



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

GEF ID:	<b>5603</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uganda</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change Through Banana Value Added Activities - Enhancing Food Security And Employment Generation</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,820,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$7,737,533</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$10,657,533</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 08, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Yvonne Lokko</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, Uganda is a least developed country, Party to UNFCCC, and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter is on file.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>	<p>Not clear. The project identifies alignment with CCA-1 and CCA-3 strategic objectives. However, the project also appears closely aligned with CCA-2.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please consider reflecting CCA-2 in the indicative Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A).</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: This has been done -- cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is consistent with Uganda's NAPA.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>The baseline problem and projects are well-described.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Yes, the components, outcomes and outputs are clear, sound, and appropriately detailed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the adaptation benefits are clearly identified and the additional reasoning is sound and appropriate.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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, the role of public participation is identified, and key stakeholder groups have been listed. The full list of stakeholders would be identified during the PPG phase and they would be engaged in the final project preparation.	
	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>Not clear. While the risks and mitigation measures listed appear to be sound, the proposal does not fully discuss the risks of climate change to the viability of the proposed investment, or the banana production in Uganda in the longer term. At various points, the proposal argues successfully how improving the production, including adding value to the product, more efficient use of the crop, and diversification of livelihoods would maintain and improve productivity, profit margins, and incomes, thus reducing the vulnerability. However, the proposal could be strengthened by inclusion of mechanisms for monitoring and adapting to the evolving effects of climate change on the banana production beyond the near-term.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: The proposal has included additional information including strengthening the monitoring progress in adapting to the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		effect of climate change on the banana production system. The justifications provided are satisfactory.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is well-coordinated with other initiatives, such as the FAO/MAAIF farmer field schools. The project will also work in synergy with the private sector, including with established plant tissue culture companies.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>The project is innovative insofar as this is an industry-focused approach to adaptation, with a very comprehensive approach, involving a multitude of actors, from the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Cooperatives, to smallholder farmers, industry entities and private sector. By establishing and fortifying successful business practices in the banana production industry, it has a strong potential for scaling up. However, some questions about sustainability remain, considering that the model, as presented, does not discuss robustness of the banana production, as proposed, in the event of, for instance, banana crop failure due to climate change-exacerbated extreme weather conditions. This issue is also similarly raised via comment under Question 11.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: Additional clarification have been provided in the revision, arguing that robustness of banana production depends greatly on the ability to address pests and diseases of the banana plant. Given the importance of the banana production to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the economy currently, and that the measures proposed are expected to improve management of banana pests and diseases, and thus overall resilience of the banana crop, this is cleared.	
	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. Overall, the GEF funding and cofinancing as indicated in Table B are appropriate and adequate. However, Component 4, Quality Control, Monitoring and Evaluation, exceeding 10% of the subtotal, appears somewhat high.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide justifications for requesting this amount for Component 4.</p> <p>Update 11/6/2013: The additional details and related justifications provided in the revision are adequate and this is now 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?	Yes, the amount and composition of cofinancing is good, and in line with the role of the Agency.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes.	
	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 report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes. The amount does not deviate from the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> 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 yet. This is clearly a strong proposal, and PIF clearance will be recommended after issues under Questions 4, 11, 13,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and 16 are reconsidered. It is especially important to consider the issues of long-term viability, and risks to the proposed model given potential future climate-exacerbated conditions.  Update 11/7/2013: The PIF is now recommended for clearance. 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/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	October 10, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 07, 2013	
	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.**