on the ground. Combined they are likely to increase resilience although the team should be sure that activities are layered and integrated so communities can benefit from all three areas.	
	? What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Properly presented	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	? Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions ?	Yes	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	<p>Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</p>	<p>The baseline scenario includes respectable efforts, but complementary investments are needed to make them really effective. No attempt is made at preparing an incremental cost reasoning.</p>	<p>See above comment on GEB and adaptation benefits. The incremental cost reasoning section has been enhanced. The roughly 9 million US\$ LDCF project is expected to co-finance at least 80 million US\$ of AfDB investment through the Agricultural Value Chains Development Project (AVCP), which aims to strengthen the agricultural sector in Uganda. The LDCF will be a complementary and catalytic source of support in enhancing the effectiveness of the AfDB investment and utilize its scale to make the agriculture value chain and watersheds resilient to climate change. The project also includes gender considerations and will engage the private sector in strengthening market linkages for agriculture and alternative livelihoods in the region.</p>

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?		
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes. During project preparation the team may wish to further study and validate the scale to ensure the benefits are sufficiently widespread to influence resilience in the watershed.	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Main focus is on local / regional benefits but some may well spill over and produce GEBs.	
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	No	On the GEB, several indicators have been added on ?Climate-resilient ecosystem development? (refer to section 1.6)
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No	
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	A range of institutional and physical measures in proper combinations.	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Addressing climate change adaptation in the context of integrated watershed management is a novel approach in this region. A declared objective is to develop innovative tools and adaptation technologies and transfer them to farmers and communities. There is indication of plans for scaling up but they are somewhat vague. More specific action plans would be useful. Additionally, the project could improve innovation by capitalizing on innovations in early warning systems, for example, exploring the use of forecast based finance or partnerships with private sector and use of ICT technology to provide communities with warnings.	<p>Refer to comment above on adaptation benefits. This section has been enhanced:</p> <p>? The LDCF project will introduce weather stations and forecasting facilities.</p> <p>? The Project will furthermore develop key water resources management information and specific knowledge management guidelines for Uganda.</p> <p>? One important benefit will be the improved coordination between government departments and the sharing of information, which can lead to improved products and services that enhance adaptation.</p> <p>? At the</p>

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Very little and rather vague. A plan for maintenance of investments (e.g. hydromet stations) should be created and should include information about long term funding.	The sustainability section has been enhanced to refer to maintenance plans for investments. Furthermore, reference is made to private sector engagement and local service providers for maintenance of technical equipment.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The plan is to work within the current structures and programs and to gradually scale up through integration with national development programs. Clear and determined actions will be needed to pursue truly transformative changes beyond the current boundaries.	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes, although formal partnership should be made between different government Ministries. For example the Met Agency is not an official executing partner but is critical to Outcome 3. Have they agreed to partner with the Ministry of Agriculture? Who will control the funds? Further the project should link to regional groups, such as the Regional Climate Outlook Forums and actors working in early warning systems in East Africa. There is significant scope for learning and collaboration, as many of the groups active here have long worked to strengthen early warning systems.</p>	<p>A Stakeholder Engagement Program has been developed in addition to the ongoing consultations with all relevant governmental entities and agencies in the preparation and design of the project.</p> <p>Details on the involved stakeholder groups, their participation and resources provided are given in Annex I.</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>Roles properly designed.</p>	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Gender issues have been considered but no specific response measures are presented.</p>	<p>A Gender Action Plan is included in the CEO Endorsement Request document with gender-sensitive actions foreseen and indicators proposed.</p>

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</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>Such hindrances are not mentioned.</p>	<p>Refer to gender section 3 in the CEO ER.</p> <p>In the project design, it is envisaged that women need to be adequately represented in decision making, stakeholder groups to be engaged and committees to be formed. All design processes and implementation procedures should take the specific requirements of women and girls into account and ensure that project results benefit women and men equally. Activities directly addressing gender equality and the reduction of gender-related barriers should be included.</p>

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>The identified risks are valid but their scope is rather limited, most are outside the project's control. A range of risks associated with current climate variability and extreme events as well as future climate change are mentioned but not assessed in detail. In general, a more systematic, broader scope social and environmental risk assessment would be needed. Climate risks will need to be assessed for the baseline and the alternative scenario so that proper measures can be designed and implemented to enhance climate resilience, reduce climate vulnerability and thus improve adaptive capacity. Greater attention could be paid to risks to the durability of investments over the long term, after GEF funding has ended.</p>	<p>The risk section has been enhanced during the PPG stage, with environmental and social risks included as well.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>		
	<p>? How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p>	<p>The focus is on reducing the region's vulnerability to climate risks. ? Has</p>	
	<p>? Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>Initial impact assessment is OK but will need to be improved further in the next project stage. In addition, some of the alternatively livelihood activities should also be screened for sensitivity to climate factors.</p>	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	? Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	Yes, considered. Institutional and physical capacity improvements.	
	? What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	A broad range of capacity enhancements considered.	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes.	
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes.	

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes.	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation ?	Documents, reports, and personal interactions.	
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Some initial elements are mentioned, but will need to be further improved.	Development and dissemination of good practice and publications is foreseen, so the project will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely.

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the Knowledge Management Approach? for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>The knowledge management plan is rather weak and needs a major improvement. No KM mechanism is specified in the PIF but the intention is there. Developing practical guidelines and a few other ideas are mentioned about KM. STAP recommends that the project team prepare a more detailed KM plan, including KM indicators and metrics. The related STAP document Managing knowledge for a sustainable future https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Report%20on%20KM.pdf is a good source of guidance.</p>	<p>The KM framework has been included in the CEO ER. It describes the objective of the KM strategy, knowledge products and events, and capacity building activities to be developed/organized by the project. Specific indicators have been added to the PRF.</p>
	<p>What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?</p>	<p>See KM comments above.</p>	
<p>STAP advisory response</p>	<p>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</p>		

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.		

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that ?STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.?</p>		

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>		
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>		
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>		

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>		
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>		

PIF	STAP Review Criteria	STAP Comments on project	Agency Response
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>		

GEF SECRETARIAT comments at PIF stage relevant for CEO Endorsement Request stage:

<p>1. Comment on the specification of name of Executing Agency:</p> <p>After the initial comment from the Secretariat, the Executing Agency name has been included in the Portal. As noted by the OFP the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) had been set to be the project executing agency, this was updated accordingly in the PIF.</p>	<p><u>Response at CEO Endorsement Stage:</u></p> <p>During the PPG phase and the stakeholder consultations being conducted, it became obvious that the EA should be shifted from the MAAIF to the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE). This was confirmed during the validation workshop by all stakeholders and follows the major government responsibility for the topic covered by that project (integrated water resources management), which is at the MWE (see also Part II Changes in Alignment with the Project Design and the original PIF).</p>
<p>2. Comment on aligning project outcomes and outputs with the components</p> <p>The Components 3 and 4 are quite clear. It is recommended that components 1 and 2 are reviewed by the Agency in and possibly categorize the interventions more systematically, for example: Building resilient infrastructure e.g. resilient river banks, resilient water and sanitation system. Within this, the agency is requested to elaborate why GEF investment is sought in water supply and sanitation infrastructure. While this is indeed important basic infrastructure, the use of LDCF in its construction is not clear. (Investment)</p>	<p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>Project activities and components have been revised in the PIF to ensure consistency. Outcomes and outputs were also reorganized so that investment activities were listed under Component 1 and technical assistance activities under Component 2 as suggested.</p> <p>Catchment based Integrated Water Resources Management (CbIWRM) includes activities related to protection of water sources and supply facilities, like maintaining tree or grass cover in the catchment area of water sources, reducing stream pollution and abstractions, resolving conflicts from sharing of water, water supply (for example gravity flow schemes), water harvesting (water conservation and efficient use technologies), awareness, catchment/watershed management, and community mobilization and citizen participation. Therefore the construction of climate-resilient water supply and sanitation infrastructure in the project region is important.</p>
<p>3. Comment on Project Preparation Grant:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowable cap. With the PPG fees, the project is exceeding the cap of \$10 million. The agency needs to revise the budget accordingly.</p>	<p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>The overall project grant request including the PPG is \$9,149,772, which is below the cap of \$10 million.</p>
<p>4. Comment on the articulation of gender context and need to promote gender equality and empowerment of women.</p> <p>A detailed gender action plan has been proposed to be developed for implementation of the project.</p>	<p><u>Additional information at CEO Endorsement Request stage:</u></p> <p>Refer to Part II Section 3 and the presented Gender Action Plan.</p>

<p>5. Is case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?</p> <p>The agency is requested to elaborate a bit more and also proposed a few private sector organizations who will be engaged (they could be part of the AVCP project also).</p>	<p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>The private sector plays a very important role in the water and environment sector by providing the following but not limited contributions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? private sector contractors and consultants undertaking consultancy services like feasibility studies ? design and construction work in water supply, water for production, flood protection and sanitation ? private hand pump mechanics and scheme attendants providing maintenance services ? private operators managing piped water services in small towns and rural growth centers; ? forest owners with registered forests and processing of forest products in the forestry sub-sector (e.g. tree nurseries). <p>Private sector will be nominated into technical coordination group meetings, related to their specific topics. Specific reference is made to private sector engagement within Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2.</p>
<p>6. Risks: Risks are identified and mitigation strategies are proposed. The Agency is also requested to elaborate on project delivery or execution risk by the execution agency. Is there a capacity gap in the execution agency to influence, deliver and scale up the results of the project? How will the project mitigate this risk.</p>	<p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>As mentioned under the risk section, the successful implementation of this project will depend highly on the effective coordination of the various technical departments and their ability to provide extension services and to enforce NRM rules and regulations. There is a risk that coordination across the departments is ineffectual due to unequal mandates and capacities.</p> <p>However, in order to enhance efficiency in the implementation of this project, a highly decentralized but efficient, and inclusive structure is required.</p> <p>MWE will coordinate implementation of activities being undertaken by its Directorates and Authorities and with MAAIF that is coordinating the baseline project. The PSC is expected to be chaired by Permanent Secretary (PS) at MWE and co-chaired by the PS at MAFID, to ensure high-level coordination among both ministries leading the implementation of this LDCF Project and the AVCP umbrella project. Other entities to be involved in the PSC are the MFPD (GEF Focal Point), NFA, UNMA and NEMA.</p> <p>Project interventions will involve heavy community mobilization and therefore project components will require implementation by/through the district local government structures in line with their jurisdictional mandate.</p>

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:		\$200,000	
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Local Transport and Accommodation Field Mission	820	820	0
Stakeholder Validation Workshop	2,375	2,375	0
BACRiAC Workshop	520	520	0
Consultancy Preparation Contract	155,018	123,375	31,643
Total	158,733	127,090	31,643

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.

Given that it was not possible to save the project map(s) and coordinates in this box, ANNEX E was uploaded under the "2.Stakeholders" section in the portal.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Below is the latest version of the project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)						Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]	
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4 (without Outputs 4.2.1 and 4.2.2)	Sub-Total	M&E (Outputs 4.2.1 and 4.2.2)			PMC
GOODS	Seedling production, multiplication and distribution	2,769,050				2,769,050			2,769,050	
	Procurement of vetiver + napier grass plantlets	511,000				511,000			511,000	
	1.2.1 -Planting of vetiver + bamboo plantlets, installation of ~5km of gabions	15,000				15,000			15,000	
	1.3.1 -Climate-resilient community water supply systems	1,040,000				1,040,000			1,040,000	
	1.3.3 Procurement of materials (rainwater collection, harvesting tanks)	25,000				25,000			25,000	
	Meteorological and hydrogeological stations				52,000	52,000			52,000	
	Hardware and software for flood early warning system				20,000	20,000			20,000	
	Procurement and operationalisation of KVMZ database				5,000	5,000			5,000	
	Procurement of office furniture and equipment (computers and printers for the office) for record-keeping of project documentation				10,000	10,000			10,000	
WORKS	Afforestation/reforestation implementation supervision (National-TA)	396,000				396,000			396,000	
	Conservation agriculture implementation and supervision (by district extension agents)	8,594				8,594			8,594	
	1.2.1 -Implementation and supervision support	10,000				10,000			10,000	
	1.3.1 - implementation of water source protection measures	445,000				445,000			445,000	
	1.3.2 Construction and site supervision of earth dams and valley tanks	680,000				680,000			680,000	
	1.3.3 Construction and site supervision	7,250				7,250			7,250	
	Procurement and installation of stations				10,000	10,000			10,000	
	Procurement and installation of stations and HW/SW				5,000	5,000			5,000	
Training, Workshops, Meetings	Startup support & training (International TA, National TA)	391,500				391,500			391,500	
	1.3.2 feasibility study and design, training and district staff facilitation	72,100				72,100			72,100	
	1.3.3 Establishment and training of water user committees	253,800				253,800			253,800	
	Capacity building for community-driven wetlands & riverbank management			197,202		197,202			197,202	
	Development of flood early warning system, hazard maps, sensitization and trainings (International & national TA)				439,223	439,223			439,223	
Contractual services	Identification of afforestation areas, procurement of seedlings/equipment and facilitation of district staff.	31,140				31,140			31,140	
	Identification of degraded areas	24,780				24,780			24,780	
	1.3.1 feasibility study and design (national & international TA)	120,750				120,750			120,750	
	Wetlands Management Plans		340,800			340,800			340,800	
	Siting missions and feasibility studies for the 20 stations and scaling up strategy (International & national TA)			221,000		221,000			221,000	
	Develop water resources management information and knowledge guidelines (Intl. & Nat. TA)				47,500	47,500			47,500	
	Dissemination of knowledge and learning materials				65,540	65,540			65,540	
M&E	Baseline studies, stakeholder & gender analysis					-	54,000		54,000	
	Conduct quarterly progress review meetings and field visits for assessing/measuring project progress and results					-	16,800		16,800	
	Project implementation & monitoring reports					-	173,297		173,297	
Operating costs	Project operation costs					-		175,453	175,453	
	Project personnel costs					-		223,200	223,200	
	Project audits (financial)					-		18,004	18,004	
Other Cross-cutting issues	Land compensations	74,790				74,790			74,790	
Grand Total		6,875,753	538,002	747,223	128,040	8,289,018	244,097	416,657	8,949,772	

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).