



Building a Climate-Resilient and Sustainable Shea Landscape of Northern Uganda

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11701

Countries

Uganda

Project Name

Building a Climate-Resilient and Sustainable Shea Landscape of Northern Uganda

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

9/19/2024

Review completed by PM

10/11/2024

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes. However, we suggest the inclusion of women into Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.3.

GEF-SEC OCT 16, 2024

In addition to the response for the above comment, please also incorporate women/women's groups representatives in Output 5.1.3 and ensure that the project's mid-term reviews and terminal evaluation reports include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the gender action plan.

GEF-SEC OCT 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF October 28, 2024

Noted, regarding ensuring gender-specific results are captured in the mid-term review and terminal evaluation reports.

Results Framework: Gender has been mainstreamed under output 5.1.3, and its indicators and targets as outlined below. Additionally, under **Paragraph 72**, representatives of women groups have been captured among the community members who would be sponsored by the project to participate in the learning events.

Output 5.1.3: Gender-sensitive learning and exposure events and visits facilitated by the project at landscape and national levels; South-South Exchange with Shea-producing countries, with at least 50% women representatives

Output Indicator 5.1.3a: Number of learning and exposure trips, with at least 50% women representatives

Output Target 5.1.3a: At least two learning and exposure trips (one trip per held every two years) with 5 representatives from the Government of Uganda, 35 from the local community, **including representatives of women groups** and 10 private sectors per trip [Total: two trips (50 people for 4 years), with at least 50% women).

Output Indicator 5.1.3b: Number of South-South learning and knowledge exchange visit, **with at least 50% women representatives**

Output Target 5.1.3b: At least one South-South learning and knowledge exchange visit (5 representatives from the Government of Uganda, 15 from the local community, **including representatives of women's groups**, 10 from the private sector (Total: 30 participants with 50% being women).

Paragraph 73 also includes this text: *Inclusion of women and women groups: The exchange programs will also specifically target women producers and women-led cooperatives, facilitating their participation in knowledge-sharing and capacity-building activities. This will help them learn best practices and innovative techniques from their counterparts in other Shea-producing countries.*

CI- GEF response, October 11, 2024:

Text adjusted under Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 updated to be gender-responsive including capturing 30% representation of women:

- Paragraph 38: Description of Output 1.1.2 and its output indicator and target updated to be gender responsive including capturing 30% representation of women
- Paragraph 39: Description of Output 1.1.3 and its output indicator and target updated to be gender responsive including capturing 30% representation of women

See changes in portal section: B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY; Part II. Project Justification B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION. In the Prodoc these changes are in the section Results Framework (under the indicative project overview section).

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

- a). Yes
- b). Yes
- c). Yes

Agency's Comments
4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). No. Although there is some description of the key global environmental problems and contextual drivers, there is limited elaboration of the climate rationale of the project. Please provide a substantive climate vulnerability analysis and how climate change has affected the local communities and their livelihoods assets over a period of time.

b). Yes

GEF-SEC OCT 10, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI- GEF response, October 11, 2024:

a) Text added under paragraph 9 on variability, and in paragraph 16 to further elaborate on vulnerability. See these changes in portal section Part II. Project Justification A. PROJECT RATIONALE.

Paragraph 9 - information added: **Near-surface temperature is predicted to increase by 2⁰C in the next 50 years and the total annual rainfall is expected to drop by 20% over the same period**

resulting in loss of natural resources-based assets and increased poverty²³. While climate change is a major risk to Uganda's overall development, northern Uganda is even more vulnerable as only rain-fed subsistence agriculture provides livelihood to the resident communities^{24,25}. High temperatures averaging 29-40⁰C in the north of the country coupled with increased duration and severity of the dry season from December to March have contributed to crop failure, livestock mortality, affected settlements and increased household food insecurity and poverty²⁶ thereby increasing vulnerability²⁷.

Paragraph 16 information added: The Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative puts Uganda as the 9th most vulnerable country to climate change and the World Bank affirmed that climate change is a major risk to Uganda's development outcomes as the national economy relies on natural resource base. Northern Uganda has the highest proportion of households most vulnerable to climate change as 80% depends on rain-fed subsistence agriculture^{33,34}. In the past two decades, nearly 200,000 Ugandans have been affected by climate related disasters annually³⁵. In northern Uganda, high temperatures and extreme heat averaging 29-40⁰C have increased aridity and the length and severity of the dry season from December to March, contributing to reduced shea nut yields, crop failure and livestock mortality which in turn have increased household food insecurity and poverty³⁶. Floods due to El Nino Southern Oscillation have affected settlements and farming thereby increasing vulnerability and exacerbating poverty³⁷. Near surface temperature is predicted to increase by 2⁰C in the next 50 years and the total annual rainfall is expected to drop by 20% over the same period resulting in loss of assets and increased poverty³⁸. Impacts of climate change on the local communities in northern Uganda are not explicitly documented. National statistics indicate that between 2004 and 2013, droughts affected close to 2.4 million people in the country (including northern Uganda) with an estimated loss of USD 1.2 billion, equivalent to 7.5% of Uganda's Gross Domestic Product at that time.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). No

b). Yes

c). No. Please note that instead of listing previous projects like the GEF Kidepo Critical Landscape Project, there is need to provide an analysis of lessons learned and potential gaps if any which have/will inform this project.

d). Yes

GEF-SEC OCT 10, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI- GEF response, October 11, 2024:

a) Justification included in portal section: Part II. Project Justification A. PROJECT RATIONALE. Text added under paragraph 25:

Previous and on-going projects in the shea landscape of northern Uganda lacked a strong component of climate resilience and did not develop the capacity for the resident communities to adopt and practice climate-resilient activities for sustainable livelihoods. The proposed project adopts a whole-of-society approach hitherto unused in projects that tended to target specific sections of the community such local shea producers' collective action groups. Conservation of associated indigenous flagship tree species is an innovative and unique integrated approach at the landscape level. In addition, most of the interventions have been on research and not enlisting stakeholder interest particularly government and resident communities. The priority to conserve the shea landscape is thus just developing within government and so the project intervention is chosen to ensure creating further awareness and value proposition for the shea landscape. Shea has great potential for commercialization and this project will increase that profile. Finally, many women are depending on shea for livelihoods and the project approach is intended to promote livelihood security, health, community resilience and sustainability. As well a table has been inserted under Paragraph 23, that provides a summary of the Incremental Benefits of The Project's Interventions.

b) No action required

c) A table that shows how this project builds on/leverages baseline initiatives has been moved under paragraph 22. The table also has a column that shows gaps/lessons learnt from the baseline projects. Additionally, text has also been added under para 22. See this added information in portal section Part II. Project Justification, B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

d) No action required

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). Yes. However, The discussed enablers (E) and assumptions (A) are not visibly represented in the ToC diagram as stated in the text.

b). Yes

GEF-SEC OCT 16, 2024

Please note that the ToC diagram in the portal is visible as the current version can not be viewed.

Figure 2: Diagrammatic representation of the Theory of Change



GEF-SEC OCT 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF October 28, 2024

The PPT Version of the ToC has been re-uploaded in the portal.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). Yes

b). No involvement of the Agency in execution

c). Yes. However, analysis of lessons and gaps in the identified project is not provided. Please provide lessons learned from those project instead of just listing the projects.

d). Yes

GEF-SEC OCT 10, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI- GEF response, October 11, 2024:

a) No action required

b) Based on preliminary stakeholder mapping in Uganda's Shea Landscape, key local actors appear capable of executing project activities. As a GEF Agency, our model focuses on building the technical and institutional capacity of local organizations to ensure sustainability

and ownership of results. For now, at PIF stage, we have indicated that Conservation International will serve as the implementing agency, leveraging in-house expertise to oversee and support the in country organizations to deliver project activities while building their capacity. During the PPG phase, we will reassess whether CI will remain solely the implementing agency or take on implementing and executing functions. The final decision regarding CI's role will also be informed by the outcome of the financial due diligence of the organizations that would have been identified to execute

c) A table that shows how this project builds on/leverages baseline initiatives has been moved under paragraph 22. The table also has a new column that shows gaps/lessons learnt from the baseline projects. Text has also been added under paragraph 22.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). No.

1) Since Outputs 2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 3.1.3 all deal with MSMEs, a META Information related to private sector needs to be "true" instead of false.

2) There is inconsistency in the core indicators. For example, while core indicator 1 states 490 beneficiaries, core indicator 4 states 930. With only 490 direct beneficiaries, the adaption benefits of the proposed project (i.e. return on investment) is minimal as only 0.07% of the total population of the targeted Districts will benefit. This also means that more than \$15,000 will be invested per beneficiary.

b). Yes

GEF-SEC OCT 10, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

GEF response, October 11, 2024:

1) In the META, private sector has been changed to ?true?.

2) Targets adjusted for the relevant indicators 1, 2 and 4. Specifically, Core Indicators 1 and 4 have been increased to 4,320 and the breakdown?provided in Table 4. See these

changes in the portal section Core Indicators and an explanation was provided in section B. Project Description, at the end of the section see LDCF Core Indicators. This conservative target estimate will be re-evaluated during the PPG Phase and if needed, increased. Additionally, it is critical to note that the direct beneficiaries of the project activities are likely to overlap across the outputs. Therefore, this conservative target ensures there is no double counting.

Furthermore, Core Indicator 2 has been increased to 4,500 hectares and the breakdown provided in Table 5. Given the severe degradation in this landscape, it is safer to set a conservative yet realistic target and re-evaluate it during the PPG Phase. This re-evaluation will occur after: a) developing criteria for selecting priority restoration sites, b) mapping the priority sites for restoration, and c) conducting site visits to evaluate the extent of degradation, estimate restoration costs, and determine how many hectares can be restored with the available resources for maximum impact, without compromising the delivery of other project activities.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

a). Yes

b). Yes

c). Yes

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

- a). Yes
- b). Yes (e.g. Establishing national Shea Champions Interactive Forum and deploy financial literacy to promote the saving culture of the local communities and encourage adaptative financial for enterprise development).
- c). Yes

Agency's Comments

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes. However, there are several disparities in the alignment. The proposed project intends to contribute 40% to Nature-based management and 60% to Water resources management sectors as well as Theme 1 and 3 of the GEF-8 adaptation programming strategy, but this is not well linked to the proposed project components. Could you advise which component/outcome/output contribute to the specific sector?

GEF-SEC OCT 10, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI- GEF response, October 11, 2024:

Text adjusted in section C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES to proposed project interventions. As well these were added in the Prodoc in paragraph 91.

The META information for the project has also been revised to 70% Nature-based management and 30% Agriculture to well align the project interventions with the Themes 1 and 3 on the GEF adaptation programming strategy.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

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

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

No

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

No

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

No

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

No

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC OCT, 16, 2024

Yes. However, the project Title in the LoE is different from that in the portal. Please make sure that the project Title in the portal is consistent with the information in the LOE.

GEF-SEC OCT 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF October 28, 2024

Noted. The revised LoE has been secured and uploaded to the portal.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC OCT 16, 2024

No.

1- The template used by the OFP removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?". Please you are advised to either request a new LoE that retains the footnote, or get an email from the OFPs accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE.

2- The amount entered into the portal are different from those in the LoE. For example, the column for PPG fee in the LoE is missing. We advised that you obtain a new LoE from the OFP with accurate distribution of the amounts and ensure that the figures are entered into the portal as indicated in the LoE.

GEF-SEC OCT 29, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF October 28, 2024

1. Noted. The revised LoE has been secured and uploaded to the portal.

2. PPG included in the LoE and figures in the portal match

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC OCT 29, 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF-SEC SEPT 23, 2024

TBD

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/23/2024	10/11/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2024	10/28/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		