



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

|  |  |                              |                |
|--|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4456   |                              |                |
| Country/Region:                            | Uganda   |                              |                |
| Project Title:                             | Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda |                              |                |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 4592 (UNDP)    |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund   | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Biodiversity   |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; Project Mana;  |                              |                |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$101,819  | Project Grant:               | \$3,080,000    |
| Co-financing:                              | \$10,684,700   | Total Project Cost:          | \$13,866,519   |
| PIF Approval:                              | March 09, 2011   | Council Approval/Expected:   | May 26, 2011   |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                |
| Program Manager:                           | Charlotte Gobin  | Agency Contact Person:       | Alice Ruhweza, |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Eligibility     | 1. Is the participating country eligible?                | 2-7-11<br>Uganda is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared.  | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage.                                |
|                 | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 2-7-11<br>Uganda is using nearly all its BD allocation (\$3,830,000) in this project (\$3,388,000). There is a letter of endorsement dated November 25, 2010 signed by the Operational Focal Point. The letter mentions an amount of \$3,500,000 from the BD STAR allocation, including PPG and fees. The title is slightly different than in the project document. The letter endorses the project on conservation and management of the threatened savanna woodland and afro-montane forest landscape in Northern Uganda. |  |

|                                |  |  |                             |
|--------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?                     | 2-7-11<br>UNDP has a strong experience in the country and the region to enhance protected area networks.<br>Cleared  | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage. |
|                                | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                | NA   | 12-3-12<br>NA               |
|                                | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           | 2-7-11<br>The project fits with the UNDP's programme on biodiversity in the region and in the country. UNDP can take lessons from other projects in the same country and even in the same region. UNDP's team is involved in the Peace Building and Recovery Assistance Plan and its implementation in the Northern part of the country.<br>The project links to UNDAF outcome 2 (sustainable livelihoods), its objectives 1 and 6 on increasing household incomes, and harnessing natural resources and the environment for sustainable development.<br>Cleared | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage. |
| Resource Availability          | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |  |                             |
|                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>   | 2-7-11<br>The BD STAR allocation for Uganda is \$3,830 million. The requested amount is \$3,5 million, including PPG and fees.<br>Cleared  | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage. |
|                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>                                   | NA   | 12-3-12<br>NA               |
|                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>             | NA   | 12-3-12<br>NA               |

|                     |   |   |                             |
|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul> | NA  | 12-3-12<br>NA               |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>               |   | 12-3-12<br>NA               |
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>                         | NA  | 12-3-12<br>NA               |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?     | <p>2-7-11<br/>According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework (A. in page 1 of PIF template), the project is all BD-1 (Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems). In the Project Framework (B on page 1 of PIF Template), there are two components; the first "Strengthening management effectiveness of the Kidepo critical landscape PA cluster" and the second, "Integrating PA Management in the Wider Landscape". While the first component is BD-1, the second appears to be BD-2 because outcomes and outputs include activities like "defining off-take rates for shea tree harvesting (for charcoal) and wildlife hunting" both outside PAs, "Measures to improve market access for shea products in place", and "Infrastructure placement under the Peace Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) influenced to curtail future threats to biodiversity" (development of new settlements and infrastructure. If these activities are taking place outside PAs ("Wider Landscape"), please split these two components in Table A.</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated 2-18-11.<br/>Cleared</p> | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage. |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>   | <p>2-7-11<br/>See item 8.</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated 2-18-11.<br/>Cleared</p>  | <p>12-3-12<br/>As at PIF stage.</p>   |
|  | <p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p> | <p>2-7-11<br/>The project is in line with the Uganda's national development plan. More recently, the country undertook a prioritization exercise and develop their GEF-5 priorities using GEF's funding in support of the OFP. No NPFE will be carried out by Uganda.<br/>Cleared</p>  | <p>12-3-12<br/>As at PIF stage. Under Para 24 or 26, please mention which Aichi Biodiversity target will be addressed by the project (mainly Achi Target 11), and how the projects will contribute to its achievement e.g % of national coverage by PAs before and after the project, number of site of particular importance included in the PA system before and after the project.</p> <p>1-8-13: Cleared.</p>   |
|  | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>  | <p>2-7-11<br/>Under the component 1, the project aims at developing proper management plans for the PAs, including a financing and business plan. The capacity building activities are addressing practical issues for the 120 rangers and other field staff to improve the management effectiveness of protected areas.</p> <p>Under the component 2, "capacity of local governments will be built to ensure they have the competence and skills to monitor and enforce laws on sustainable harvests of shea tree". What is the land tenure status in the region? How realistic is to propose building local capacities for monitoring and enforcing the law, particularly on the issue of harvesting valuable NR outsides PAs?</p> | <p>12-3-12<br/>Under component 1, the capacity building activities are addressing practical issues for the 120 rangers and other field staff to improve the management effectiveness of protected areas. Community representatives and customary leaders will be involved in wildlife and environmental trainings. A platform for intelligence gathering and information sharing among 8 PAs will be developed.<br/>Under component 2, the capacity of local government to monitor and enforce the laws will be strengthen. A security strategy linked to PA security management and the police force will be developed at the inter-district level to prevent wildlife poaching and illegal trade.</p> |

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       |  | <p>and executing agencies think that they will succeed in law enforcement when the existing community bylaws have been long disregarded? Are there policing activities that can be carried out to protect BD from poachers? The approach of the project is rather "soft" when compared to the threat.</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>These issues were addressed in the revised PIF dated 2-18-11. For CEO Endorsement, please strengthen the "law enforcement component" and provide a clear cost-benefit analysis for the proposed activities.<br/>Cleared</p>  | <p>developed for local communities. Cleared.</p> |
| <p>Project Design</p> | <p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <p>2-7-11<br/>The baseline is described with the description of a critical landscape for biodiversity (IBA, WWF Ecoregion, zones of endemism), and the existing efforts by the Uganda Wildlife Authority. The baseline is low as the 20 year civil war and the remoteness of the Kidepo critical landscape have made impossible for UWA to regain control of protected areas and develop management planning tools. UWA needs support to develop and implement the different sides of management plans for the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity. The project will then focus on improving the management effectiveness of protected areas in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in the Northern part of the country, and reducing emerging and future threats.</p> <p>Please address the following issues:</p> | <p>12-3-12<br/>As at PIF stage.</p>              |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>1. Please state what part of the \$45M "Environment and Natural Resource Programme (ENRP), one of the 14 components of the Peace Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP), directly relates to the 2 components of this GEF project, and should be considered objectively its Baseline Project. This would facilitate understanding the incremental reasoning of the project (see below item 15).</p> <p>2. What is the role of the UNDP's cofinancing in the project?</p> <p>3. How the USAID WILD programme helps the baseline?</p> <p>4. Please describe the role of the private sector, local communities, and governing bodies (districts, local governments) in the baseline for the component 2.</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br/>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | <p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> |   | <p>12-3-12<br/>The approach of integrating PAs in a broader ecological block to improve the returns per-unit-of-investment in PAs by spreading conservation management across a wider scale is interesting. However, the lack of information regarding the Kipedo Valley CTF, the Community Wildlife Association, and the user right mechanism does not help to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the approach.</p> |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |   | <p>information.</p> <p>1-8-13: Cleared.</p>  |
|  | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p> | <p>2-7-11<br/>Using the Baseline Project as the starting point, please elaborate on the Incremental Reasoning for the two components (see above item 15). Are the \$45M of the Baseline Project going to be used in activities directly closely related to the GEF project?</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br/>Cleared</p> | <p>12-3-12<br/>While the Peace and Recovery Development Plan will address the environmental impact of the resettling and infrastructure development, the project will reinforce the management of the PA system and its buffer zones.<br/>Cleared.</p>   |
|  | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>   | <p>2-7-11<br/>Please clarify the area and location of the "wider landscape" that will be targeted in the project (component 2) and in relation to component 1. Is the entire area (hectares) outside the PAs in Annex 1, the area for implementation of Component 2.</p> <p>2-24-11<br/>This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br/>Cleared</p>        | <p>12-3-12<br/>Under Component 1, there is some discrepancy between Table B and the activities presented in the text e.g Table B, output 1.3 refers to the creation of a Kidepo Valley conservation Trust Fund but no further detail is provided in the text. Instead, the text mentions the creation of a community wildlife association with Trust Fund. Please, clarify. If the project will support the development of Trust Fund, more information is expected on this process, and the level and the kind of involvement of the GEF funding. Regarding the institutionalisation of the user right, there is no particular output and no indicator under Table B related to this activity. Furthermore, it is not entirely clear how this institutionalisation will help to improve the PA revenue, and how the High Value concession will be chosen.</p> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>information.<br/>Under Component 2, certification activities are mentioned, please further detail on which certification will be developed. The expected outputs/ outcomes and indicator have to be included in Table B. Please also describe how guidance from STAP on certification has been addressed in the project design.</p> <p>1-8-13: Cleared.</p> |
|  | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?  | 2-7-11<br>Cleared  | 12-3-12<br>Yes.  |
|  | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | 2-7-11<br>Yes. See B3, p7.<br>Cleared  | 12-3-12<br>There is a clear description on how the socio-economic benefits will support the long term achievement of incremental benefits. However, please provide additional information regarding the targets e.g. how many people will be impacted by the project.<br><br>1-8-13: Cleared   |
|  | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?  | 2-7-11<br>The issue has reasonably been taken into consideration for what is requested at PIF level. Additional information will be request at CEO endorsement (baseline, indicators, targets) including activities linked to the component 2 involving women and young groups.<br>Cleared | 12-3-12<br>Yes, page 108 of the Project Document. Cleared.   |
|  | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e.. climate resilience)  | 2-7-11<br>Major risks are mentioned linked to the recent history of the region, land conflicts, and the return to normal in terms of institutions. local governments.  | 12-3-12<br>Adequate information provided.<br>Cleared.  |



|                   |  |   |   |
|-------------------|--|---|---|
|                   |  | expected at CEO endorsement.<br>Cleared   |   |
|                   | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 2-7-11<br>Cleared   | 12-3-12<br>Cleared.   |
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   | 2-7-11<br>Please clarify if the institutions providing co-financing will be also executing agencies, including WWF, WCS (under USAID-WILD), and the two NGO/Academia. Only NEMA and UWA appear as formal executing agencies.<br><br>2-24-11<br>These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br>Cleared | 12-3-12<br>The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) will be the implementing partner. A National Task Force Membership gathering relevant institutions will be set-up. A project coordination Unit and a project Steering Committee will allow coordination among the partners.<br>Cleared. |
|                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?   |   | 12-3-12<br>The project structure is close to what was presented at PIF stage. However, clarification and explanation are expected, as indicated in the above items.   |
|                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?             |   | 12-3-12<br>NA   |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?  | 2-7-11<br>The management costs reach the maximum (10%). Due to the region, the country, and the multiple difficulties of logistics and communication, it is acceptable for such project.<br>Cleared   | 12-3-12<br>The project management cost is about 5%, which is acceptable.  |

|                                   |  |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 2-7-11<br>No. Please re-evaluate funding availability to achieve proposed outputs and outcomes.<br><br>2-24-11<br>This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br>Cleared   | 12-3-12<br>Yes. Cleared.   |
|                                   | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | 2-7-11<br>What are the two Private Sector co-financiers and the two NGO/Academia?<br><br>2-24-11<br>This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011<br>Cleared   | 12-3-12<br>The co-financing ratio is about 1:3.46, which is slightly higher than PIF stage (1:3.37). However, a new co-financing letter from the PRDP-ENRP is expected. This letter will have to explicitly mention the co-financing of US\$4,425,000.<br><br>1-8-13: Cleared. |
|                                   | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?                         | 2-7-11<br>The cofinancing is brought by the Government in cash and in-kind (\$5.5m), the Agency (\$2.5m in cash), and on-the-ground partners, including bilateral donors (USAID), Academic and International NGOs (i.e. WWF Rhino Programme), and local districts for a total of \$10,4 million.<br>Cleared | 12-3-12<br>As at PIF stage. Cleared.   |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?       |   | 12-3-12<br>The METT for each PA concerned and the financial scorecards have been provided. Cleared.  |
|                                   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?        |   | 12-3-12<br>Yes. Cleared.   |
| Agency Responses                  | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:  |   |  |

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>   |  |   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>   |  |   |
| Secretariat Recommendation                  |   |  |   |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>   | <p>2-7-11<br/>No. Please address issues under items 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, 24, 28, 29 and 30.</p> <p>3-9-11<br/>Yes. This project is recommended for clearance.</p> |   |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  | <p>2-24-11<br/>For CEO Endorsement, please strengthen the "law enforcement component" and provide a clear cost-benefit analysis for the proposed activities.</p>       |   |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  |   |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |  | <p>12-3-12<br/>The project proposal cannot be recommended for CEO approval yet. A number of issues have been identified. Please address these issues entirely and resubmit.</p> <p>1-8-13: Yes, the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | February 04, 2011  | December 03, 2012   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | February 24, 2011  | January 08, 2013  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | March 09, 2011   |   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |   |

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

| Review Criteria            | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments  |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| PPG Budget                 | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | <p>6-1-11<br/>Yes. GEF funding will be used for the following activities:</p> <p>1) Baseline data collection and informational gap analysis, including: i) management effectiveness scores of the Pas, ii) PA financing score cards for the Pas, iii) financing gap and options, iv) headcounts of the number of key indicator species, v) shea tree coverage and degradation, vi) PA staff capacity assessment, and vi) inventory of the district policies and plans guiding the expansion of pas, and the development of corridors, buffers zones.</p> <p>2) Assessment of the capacity of different agencies to support the implementation of project activities at the local government level, at the PA level, at the law enforcement level and at the civil society level. In addition, there is the need of identification of needs and opportunities for strengthening biodiversity management at each of the above levels, and development of recommendations of how these can be improved.</p> <p>3) Project feasibility analysis, strategy and budget. The three key outputs of these component will be (i) a detailed project strategy, including incremental cost analysis, cost-effectiveness, and risks; (ii) a detailed budget, and (iii) a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
|                            | 2. Is itemized budget justified?                                    | <p>6-1-11<br/>Yes.<br/>Cleared</p>  |
| Secretariat Recommendation | <b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>                        | <p>6-1-11<br/>Yes.</p>  |
|                            | 4. Other comments   |   |
| Review Date (s)            | First review*   | June 01, 2011   |
|                            | Additional review (as necessary)                                    |   |

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

