GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**8035**		
Country/Region:	**Uganda**		
Project Title:	**Reducing the Climate Change Vulnerability of Local Communities in Uganda through EbA in Forest and Wetland Ecosystems**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$130,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,350,000**
Co-financing:	**$17,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$21,850,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Saliha Dobardzic**	Agency Contact Person:	**Ermira Fida**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental	Not clear. Currently, the activities to be funded by the project include	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	developing the technical and insitutional capacities at the local and national levels to integrate Ecosystem based Adaptation, and raising the awareness and increasing knowledge on Ecosystem based Adaptation. This in of itself can be transformational, is innovative, and could lead to scaling up. However, please see the item under Section 7, which necessitates a revision of the project as currently proposed. Update 5/8/2015: Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, the project has been designed with sound additional/adaptation reasoning.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Not clear. The components presented under the Indicative Project Description Summary are clear and appropriate. However, please see the comment under Section 7. Update 5/8/2015: Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	n/a	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	No. The amount requested, including the PPG and agency fees, would exceed the current per/country ceiling by $2.13 M. Recommended Action: Please make the necessary adjustments to the project accordingly. Update 5/8/2015: Cleared, the requested grant amount has been revised. However, please note that the numbers in Appendix 1 (Logical Framework) have not been corrected. Please ensure this is done by CEO Endorsement.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not at this time. This is a strong proposal, however, please see the comments under Sections 3, 5, and 7. Update 5/8/2015: The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
Review Date	Review	March 03, 2015	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		