



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

GEF ID:	7997		
Country/Region:	Uganda		
Project Title:	Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production in Uganda, through a Farmer/Agro-Pastoralist Field School Approach		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$6,886,838
Co-financing:	\$29,269,269	Total Project Cost:	\$36,356,107
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawlestone Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Barbara Herren

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, Uganda is a LDC and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated June 19, 2014 is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. 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 SCCF (Adaptation or		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, the project is aligned with CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3, as per the GEF Adaptation Programming Strategy 2014-2018.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes, the project is consistent with the NAPA.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>	Yes, the key baseline project is the Agropastoralist and Farmer Field School extension approach.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Not clear. The components and outcomes are mostly clear and detailed sufficiently for the PIF stage.</p> <p>It is unclear what the first component aims to achieve, that would not be achieved through the second component. Currently, the description of the first component is overly broad, and it unclear if the proposed budget under this component is justifiable.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Recommended action: Please provide further information on this component, particularly how these activities will directly support the implementation of the urgent and immediate needs, and support, in a targeted and cost-efficient manner, the delivery of the outcomes and outputs consistent with the LDCF's strategic results framework.</p> <p>Update 1/31/2015: Additional information has been provided, further strengthening the rationale for component 1. It is understood that further elaboration will occur during the project preparation stage and that by the CEO endorsement stage a more detailed picture will be presented.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, sufficiently so for the PIF stage. It is understood that these will be elaborated during the project preparation stage and that by the CEO endorsement stage a more detailed picture will be presented.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Not clear. Risks no. 2 and 4 appear overlapping and inconsistent.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please review the risks mentioned, and make the necessary adjustments.</p> <p>Update 1/31/2015: Cleared. The needed adjustments have been made.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Not clear. The project appears coordinated and consistent with other related initiatives. However, please see comment under section 7. Once this component is clarified, it will be reassessed to better understand consistency and coordination with other relevant initiatives.</p> <p>Update 2/3/2015: This is cleared.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>While the project is not, generally speaking innovative (FFS is a tested method), it would be innovative in this particular context and would help address the urgent and immediate needs. The project has a significant potential for sustainability, based on long-running experience of the implementing agency in employing the FFS approach. Similarly, the potential for scaling up is significant, particularly once the capacity for organizing FFS is established.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address the comment made in section 7.</p> <p>Update 2/3/2015: This is cleared.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The indicated amount and composition of cofinancing is adequate, and the amount the Agency is bringing is in line with its role.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	At 5% of the project grant amount, the project management cost appears adequate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency	Yes. The amount does not deviate from the norm.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Please address comments in sections 7, 11, 12, and 16. Update 2/3/2015: All the outstanding comments have been addressed and the PIF is ready to be technically recommended. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	First review*	February 04, 2015	
Review Date (s)	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.