



## PDF /PPG STATUS REPORT



**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 1837

**UNDP Project ID:** 1610, Proposal ID: 00015084

**COUNTRY:** Uganda

**PROJECT TITLE:** Community Based Conservation of Wetland Biodiversity  
in Uganda

**OTHER PROJECT EXECUTING AGENCY (IES):** IUCN- The World  
Conservation Union

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

**GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM:** OP2

**STARTING DATE:** 17 February 2003

**ESTIMATED DATE OF OPERATIONAL CLOSURE:** 14<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2005

**ESTIMATED DATE OF FINANCIAL CLOSURE:** 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2005

**Report submitted by:**

**Name**

**Title**

**Date**

Justin Ecaat

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Justin Ecaat'.

UNDP Environment Focal Point

20 March 2007

## PART I - PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE ACHIEVEMENTS

### A- SUMMARY OF ACTUAL ACHIEVEMENTS OF PREPARATORY PHASE (OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES), AND EXPLANATION OF ANY DEVIATIONS FROM EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The PDF A completed its primary purpose which was to develop, in a participatory manner, an acceptable final MSP Brief for the GEF. This was completed satisfactorily. The PDF A did have a number of subsidiary activities of undertaking Baseline surveys for wetland resources and socio-economic information in south west and northeastern part of Uganda.

#### Summary of the PDF "A" activities

Objective and Purpose	Output and achievements
To identify gaps in information and describe the potential demonstration sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Baseline surveys were conducted in southwestern Uganda and northeastern Uganda and reports produced.</li> <li>❖ Three potential demonstration sites: Nyamuriro in Kabale District; Kandekye in Bushenyi District Pian-Upe-Opeta –Bisina wetland Complex in Nakapiripiti, Kumi, Sironko, Soroti and Moroto Districts were identified</li> </ul>
To undertake stakeholder analysis and mobilize stakeholders and prepare them actively participate in consultation workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Through the process of undertaking baseline surveys, relevant key stakeholders were identified and briefed about the project.</li> </ul>
To hold one national and two regional planning workshops to develop an over-all project work plan and budget	<p><b><u>South-western regional workshop:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Regional workshop for the southwestern Uganda valley seasonal grassland wetland held.</li> <li>❖ Workshop developed criteria for selecting potential demonstration sites and recommended demonstration sites.</li> <li>❖ Workshop confirmed threats to the wetland in this region and recommended priority actions.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>North-eastern regional workshop:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Regional workshop for the northeastern wetlands was held. Workshop discussed and confirmed threats to the wetlands in this region and recommended remedial actions that could be supported by the project.</li> <li>❖ The key threat identified by conflict over access and use of wetland resources.</li> <li>❖ Workshop recommended project implementation structures that would empower districts.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>National workshop</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ One national workshop was held. Workshop considered and validated outcomes of the two regional workshops and developed a log frame for the project.</li> <li>❖ Workshop developed work plan and budget for the 1<sup>st</sup> year of implementation.</li> <li>❖ Workshop proposed implementation modalities.</li> </ul>
To prepare MSP brief and secure relevant endorsements and approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ MSP Project brief was prepared and submitted to UNDP Kampala Office and GEF Focal Point for Uganda.</li> <li>❖ Secured UNDP Technical approval.</li> <li>❖ Secured approval by Government of Uganda</li> <li>❖ Project was accepted by Government and is reflected in Mid-Term Expenditure budget Framework (2006-2008) for government of Uganda.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Secured letters of endorsement from all implementing institutions and districts.</li> <li>❖ Secured letters confirming co-financing from all implementing institutions.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Table 1: Completion status of Project Activities**

Approved			Actual			
Proposed Activities at Approval	GEF Financing	Co-financing	Completion status	GEF financing	Co-financing	Uncommitted GEF funds
Identify gaps in information and Description of potential demonstration sites	9000	6000	Completed	6932	7000	2102
Stake holder analysis and mobilization of consultative workshops	6000	4000	Completed	8336	4000	-2590
Hold 2 regional Planning workshop in Uganda Valley grass seasonal wetlands and NE Uganda	3000	4000	Completed	3500	4000	-300
Hold a national level workshop to develop an overall project work plan and budget	3000	1000	Completed	2283	1000	707
Prepare a draft MSP brief and submit to UNDP Hold meetings to finalize MSP brief	4000	1000	Completed	3919	0	81

## **B – RECORD OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT PREPARATION**

The project concept and design was developed over two years in a highly participatory manner. The various stakeholders were involved as follows:

- i. Wetland resources users/dependants around the demonstration sites were consulted during the baselines surveys as well during the regional workshops.
- ii. District leadership for those districts holding the demonstration sites were involved in regional workshops and national workshop.
- iii. Central government institutions involved in regional workshops and national workshop. Further, the Ministry responsible for wetlands management was engaged in technical discussion that led to incorporating this project in their mid-term, expenditure framework and budget.
- iv. GEF Focal point convened meetings for the national GEF Steering committee at which meeting; the MSP was approved and recommended for GEF Funding.
- v. The project was implemented according to the agreed structure and mechanism. A Task Force composed of UWS, NU, UNDP/SGP and WID coordinated by IUCN via IUCN Uganda Country Office implemented the work plan. The implementation largely involved participatory planning, field assessments, workshops and preparation of MSG project brief.
- vi. UNDP Kampala office convened several PAC meetings.

**PART II - PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE FINANCIAL DELIVERY**

**Table 2 – PDF /PPG INPUT Budget – Approvals and commitments**

Input Description*	Approved			Committed		
	Staff weeks	GEF funds	Co-finance	Staff weeks	GEF funds	Co-finance
Personnel						
Local consultants						
International consultants						
Training		12000	9000		12000	9000
Travel		9000	6000		9000	6000
Office equipment			1000			1000
Miscellaneous (implementation costs)		4000			4000	
<b>Total</b>		<b>25000</b>	<b>16000</b>		<b>25000</b>	<b>16000</b>

Additional information as relevant:

- Indicate PDF/PPG delivery rate (funds disbursed at time of operational closure as percentage of total GEF allocation): 100% of the funds had been disbursed at time of operational closure.
- Indicate whether it is expected that there will be unspent PDF/PPG funds at the time if financial closure: There were no Unspent funds.
- Provide justification for major deviations of actual disbursement from what was planned: N/A

**TABLE 3: ACTUAL PDF/PPG CO-FINANCING**

Co-financing Sources for Project Development Preparation (PDF)				
Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount	
			Expected (\$)	Actual (\$)
GOVT (WID, UWA, Districts)	Central & Local Government	Venue for workshops, staff time	7000	7000
NU	National NGO	Staff time	3000	3000
IUCN	International NGO	Staff time, office space	4000	4000
UWS	National NGO	Staff time	2000	2000
<b>Total co-financing</b>			<b>16000</b>	<b>16000</b>

Additional information as relevant:

- Provide explanation for major deviations from what was planned: N/A