



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

GEF ID:	4993		
Country/Region:	Uganda		
Project Title:	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Africa to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5094 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$26,270,000	Total Project Cost:	\$30,370,000
PIF Approval:	May 31, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Tadross

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?	YES. Uganda is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	YES. Uganda is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated April 24, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in institutional capacity building, as well as technical and policy support in the area of climate change adaptation.	YES.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	YES. UNDP has a considerable portfolio of relevant projects, as well as	YES.

		UNDP's programming in the areas of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management is well described in the PIF.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$4.4 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	YES.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	YES.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks of climate change-induced economic losses; and CCA-3.1 on the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1.	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2, outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. The Request for CEO Endorsement does not, however, provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome. RECOMMENDED ACTION: In the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), please provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome. 07/31/2013 â€œ YES.
9. Is the project consistent with the	YES. The proposed project is well	YES. The proposed project would	

	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Reduction Strategy Paper and it contributes directly towards the implementation of the country's second NAPA priority on strengthening meteorological services, as well as towards the implementation of other priority measures, particularly in the agriculture sector.	priorities in the areas of strengthening hydro-meteorological services, and climate-resilient development policy and planning. The project is also aligned with Uganda's National Development Plan.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>YES. The project combines physical investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning infrastructure with capacity building for national hydro-meteorological services and other key stakeholders. The project includes a sub-component focusing on long-term public and private financing arrangements to ensure the sustainable management of the systems developed.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with the lack of sustainable financing, institutional support and political commitment, along with appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	YES. The proposed project addresses current gaps in Uganda's hydro-meteorological monitoring capacity and early-warning systems in an integrated manner, with a focus on hardware, software, capacity building, planning, coordination, and finance. The project would include a sub-component to establish a framework for financial sustainability based on cost-recovery to support future EWS operations. A detailed sustainability strategy is presented in section 2.7 of the Project Document.
Project Design	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?	YES. The proposed project would build on and contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) the Partners for Resilience project, financed by the Government of the Netherlands and implemented in partnership with the Dutch Red Cross; (ii) the Natural Disaster Early Warning System project, lead by the International Telecommunications Union; (iii) the Agricultural Technology and Agri-business Advisory Services project, financed through a World Bank loan; and (iv) Support to the Preparation of a National Disaster Management Policy.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Overall, the Request for CEO Endorsement identifies and describes adequately a range of relevant baseline initiatives, on which the proposed project would build and which it would strengthen.</p> <p>The relationship between the baseline projects and the confirmed sources and amounts of co-financing is not entirely clear, however. In particular, the sources of co-financing identified in the table on p. 7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement do not appear to be consistent with those provided in Table</p>

		<p>The baseline initiatives are all relevant and adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more detailed understanding of the specific activities to be carried out in the context of the proposed project, please discuss the gaps and needs associated with the baseline initiatives to allow for a complete and thorough assessment of the additional reasoning.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the baseline initiatives described in Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement is consistent with the sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C.</p> <p>07/31/2013 â€œ YES. The co-financing figures and the description of baseline projects and programs have been revised for consistency.</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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project appears to have been designed in a cost effective manner. The Project Document (Section 2.6) demonstrates that sufficient cost comparison has been carried out for all key components of the project.</p> <p>In addition, taking into account the simultaneous submission of 9 similar projects in the region, and with a view to enhancing cost-effectiveness, the Request for CEO Endorsement could explore approaches to enhance regional coordination and collaboration. This would also respond the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, captured in the Highlights of its 12th meeting.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider, from the perspective of cost-effectiveness, approaches to enhance regional coordination and collaboration, including activities carried at the regional level.</p> <p>07/31/2013 â€œ YES. The re-</p>

			<p>project will seek to capture the potential cost savings arising from close collaboration with the 9 similar projects in the region. In particular, opportunities for joint procurement and training activities have been identified, as well as modalities for inter-country information sharing.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. While, for the most part, the additional cost reasoning is well described for each component and output, it is not clear what activities would in fact be carried out under Component 3 and how such activities relate to the technical assistance activities carried out under outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3. Moreover, the description of outcome 3.2 on page 17 appears to be inconsistent with that of the Project Framework (Table B).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a more clear and coherent description of the added value of Component 3 vis-à-vis the project as a whole, and, if appropriate, consider integrating the component into outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more comprehensive assessment of baseline initiatives, as well as associated gaps and needs, please describe in greater detail the activities proposed for LDCF financing, their associated cost, and the additional reasoning on which these activities are based.</p> <p>05/23/2012 -- YES. The activities previously proposed under Component 3</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a detailed description of the baseline scenario and associated gaps and needs, as well as the additional activities proposed for LDCF financing.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 11 above.</p>

		outputs 1.6, 2.1 and 2.3.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above with respect to Component 3. Moreover, it is not clear why output 2.3 has been identified as an investment as opposed to technical assistance.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendation under Section 13 above, please revise the Project Framework accordingly; and kindly revise or classify output 2.3 as TA.</p> <p>05/23/2012 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	<p>YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to the recommendation under Section 12 above, and make appropriate adjustments in the Project Framework in response to the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, if necessary.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>YES. The adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing are clearly described, based on sound and appropriate assumptions and methodology.</p>	<p>YES.</p>
	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?	<p>YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project would reach the most vulnerable communities and groups, particularly women.</p>	<p>YES. The expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information regarding the local-</p>	<p>YES. Comprehensive stakeholder consultations have been carried out during project preparation, and the Project Document describes how stakeholders would be involved during project implementation and evaluation.</p>

		project.	
	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)	<p>YES. The risk assessment is adequate for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of risks and relevant mitigation measures, considering in particular the sustainability of the systems established and the capacities developed (see also Section 10 above).</p>	<p>YES. A comprehensive assessment of relevant risks and associated, appropriate mitigation measures is provided in Annex 6 of the Project Document.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>YES. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives and processes in Uganda as well as in the wider region.</p> <p>BY CEO Endorsement, in addition to listing other relevant initiatives, please describe in greater detail how the proposed project will be coordinated with such initiatives.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement describes in some detail the ways in which the proposed project would be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant initiatives in the country and the wider region.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 12 above. In addition, the Request for CEO Endorsement could discuss the relationship between the proposed project and other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives under preparation in the region, including potential synergies.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please discuss the relationship between the proposed project and other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives under preparation in the region, including potential synergies.</p> <p>07/31/2013 – YES. Relevant opportunities for coordination and collaboration have been considered in</p>

			focus on synergies with other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please identify other executing partners in the Project Identification section of the PIF (page 1), considering in particular that the project will primarily be nationally executed, as stated on page 5.</p> <p>05/23/2012 -- YES. The revised PIF identifies the following executing partners: Meteorology Department, Ministry of Water and Environment; Department of Disaster Preparedness and Management, Office of the Prime Minister. Further information about implementation and execution arrangements will be provided by CEO Endorsement.</p>	YES. The proposed implementation arrangements are appropriate.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.	YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 2.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 12 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon</p>

		Section 13 above, please revise the grant and co-financing amounts accordingly. 05/23/2012 -- YES. The grant and co-financing amounts have been adjusted as recommended.	Section 12, please adjust the proposed grant and co-financing amounts accordingly, if necessary. 07/31/2013 â€œ YES.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The indicative co-financing is appropriate at \$29.66 million, placing the co-financing ratio at 1:7.4.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please ensure that confirmation is provided for all relevant sources and amounts of co-financing. 07/31/2013 â€œ YES.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. At \$3.86 million, the co-financing brought by UNDP is appropriate and in line with its role.	YES. At \$3.9 million, the co-financing brought by UNDP is appropriate and in line with its role.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		YES. An Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool has been filled out and attached to the submission.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	NA
	• Council comments?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 12 and 18 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 12 and 18. 07/31/2013 â€œ YES.

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 13, 14, 20 and 24. 05/23/2012 -- YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 11, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19.	
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?		YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 11, 12, 19, 24, 25 and 29. 07/31/2013 -- YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 11, 2012	June 19, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 23, 2012	July 31, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the itemized budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, PPG approval is being recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 08, 2012
	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.