

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10203

Countries

Uganda

Project Name

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

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

12/14/2020

Review completed by PM

12/13/2021

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is aligned with GEF's LDCF strategy.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the design is appropriate. It proposes a comprehensive suite of interventions to systematically integrate climate change related risks and information in agriculture and land use planning, and provide direct support to implementing climate adaptation measures to strengthen resilience of agriculture value chain in Uganda. However, the detailed outputs and outcomes described in the alternate scenario needs to be revised to strengthen the link with climate vulnerabilities in the target region and be more specific to indicate what this project will support.

AB GEFSEC July 28: Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response **The link between the outputs and the outputs have been elaborated by rephrasing the interventions to indicate which barriers and/or root causes they are addressing. The subsequent sections have also been revised to better reflect what the project ?will be doing? as opposed to what ?it should do?.**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The core indicator target sheet at CEO Endorsement stage is not provided. Please attach the full set of core indicators and sub-indicators. The Adaptation benefits section indicate that total beneficiaries of the project will be 791,200, which is more than the estimated beneficiaries of 436,000 proposed at PIF stage. Please provide a rational behind this increase and any other changes in the core indicators from the PIF stage.

AB GEFSEC July 28: Thanks. Will the project be able to reach out to all the people in the target catchments? It is recommended to include a %factor in assessing the number of beneficiaries to account for potential exclusion or non-participation of people .

AB GEFSEC Nov 4: Thanks for the elaboration. However, please correct the core indicator number 1 in the results framework (excel sheet). Core indicator 1 shows 1,582,500 beneficiaries. It is because of the same number of beneficiaries are targeted for 1.1.1 and 1.1.3. While it is understood that same beneficiaries may benefit from both "resilient assets" and "improved climate information services", the excel template considers them as exclusive entries and therefore sums them up in the core indicator. We suggest to either split these beneficiaries across the two outputs or propose the target under only 1.1.1.

We also recommend to delete targets under 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 as these are already entered under objective 2. Also, outcome 3 is more specific to NAP or COP guidance related projects.

December 3, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The core indicator target sheet has been provided.

The original PIF only used population from the Bukedea District but the revised figure considers all the people in the sub-catchments who will benefit from the interventions. From past experience in the area it has been observed that all the people in the communities participate in development projects such as this one. We therefore anticipate the same level of interest for the planned project and suggest that we keep the figures at 100%.

See section "Adaptation of project targets" under changes with the original PIF.
(p7 of revised PIF)

AfDB, Nov. 26

The target has been proposed only under 1.1.1 and the figures in 1.1.3 deleted.

The targets under 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 have been removed.

The revised results framework has also been revised accordingly and uploaded as separate attachment: GEFID10203_climate_change_adaptation_results_framework_gef7_rev01

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Under the "Adaptation problems" section, the project elaborates on "increased climate variability". However, the description under this doesn't correspond to climate variability as such. Please note that climate variability is about short term seasonal weather changes only. This section is clearly on long term climate change which has been observed in the country. Therefore, this should be ideally named as climate change impact instead of climate variability. Further, under this section, it will be useful if data could be provided related to climate forecast in the country. Currently, it provides only historical data and trend.

Thanks for including a theory of change in the document. However, the diagram simply maps the entire project design instead of a simpler theory of change outlining activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. Please refer to STAP guide. The assumptions are fine.
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf

The section mentions that "Climate hazards have negatively affected the livelihoods of ~150 000 people and resulted in ~74 deaths per year.". Is this latest data? The other details indicate that climate change impact is more severe and will affect millions of people in the country and target regions. If this is the baseline scenario of climate vulnerability, the proposed project's target of improving resilience of XX million people does not seem realistic.

AB GEFSEC 28 July 2021: Thanks. The revised Theory of Change is very clear and illustrates the project quite well. The section 1.2.1 still includes " Climate hazards have negatively affected the livelihoods of ~150 000 people and resulted in ~74 deaths per year." This paragraph has also very old data from 2008 and 2012. It would be good to provide more latest data.

AB GEFSEC 4th November 2021: Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Amended under section 1.1.2.

Climate variability has been replaced by impact in the heading. Climate change forecast data, with references, for the country has been provided. A new paragraph has been added in section 1.1.2 to illustrate the climate projections from modelled data and the resulting vulnerabilities in the project area, particularly the uncertainty of water supply in future.

The section on 'Theory of Change and Assumptions' has been amended. An introduction to explain the ToC rationale has been added, the wording refined, its use during project implementation elucidated and the ToC diagram (Figure 5) revised in line with STAP guidelines.

Baseline scenario updated. This has been deleted and replaced by the information from the introduction of the document. See the new section 1.2.1 of the CEO document that now describes the baseline scenario.

THE SECTION HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE FOLLOWING:

In the Climate Risk Profile: Uganda (2020): The World Bank Group notes that extreme events leading to disasters such as floods, droughts, and landslides have increased

over the last 30 years affecting an average of 200,000 Ugandans each year. Each year, floods impact nearly 50,000 people and costs over \$62 million. Droughts, on the other hand, affected close to 2.4 million people between 2004 and 2013, and drought conditions in 2010 and 2011 caused an estimated loss and damage value of \$1.2 billion, equivalent to 7.5% of Uganda's 2010 gross domestic

product.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

"The Government of the Republic of Uganda has received financing from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the development of the 'Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds' project and intends to apply part of the agreed support for this loan/grant to payments under the contract to hire a consulting firm to produce GEF and AfDB Board Project documents for the *Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's Watersheds* project"

The above seems to be copied from the hired consultant's report. Please delete.

The AfDB-GEF project is well-aligned with the GEF-7's LDCF[1]' programming strategy and Uganda's NAPA and National Development Plan. It aims to strengthen the resilience of approximately half a million vulnerable people to the impacts of climate change, through adaptation technology transfer (strategic objective 1) and climate mainstreaming (strategic objective 2). The project will support integrated adaptation planning at watershed level, strengthen the resilience of critical rural infrastructure, including river banks and wetlands, to support sustainable agriculture and alternative livelihoods; as well as enhancing access to reliable climate and weather information for climate change integration in development programs.

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. A strong buy-in is expected from the Ugandan government, as well as an effective implementation arrangement and an integrated project design. The project is prioritized by the Ugandan government and is aligned with the GEF-7 LDCF programming directions and national priorities, through consultations with the GEF Secretariat and other stakeholders.

This is also repetitive and not a fit under this baseline section.

The list of baseline projects look relevant. Please include the co-finance AVCP project of AfDB also in the list and also mention that it is a co-financed project.

AB GEFSEC 28 July 2021: Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The copied paragraph has been deleted completely.

The first paragraph has been shifted to fit better the section ?1.4 Alignment with GEF focal areas and/or Impact Program strategies?

The 2nd paragraph is moved to ?1.5 incremental/additional cost reasoning?

The AVCP has been added and summarized under section 1.2.2 of the CEO document.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide a short summary at the beginning regarding any modification in the project design compared to the PIF stage and rationale behind the modification, if any.

Outcome 1.1

Please confirm if Payment for Watershed Services (PWS) scheme will be adopted under this project. While the Outcome 1.1 mention this, no activity is listed to suggest that the scheme will be designed and implemented. It seems like a novel approach similar to PES and therefore could be included under the project.

Outcome 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 lacks a link with improved climate adaptation in the target region. Please elaborate on the link explicitly mentioning what climate vulnerabilities these outcomes will target and how. Also, as suggested above, a separate component on design and operationalization of PWS scheme could be proposed.

Outcome 1.2.

The section says "**the river sections of the main rivers and their tributaries must be identified**". The document's tone here and in many other places read like a recommendation for the project (or GEF) which is very confusing. Please confirm what the project "will" do for us to understand the activities clearly.

The details of Output 1.3.1 is not clear. Please revise to clearly articulate what this LDCF project will support. The reference to WSDF-E is not understood. Same for 1.3.2 and 1.3.3. The details seem like recommendations made by the consultant to AfDB. It is not evident if these will be carried out or if the project will deliver these outputs/activities.

The same issue is with Outcome 2.2 and its outputs. They read like recommendations by consultants and it is not clear if the project will actually do. Also, it indicates topics like hiring of national consultants, etc. Please mention these in the project coordination implementation section.

Same issue for outcomes 3.1 and 3.2. and their respective outputs. While the titles of outcomes and outputs is clear, the description under these are quite vague and generic. They don't clearly indicate what the LDCF project will support.

Finally, for each component please elaborate what complementary activities/outputs will be supported from the co-financing.

GEFSEC 28th July, 2021

Thanks for the responses. All comments are cleared except for the last one. Kindly provide a short description on how the co-finance will contribute to each project component.

GEFSEC 4th Nov 2021

Thanks for the information. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The changes with the original PIF are described at the beginning of Part II of the CEO document. The hydrological catchment has been used instead of the administrative boundary to reflect the actual climate dynamics that impact the project area. This approach led to the change in population figures and subsequent project targets.

The project has also adopted previously developed sub-catchment plans that were not recognized at PIF stage.

The changes have led to the revision of budgets for the components between the PIF and the CEO document.

The PWS will be adopted for the project. How this will be done is described fully under Outcome 1.1.

The descriptions of the outcomes and outputs has been updated and revised to show how the proposed interventions link directly to the barriers and/or root causes they are addressing. The wording of the titles has also been revised to match those presented in the table of the 'project description summary' of the CEO document.

The writing style (the tone) has been revised and written in the affirmative to illustrate what the project will do instead of recommending what it should do. THIS HAS BEEN DONE FOR ALL OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS.

This has been done and is presented in the main document. A table has been created to show the complementarity of the components of the baseline and the GEF projects.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

GEFSEC 28th July:

A new paragraph has been added with yellow highlights. In this, please elaborate on the following sentence " A strong buy-in is expected from the Ugandan government, as well as an effective implementation arrangement and an integrated project design. "

It is expected that the project will be executed by the Ugandan government. So, this sentence seems to be misleading.

GEFSEC 4th November:

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

THE SENTENCE HAS BEEN CHANGED TO:

The Ugandan government will execute the project. It has already demonstrated its commitment by providing co-financing for the project and seconding its staff for

the project. The government has also identified and designed the valley tanks, the water supply schemes as well as the hydromet stations in preparation for project implementation.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project doesn't have to define adaptation benefits across GEF's global environmental benefits of biodiversity, land degradation, SFM, etc. For the LDCF project, please elaborate on climate resilience benefits only and any other co-benefits which support improved climate adaptation. Please revise this section.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Wording has been changed accordingly. The GEBs for BD, LD and SFM have been removed and replaced with adaptation specific GEBs.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The details of innovation aspect is not very evident. It indicates scalability and replicability. Please highlight specific innovation approaches under this project e.g. innovative technology interventions examples, innovative approaches to engage communities and private sector, or anything else. The Payment for Watershed Services (PWS) seems innovative if the project will support this.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Amended incl. input on PWS (outcome 1.1). The PWS has been elaborated to highlight past experiences and define implementation modalities for the GEF funded project.

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The gender action plan looks fine. However, it is not clear what is the relevance of water and sanitation sector gender strategy in this project. Please elaborate on the link of this with the LDCF project.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Section 3 Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment has been updated. A paragraph to justify the proposed gender actions is presented in the CEO document under the narrative for Gender Equality.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The private sector engagement section needs to be strengthened. Hiring of private consultants is not a private sector engagement strategy. The section misses out on other strategic partnerships with private sector in strengthening agri-value chain, financing, etc. It is not clear how hand-pump mechanics and private forest owners are included under private sector engagement.

Please revise to make the private sector engagement more strategic including in the areas of climate information dissemination, conservation agriculture practices, water distribution systems, etc. which are core activities of the project.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Section has been revised and updated. A new write-up under Section 4 of the CEO document has been added in which the role of the PS sector in service delivery is elaborated in line with the GEF recommendation in the comments. The suggested roles cover infrastructure development, technical assistance, training as well as information dissemination activities. Private sector engagement strategy elements are also proposed.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please add a section on COVID-19 context, risks and opportunities for this project as per the guidance provided by GEFSEC last year.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The COVID-19 related risks are have been considered under section 5 (table) whilst the Risks, the opportunities are presented under section 1.6 of the CEO document

Covid-19 barriers are mentioned and considered for the ToC as well.

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The entire coordination section provides recommendation on what a good institutional arrangement should be. It is not clear whether the project will indeed adopt this approach. **e.g. Project interventions involve heavy community mobilization and therefore project components should be implemented by/through the district local government structures in line with their jurisdictional mandate.**

Also, the two institutional frameworks are provided which look identical. Please revise the section to clearly indicate and confirm what the institutional arrangement will be adopted in the project.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response **This section has been re-formulated and presented under section 6 The executing agency and its operational approach for the project is elaborated whilst the organizational structure is specified (figure 10). The roles and functions of the project steering committee and project management unit are**

defined and the ToR for the key experts elaborated. A procurement framework is also presented as per the Bank procedures for project implementation.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The section primarily elaborates on adaptation benefits and to some extent social benefits related to gender. However, it doesn't sufficiently elaborate on the economic benefits and other social benefits at local and national level, and a clear argument on how these benefits will translate into adaptation benefits.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. Comments cleared now.

Agency Response Section 9 has been revised and updated. Socio-economic benefits and gender related benefits have been presented separately. Two new paragraphs explaining the socio-economic benefits have been added.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The core indicators sheet at CEO ER stage is not attached. The co-finance letters are not provided.

July 28th, 2021

Thanks. The co-finance letters are fine.

The core-indicator sheet has core indicator 1 estimated as 1.58 million under CEO ER stage and 791,200 in CEO PIF stage. This is inconsistent with the values in the main document. Please revise. Also, as suggested please take a factor to assess the total number of beneficiaries. Assuming that the entire population will benefit from a program may not be appropriate.

Nov 4 GEFSEC

Thanks. Comment cleared now.

Agency Response

These are now provided.

The Core Indicators sheet is now uploaded

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Project results framework is provided.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please see some comments on the budget below:

- Under PMC of 2 drivers (50%) has been proposed. Please provide a rationale behind the need for hiring drivers for this project. We recommend using co-finance for paying salary of drivers as this is not typically permitted under the PMC.
- Under PMC, a miscellaneous amount of 83,456 USD is proposed. Please provide some indication of where this will likely be spent. Please provide such indication in all the miscellaneous budget heads for all the project components.
- Budget for project travel has been proposed. Please indicate whether it includes purchase or hiring of vehicles. Purchase of vehicles is generally not allowed within LDCF funding and is encouraged to be co-financed.

July 28th, 2021

Please paste the budget table in the portal under Annex E. All Agencies are able to paste the table in this section.

Also, the new budget document doesn't seem to be uploaded in the documents section. Please upload.

November 4, 2021

Thanks. Please address the comments related to targets mentioned in the review sheet above.

Comment cleared.

December 7, 2021

Please address the following additional comments and resubmit the project:

1. Expected Implementation Start date has past ? please amend
2. Project audit cost should be charged to PMC and not included in the M&E budget:
3. Core Indicators: please indicate which indicators are GEF Core Indicators as we will need to monitor and report on results on project and portfolio levels.
4. Stakeholder engagement: 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.
5. Gender Equality: 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 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.
6. Environmental and Social Safeguards: 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.

7. Status of Utilization of PPG: the Table included in Annex C of the CEO Endorsement Portal view doesn't match in many aspects:

- i. While the Total approved amount at PIF stage was \$200,000, the total budgeted amount is \$158,733 (in yellow shadow below)
- 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 amend.

8. Budget table:

- 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 use this format so instead of presenting components in the rows, they should be in the columns (no need to do it by outcome).

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:

- There are 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:

- 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?

GEFSEC December 15, 2021

Please address the following additional comments and resubmit the project:

- Comment 2: While charged to PMC in the Budget Table in Annex E in Portal, the project audit cost are still charged M&E budget ? please remove the audit costs from the M&E budget.

- Comment 7 on PPG status: partially addressed. As indicated in the Review Sheet, the figures now balance: (Budget ? Spent = Committed). However, as the PPG approved amount (\$200,000) is different from the Budgeted amount (\$158,733), please

- either cancel the remaining amount (\$41,267) to be cancelled, so these can be returned to the Trustee ? a cancellation notification has to be submitted (this can be done at a later date).

- or clarify if the remaining amount will be used.

GEFSEC December 15, 2021

Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

The costs for vehicles and drivers have been taken up by the Government of Uganda as part of their in-kind contribution. Two vehicles have been set aside by the government for the GEF funded project. The budget has been revised accordingly.

The revised budget indicating the above changes has been uploaded and the summaries also added to Annex E.

AfDB Nov. 26

These have been addressed as recommended.

AfDB December 9, 2021

1. 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
2. This has been done. Please refer to the budget table in Annex F.
3. This has been done for the four Core Indicators but not for the outcome breakdown.
4. Annex 1 has been uploaded.
5. A Gender analysis report has been uploaded and referred to in the CER.

6. 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.

7. This has been resolved and the figures balance.

? The figures now balance: (Budget ? Spent = Committed)

8. The old budget tables have been removed.

? The GEF standard template has replaced the previously inserted tables.

? Items without explanation which cannot be financed by GEF funds have been removed as budget items. Vehicle purchase and drivers expenses have been removed as budget items.

AfDB December 15, 2021

On comment 2: The project audit costs have been removed from the M&E budget.

On comment 7: The PPG table was revised. The remaining amount may still be used and the balance is expected to be returned to the GEF at a later date.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_LDCF_SCCF_26_compilation_council_comments_0.pdf Please address comments of Council members in the project design and attach the responses in Annex.

July 28th, 2021

Please indicate where the responses are attached. I couldn't find it in the submission. Annex B has GEF Sec comments' responses only.

November 4, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

(These have already been considered in drafting the CEO documents but the direct responses are attached for reference)

**These have been pasted in the Portal above the GEFSEC review comments.
Separate document with the comments has also been uploaded.**

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10203_STAP_Screen.pdf Please respond to STAP's comments in Annex and integrate their recommendations in the project design as appropriate.

November 4, 2021

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response
(These have already been considered in drafting the CEO documents but the direct responses are attached for reference)

**These have been pasted in the Portal above the GEFSEC review comments.
Separate document with the comments has also been uploaded.**

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Provided.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Please address the comments above and resubmit the project for further consideration.

July 29, 2021

Please address additional comments and return the project for consideration.

November 4, 2021

The agency is requested to address the technical comment on results as stated above.

December 3, 2021

The Agency has addressed the outstanding comment and therefore the project is cleared for CEO Endorsement.

December 7, 2021

The project is returned for the agency to address additional comments provided under the GEF Secretariat comments box above.

December 13, 2021

The Agency has addressed the remaining comments on the project and therefore the CEO endorsement is recommended.

December 15, 2021

The Agency is requested to address the following additional comments (provided in the GEFSEC Comments box above)

- Comment 2: While charged to PMC in the Budget Table in Annex E in Portal, the project audit cost are still charged M&E budget ? please remove the audit costs from the M&E budget.

- Comment 7 on PPG status: partially addressed. As indicated in the Review Sheet, the figures now balance: (Budget ? Spent = Committed). However, as the PPG approved amount (\$200,000) is different from the Budgeted amount (\$158,733), please

- either cancel the remaining amount (\$41,267) to be cancelled, so these can be returned to the Trustee ? a cancellation notification has to be submitted (this can be done at a later date).

- or clarify if the remaining amount will be used.

GEFSEC December 15, 2021

Thanks for addressing the comments. The project is recommended for endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	3/6/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/3/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2021

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The AfDB Uganda project (GEF ID 10203), Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's Watersheds, is well-aligned with GEF-7's LDCF programming strategy and Uganda's NAPA and National Development Plan. The project's objective is 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. It will strengthen climate resilience of 791,200 vulnerable people including 407,500 women, bring 9000 hectares of land into climate resilient management and build technical capacity of 720 government officials and community members for climate resilient planning and implementation.

The project adopts an integrated approach to build climate resilience through interlinked components. First, it will strengthen climate information services and early warning systems to integrate climate change in development and infrastructure planning. Second, it will support building climate resilient infrastructure primarily focusing on flood management through strengthening river banks, resilient water supply systems and ecosystem based solutions such as afforestation, conservation agriculture and agroforestry. Finally, it will build capacity of government institutions and community groups in climate resilient planning at watershed level. In addition, the project will also support communities in developing alternative livelihoods opportunities for enhanced adaptive capacity.

The \$10 million LDCF project will mobilize \$90.17 million dollar of co-financing including nearly \$80 million of AfDB investment which aims to strengthen agriculture sector in Uganda. The LDCF will be a complementary and catalytic source of support to enhance effectiveness of the national government and AfDB's investment and utilize their scale to make the agriculture value chain and watersheds resilient to climate change. The project has a distinct focus on gender and will engage private sector in strengthening market linkages for agriculture and alternative livelihoods in the region.

COVID-19 has a significant impact on the country economy and affected livelihoods of vulnerable communities including those relying on agriculture value chain. The pandemic affected the project operationally due to various travel restrictions and remains a risk during implementation due to continued restrictions to access expertise, carry out stakeholder consultation and shift in national government priorities. The project has provided satisfactory mitigation measures for these which is primarily based on drawing on local expertise, continuous engagement with key stakeholders and complementary initiatives such as AfDB's COVID-19 Emergency Response Support program. The project will also contribute to building back better and resilient recovery primarily through enhanced livelihood resilience, ecosystem conservation for sustained adaptation benefits and through a specific focus on increased access to clean and safe water and improved hygiene.