



## 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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,080,000
Co-financing:	\$10,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,480,000
PIF Approval:	March 09, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	May 26, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval	Expected Project Start Date:		
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavelier	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza, RTA EBD

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 Uganda is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	2-7-11 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-	

		Uganda. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	2-7-11 UNDP has a strong experience in the country and the region to enhance protected area networks. Cleared	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	2-7-11 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. Cleared	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	2-7-11 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. 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. Cleared	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	2-7-11 The BD STAR allocation for Uganda is \$3,830 million. The requested amount is \$3,5 million, including PPG and fees. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	

	equitable access?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
		NA	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	<p>2-7-11 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 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated 2-18-11. Cleared</p>	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	<p>2-7-11 See item 8.</p> <p>2-24-11 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated 2-18-11. Cleared</p>	

	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	<p>2-7-11</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>2-7-11</p> <p>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 outside PAs? What makes the project implementation 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</p> <p>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.</p>	

## Project Design

12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?

2-7-11

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.

Please address the following issues:

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).

2. What is the role of the UNDP's cofinancing in the project?

3. How the USAID WILD programme helps the baseline?

4. Please describe the role of the private sector, local communities, and governing bodies (districts, local governments) in the baseline for the component 2.

		2-24-11 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	2-7-11 The main problems and the barriers are well described in the PIF. Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	2-7-11 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.  2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	2-7-11 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?  2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	2-7-11 Cleared	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar	2-7-11 The project will build capacities of the UWA, and will support other partners in the landscape to handle biodiversity related issues (conservation and sustainable use). At CEO endorsement	

		effectiveness of the chosen approach. Cleared	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	2-7-11 Yes. See B3, p7. Cleared	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	2-7-11 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. Cleared	
	20. 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 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, etc. A deeper on-the-ground analysis is expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	2-7-11 Cleared	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	2-7-11 Yes. Please clarify their role in the Execution of the Project.  2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	2-7-11 Cleared	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	2-7-11 Please clarify if the institutions providing co-financing will be also executing agencies, including WWF, WCS (under USAID-WILD), and the two	

		<p>appear as formal executing agencies.</p> <p>2-24-11 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared</p>	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>2-7-11 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. Cleared</p>	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	<p>2-7-11 No. Please re-evaluate funding availability to achieve proposed outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared</p>	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	<p>2-7-11 What are the two Private Sector co-financiers and the two NGO/Academia?</p> <p>2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared</p>	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>2-7-11 It is not clear if the budget allocated to the two components is going to be sufficient to achieve the proposed outputs and outcomes. It is important to develop a focus and realistic project framework (geographically and thematically). Please</p>	



		2-24-11 This issue was properly addressed in the revised PIF dated Feb. 18, 2011 Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	The Tracking tools are expected at CEO endorsement.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	2-7-11 No. Please address issues under items 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, 24, 28, 29 and 30.  3-9-11 Yes. This project is recommended for clearance.	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	2-24-11 For CEO Endorsement, please strengthen the "law enforcement component" and provide a clear cost-benefit analysis for the proposed activities.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 04, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 24, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 09, 2011	

\* 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.

## 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 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 Yes. Cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>6-1-11 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.