



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon			
Country(ies):	Uganda	GEF Project ID:	5718
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4634
Other Executing Partner(s):	Implementing partner: Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries Other partners: District Local Governments of Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli	Submission Date:	16 July 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration (Months)	36 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	153,930

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Indicative funding from GEF (\$)	Indicative co-financing (\$)
LD-3	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced enabling environment between sectors in support of SLM	Output LD.3.1. Integrated Land Management Plans developed and implemented	35,000	166,000
	Outcome 3.2: Good management practices in the wider landscape demonstrated	Output LD.3.4. Information on INRM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated	55,000	292,835
		Output LD.3.3. Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base	715,718	4,204,782
	Outcome 5.2: Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest and non-forests lands, including peat lands	Output 5.2: Forest and non-forest lands under good management practices	596,136	3,197,917
Outcome 5.3: GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered	141,308		592,708	
CCM5				
Sub-total			1,543,162	8,454,242
Project management cost			77,158	377,142
Total project costs			1,620,320	8,831,384

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To empower communities in Mount Elgon to manage their production landscapes in an integrated manner for improved livelihoods and ecosystem resilience						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1: Integrated : Landscape Planning and Management	TA	1: The landscape planning and management processes in the district of Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration ¹	<p>1.1: Community resource maps developed in 6 sub-counties in the 3 districts (2 per district)</p> <p>1.2: Land use plans developed, in line with the resource maps, in 6 sub-counties</p> <p>1.3: District local governments supported to implement clauses regarding SLM, SFM and CCM</p> <p>1.4: A system for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans and related legislation is put in place</p> <p>1.5: SLM, SFM and CCM mainstreamed into district policy planning</p>	GEFTF	213,411	1,646,125
2: Demonstration of options to reverse land degradation, reduce GHG emissions and empower communities	TA	2: Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions ²	<p>2.1: Enhanced local capacities for the adoption of SLM, SFM and CCM through the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach</p> <p>2.2: Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer's access to inputs, technical support and advice, and markets</p> <p>2.3: Pilots</p>	GEFTF	1,329,751	6,808,117

¹ See Strategic Results Framework for indicators that apply to this outcome as well as the project as a whole

² See Strategic Results Framework for indicators that apply to this outcome as well as the project as a whole

			demonstrating SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches are implemented in the 6 selected sub-counties			
			2.4: Monitoring frameworks for carbon emissions/sequestration and soil erosion are developed and implemented			
			2.5: Best practices and lessons learned collected, compiled and disseminated			
Subtotal					1,543,162	8,454,242
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEFTF	77,158	377,142
Total project costs					1,620,320	8,831,384

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK⁴

Outcomes	Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Assumption
1. The landscape planning and management processes in the district of Manafwa, Bulambuli and Mbale are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration	1.1 Community resource maps developed in 6 sub-counties in 3 districts	Percentage of parishes with community resource maps developed and disseminated in the 6 sub-counties in the 3 districts	No resource maps are available in the parishes of the 6 sub-counties of intervention	Community resources maps are developed and disseminated in the 33 parishes of the 6 sub-counties	Community resource maps Workshop attendance sheets	Communities provide valuable inputs for the development of resource maps Land use plans, existing legislation and district development plans are taken seriously and effectively enforced Land conflicts remain localized and do not endanger the overall project implementation The occurrence of extreme climate events does not compromise the implementation of project activities
	1.2 Land use plans developed, in line with the resource maps, in 6 highly degraded sub-counties	Percentage of parishes with land use plans developed and disseminated in 6 highly degraded sub-counties	No land use plans are available in the 6 sub-counties of intervention	Land use plans are developed and disseminated in the 33 parishes of the 6 highly degraded sub-counties	Land use plans Workshop attendance sheets	
	1.3 District local governments supported to implement clauses regarding SLM, SFM and CCM	Number of clauses implemented Number of people with increased awareness on SLM technologies and approaches	SLM, SFM and CCM clauses are available in the three districts of intervention but not implemented Lack of awareness on SLM technologies and approaches	50% of the relevant clauses identified are implemented 30 district staff 60 local community representatives with increased awareness in SLM technologies and approaches	1 gap analysis study on SLM legislation Clauses in existing legislation Workshop attendance sheets	
	1.4 A system for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans and related legislation is put in place	Existence or absence of a monitoring and enforcement framework	No monitoring and enforcement systems are effectively implemented	1 monitoring and enforcement framework designed per district	Monitoring and enforcement framework	
	1.5 SLM, SFM and CCM mainstreamed into district policy plans	Existence or absence of guidelines to integrate SLM, SFM and CCM into District Development Plans	The Districts Development Plans do not significantly consider SLM, SFM and CCM	3 Districts have guidelines to integrate SLM, SFM and CCM into their Development Plans	Guidelines for Districts Development Plans	

⁴ Baselines, targets and means of verification were discussed and agreed with stakeholders. However, they will be confirmed during year 1 of implementation.

		Existence or absence of District Environment Action Plans	No District Environment Action Plans are in place in the districts	1 Local Environmental Committee is effective on each district and has developed guidelines for a District Environment Action Plan	Local Environmental Committees Meeting reports Guidelines for District Environment Action Plan	
2. Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions.	2.1 Enhanced local capacities for the adoption of sustainable forest and land management and climate change mitigation through the FFS approach	Number of master trainers trained in SLM, SFM and CCM Number of FFS facilitators trained and equipped Number of farmers trained	Limited capacities in SLM, SFM and CCM and equipment among the extension staff and farmers of the districts of intervention	6 extension staff (50% women) per district trained and equipped to be FFS facilitators 1500 farmers trained	Training attendance sheets FFS attendance sheets Declaration of improved equipment from master trainers and FFS facilitators	Extension staff and farmers participate actively in the FFS trainings The public and private sectors recognize an opportunity in participating Land conflicts remain localized and do not compromise pilots implementation
	2.2 Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer's access to inputs, technical support and advice and markets	Existence or absence of an action plan to improve and strengthen existing collaboration to improve farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice, and markets	Limited farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice and markets	1 Action Plan for a better public-private collaboration to improve farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice, and markets	Action plan	Farmers are willing to adopt new technologies and approaches in their farming practices The occurrence of extreme climate events does not compromise the implementation of project activities
	2.3 Pilots demonstrating SLM and SFM are implemented in the 3 districts of intervention	Surface area of land under conservation agriculture Surface area of land reforested Surface area of farmland with tree	Conservation agriculture and tree farming systems are rare in the three districts of intervention and deforestation is significant	20,500 ha under conservation agriculture (indicative: depending on land use plans) 1,000 ha reforested (indicative:	Project Progress Reports	Best practices and lessons learned can be extracted from the implementation of the project

		farming systems		depending on land use plans) 4,000 ha of farmland with tree farming systems (indicative: depending on land use plans)		
	2.4 Monitoring frameworks for carbon emission/ sequestration and soil erosion are developed and implemented	Existence or absence of monitoring frameworks for carbon emission/ sequestration	Lack of monitoring for carbon emission/ sequestration and soil erosion	1 monitoring framework for carbon emission/ sequestration developed and implemented 1 monitoring framework for soil erosion developed and implemented	Monitoring frameworks and progress reports	
	2.5 Best practices developed and disseminated	Existence or absence of a strategic plan to scale up best practices and lessons from the project	Not applicable	1 plan published and disseminated	Strategic plan to scale up best practices and lessons learned	
Objective level indicators	Number of hectares degraded: approximately 25,500 ha Scores on the LD Tracking Tool Scorecard: 15-20% increases Score on the Capacity Development Scorecard: 25% increase Hectares under forest cover: 5,000 ha Tons of Carbon sequestered: 24,142 tC/y					

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	MAAIF	In-kind	1,526,250
National Government	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)	In-kind	2,501,384
National Government	Ministry of Water and Environment	In-kind	2,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Country Office	Cash/In-kind*	2,670,750
Local Government	3 Target Districts	In-kind	133,000
Total Co-financing			8,831,384

* CASH: 1,000,000; IN-KIND: 1,680,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	Uganda	774,316	73,560	847,876
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Uganda	846,004	80,370	926,374
Total Grant Resources				1,620,320	153,930	1,774,250

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this

table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	196,200		196,200
National/Local Consultants	147,600		147,600

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

The overall shift in approach is captured in Section A5. In addition to this, the table below shows specific rewording of outcomes and outputs to make them clearer, however they remain substantively consistent with the PIF.

Under Component 1 in the PIF, the Outcome focussed on reduced land degradation, increased carbon sequestration and enhanced local capacity This outcome has now been reworded to a clearer, summarised outcome that focuses on landscape management and planning (but links to the original outcome wording by saying that land management and planning will be done in a way that reduces land degradation and enhances carbon sequestration).

The wording for Outcome 2 has changed from a dual focus on improved land management and improved forest cover to a new summarised outcome that states that communities are empowered to use techniques that reverse land degradation and Green house gas emissions. Again this is much more in line with what the project will actually do but does not deviate what was planned in the PIF.

Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 provide more detail on what was previously output 1.1, clarifying that resource maps will be the basis for land use plans.

Output 1.3 now addresses what was previously output 1.2, but has reduced its scope, given that during the consultation process stakeholders made clear that what they need is not developing new ordinances and byelaws at district levels, but support to implement and enforce existing national clauses. In this sense, Output 1.3 on support to district local governments is deemed to be a more effective way of undertaking what was described in the PIF as by law enforcement – old Output 1.2.

The new output 2.1 on Farmer Field School (FFS) includes the old output 2.1 on farm plans and 2.7 on engaging community in implementing SLM. This new output integrates these two related strategies, highlighting their complementarities, and takes into account that farm planning is related to outputs 1.1 and 1.2.

The new output 2.3 on pilots of SLM, CCM and SFM summarizes old outputs on sustainable planning (old 2.2) and reforestation (2.6) highlighting the complementarities

The new output 2.4 summarizes three of the old outputs on monitoring (2.3, 2.4, 2.5) into one- highlighting the complementarities

The new output 2.2 is new and addresses a critical barrier that appeared during the field visit and consultation with local stakeholders. As presented in the project document (pp. 29-30), one of the barriers for sustainable land management in the Mount Elgon region is the limited access to inputs and markets. This is addressed by this new output.

PIF VS. PROJECT DOCUMENT OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

PIF		Changes in current Project Document	
Outcome	Output	Outcome	Output
<p>Reduced land degradation over approximately 29,800 ha in 4 severely degraded districts resulting in better provision of ecosystem services such as flood control, forage production, and carbon sequestration as a result of improved land-use planning, evidenced by 15-20% increases in the LD Tracking Tool.</p> <p>Increase in carbon sequestration or reduction in emissions evidenced by project monitoring.</p> <p>Enhanced local capacities for enforcement of sustainable forest and land management and climate change mitigation in the Mt. Elgon Landscape, evidenced by a 25% increase in the UNDP-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard</p>	<p>1.1 Integrated Land Use Plans enable SLM uptake in Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli districts</p>	<p>The landscape planning and management processes in the districts of Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration</p>	<p>1.1: Community resource maps developed in 6 sub-counties in the 3 districts (2 per district)</p>
	<p>1.2 Ordinances and Bye-Laws providing instruction on soil and water conservation measures to be applied in sloping areas developed and implemented in the 3 Districts paving the way for a transformative change in land-use practices in Mount Elgon: including ensuring clauses in the land use policy that extend land occupiers user rights</p>		<p>1.2: Land use plans developed, in line with the resource maps, in 6 sub-counties</p>
	<p>1.3 A System for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans in place including clear delineation of roles and responsibilities among key local Government actors. District staff will be capacitated to enforce the new land use regulations, and manage the participatory process of developing the Community resource and land use plans.</p>		<p>1.3: District local governments supported to implement clauses regarding SLM, SFM and CCM</p>
	<p>1.4 Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Mitigation mainstreamed into District Development Plans</p>		<p>1.4: A system for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans and related legislation is put in place</p>
			<p>1.5: SLM, SFM and CCM mainstreamed into district policy planning</p>

<p>Improved land management reversing ecosystem degradation over an area of 29,800 hectares, evidenced by decreased soil erosion and increase in fodder production.</p> <p>Improved forest cover over 5,000 ha through assisted natural regeneration and reforestation in forests, tree crops including coffee and agroforestry systems resulting in emission reductions of approximately 24,142 tC/y</p>	<p>2.1 Individual Farm plans and SFM activities implemented in 4 districts. <i>The plans will be developed with each landowner or community in line with the community resource maps</i></p>	<p>Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions</p>	<p>2.1: Enhanced local capacities for the adoption of SLM, SFM and CCM through the FFS approach</p>	
	<p>2.2 X ha of land put under conservation agricultural practices including minimum tillage soil cover maintenance to reduce soil erosion and less frequency of opening land for cultivation</p>		<p>2.2: Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer's access to inputs, technical support and advice, and markets</p>	
	<p>2.3 Soil erosion monitored at select sites in Manafwa district</p>		<p>2.3: Pilots demonstrating SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches are implemented in the 6 selected sub-counties</p>	
	<p>2.4 A Monitoring system and established and used to estimate emission reduced from further encroachment of forests, clearing and increase in storage from reforestation.</p>			
	<p>2.5 A Site specific monitoring system for carbon monitoring established-in line with country agriculture NAMA</p>			
	<p>2.6 X ha reforested and managed for sustainable fuelwood harvesting</p>			<p>2.4: Monitoring frameworks for carbon emissions/sequestration and soil erosion are developed and implemented</p>
	<p>2.7 Communities collectively engaged and capacitated to implement SLM to reverse land degradation and to access and utilize energy efficient technologies to conserve biomass and reduce GHG emissions</p>			
	<p>2.8 Best Practice guidelines developed, disseminated and training conducted in 3 Districts. <i>[These may include criteria for assessing the state of land and natural resources for the purposes of land use decision making].</i></p>			<p>2.5: Best practices and lessons learned collected, compiled and disseminated</p>

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable:

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The project baseline has not changed. The project has provided a more detailed and comprehensive description of the baseline situation (section B.2.b), and the problems that the project seeks to address (section B.2.f). In particular, regarding barriers, the project document elaborates further on scarcity of farm planning and land use planning, limited knowledge and insecure land tenure. In addition, it considers limited access to inputs and markets, small land size and gender inequality as critical barriers, based on literature review and significant consultation in the field.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional activities requested for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits :

The project document, following the same line as the incremental reasoning summarized in the PIF, provides a detailed rationale describing the incremental activities and associated benefits to be delivered by the project (Section C.2).

- This project takes an incremental approach towards the empowerment of communities in Mt Elgon to manage their land in an integrated manner in order to improve livelihoods and ecosystem resilience.
- Additional funding from this project will strengthen the knowledge of the Mt Elgon natural resources location, land degradation and GHG emission status through the development of community resources maps at parish level in 6 selected sub-counties considering the different ecosystems, which will provide valuable information for on-going initiatives. These maps will be a crucial tool for the land use planning of the area and will take into account ecosystem dynamics across parishes. The proposed project will also support the development of Land Use Plans for the 6 sub-counties, based on the resource maps, which will be in line with the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management. These maps and plans will address the current lack of land use planning tools such as maps and databases, and the fact that there are currently no land use or disaster/landslide management and preparedness plans in the Mt Elgon region.
- Additional funding from the GEF will address the current inadequate enforcement of land legislation, the limited rights of land occupiers, and the existing conflicts between land owners and occupiers in the Mt Elgon region. The project will ensure that task forces such as Local Environment Committees are created and meet at least three times a year to discuss SLM, SFM and CCM-related challenges as well as to settle land disputes between land owners and occupiers. The project will support the screening and implementation of SFM and SLM clauses in existing legislation. GEF funding will also contribute to the development and implementation of a framework to effectively monitor and enforce land use plans and other land-related legislation. In the meantime, the project will support the mainstreaming of SLM, SFM and CCM into District Development Plans, and the development of district environment action plans. The proposed project will also raise awareness amongst district authorities and local communities on SLM, SFM, and CCM technologies and approaches.
- The first component of the project will therefore contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for the introduction of SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches in the Mt Elgon region, in particular through the introduction of strategic planning and monitoring tools, and capacity building. Component 2 will take advantage of this enabling environment to introduce SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches on the ground, in particular through the establishment of FFS and various pilots.
- The project will adopt and use the FAO FFS approach in the districts of intervention. FFS is an approach to extension that is based on the concepts and principles of people-centred learning and was developed as an alternative to the conventional, top-down, extension approaches. It uses innovative and participatory methods to create a learning environment, including learning networks, in which land users have the opportunity to learn for themselves about particular production problems, and ways to address them, through their own observation, discussion and participation in practical learning-by-doing field exercises. FFS serve as pilots for conservation agriculture technologies and approaches for improved land management and livelihoods of smallholder farmers; they are particularly suited for the intervention of the project. Extension and advisory services staff from the district local governments will be trained in SLM, SFM, and CCM technologies and approaches to become FFS facilitators that will, in turn, train other farmers in the use of these practices. The technologies and approaches to be covered by the FFS curricula will cover for instance climate resilient coffee production, sustainable intensification of

animal crop production systems, agroforestry, conservation agriculture for both subsistence and cash crops, afforestation, water and soil conservation practices, sustainable use of forest resources, etc. Funding from the GEF will also allow the implementation of pilots to show case and support the uptake of SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches such as conservation agriculture practices, afforestation and tree plantings in the 6 selected sub-counties. The FFS established under the project will target and increase the empowerment of vulnerable populations such as young people under 25 and women, which will represent respectively 25% and 50% of all the beneficiaries.

- The GEF funding will be used to strengthen public-private collaboration in order to secure farmers' access to inputs, markets and technical support and advice. This should secure funding for farmers to be able to implement SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches in the long term. Through the project the research sector will have to interact with the extension services that will be promoting their products and findings (such as resilient seedling varieties) to farmers through the FFS. The cooperation of government and research institutions with the private sector will contribute also to increase productivity and strengthen the access of farmers to the market in better conditions.
- Funding from the project will contribute to the elaboration and implementation of a monitoring framework for carbon emissions and sequestration, and soil erosion. Such tools, not yet available at the Mt Elgon level, will be useful to monitor the progress of the project, but also the overall state of the Mt Elgon ecosystem after the end of the project.
- Finally, this project will develop and disseminate best practices and lessons learned that will be useful for related on-going and future initiatives in the region.
- In order to ensure synergies with other on-going projects (presented in section E1a), the Project Management Unit will coordinate and maintain regular communication with other initiatives. In particular, the project will coordinate with the African Development Bank (AfDB)-LDCF project on Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water Sector through the government inter-ministerial committee on sustainable land management; and the climate change policy committee. At the local level, coordination will be enhanced through the Mt. Elgon stakeholders Forum and the District Technical Planning Committees. Through these platforms, the project will share implementation plans, reports and lessons learnt including those from mid-term evaluation to have a coordinated approach and learn from what other stakeholders are doing in the region.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

With the exception of the risk regarding inadequate political support which was deleted as this was strongly requested by national and local stakeholders, the risks provided in the PIF have been maintained and additional risks identified during the PPG phase have been added to the table below:-

Risk	Level	Measures that will be taken
Local communities show limited interest and willingness to engage in project initiatives that require substantial labour investment.	Low	Community groups engaged in TACC initiatives under the UNDP small grants scheme demonstrated a high level of willingness to provide necessary labour and other inputs into improved farming systems. The project will provide training and raise awareness, and engage local leaders who can show the economic benefits of undertaking SLM practices. Community groups will also have a better access to the different inputs they require for practicing SLM through the improved public-private co-operation that will facilitate access to seedlings and financial instruments including micro-credits and insurance, among others. An improved implementation and enforcement of clauses and the existence of land use plans based on resource maps will translate into community groups being aware of the obligations they have and the sanctions they might have to deal with if they do not comply. The participatory development of plans, training curricula and public-private cooperation strategies will ensure engagement of individual farmers and community groups increasing willingness to undertake actions. The possibility of providing financial incentives will be examined within the first year of implementation.

Impacts of climate change could disrupt some interventions through weather extremes and natural disasters.	Low	While the project aims to target the most poor and at-risk households, attention will be paid to ensuring that interventions are made in communities on geologically stable slopes and where soil and water conservation measures can be implemented rapidly. The project will also avoid intervening in areas where there are land disputes as this will discourage proper investment by farmers in these techniques.
Low capacity to implement SLM, SFM and CCM practices at district level in local communities and institutions.	Low	The project will provide training to a variety of actors such as government staff, local institutions and communities on SLM, SFM and CCM through workshops but also through the FFS, which will ensure that training is appropriate to the area. Stakeholders will also learn by doing as the project activities go on, and they learn through the interaction with consultants and local leaders and activities are put in place. The integration of best practice into the project activities will also contribute to capacity building. Local institutions will become aware of SLM, SFM and CCM issues through the participatory development of community resource maps and land use plans in which they will be involved. They will also benefit from training in monitoring and enforcement of related legislation. Finally local institutions' capacities will be strengthened by the training of FFS facilitators amongst their staff. Capacities of local communities will be directly strengthened through the training provided in the FFS.
Local populations do not see the benefit of SLM, SFM and CCM practices and show some reluctance/slowness to adopt SLM, SFM and CCM practices.	Low	The project will ensure a high level of ownership from the population through the participative FFS approach. This model encourages farmers to actively get involved in order to try out and adopt practices and technologies, and gain experience through a learning-by-doing process. Trainings are given by local facilitators in order to ensure the continuity and appropriation of the learning process by the local population. Through the FFS approach, wherever income will be generated or losses reduced from SLM, SFM and CCM activities, it will be demonstrated to other farmers and replicated where possible. In addition, achievements on the ground that bring benefits to local producers will be demonstrated during the project to overcome skepticism.
Land use plans, land - related legislation and district development plans are not enforced	Low	<p>To prevent this, a gap analysis will be conducted to identify the lack of implementation of SLM and SFM clauses in existing national and district legislation related to soil and water conservation measures, land occupiers' rights, rural and urban land use and building codes, and sanctions for non-application of SLM and SFM measures. Based on this preliminary analysis, the project will help implement a strategy to fill the identified gaps.</p> <p>Under the first component, the project will also train district government staff and the police in legislation monitoring and enforcement. In addition, a realistic monitoring and enforcement framework for the land use plans and existing legislation will be developed in a participatory manner. This framework will define roles and responsibilities of key staff involved in supervision, monitoring and enforcement, and will stipulate its integration into existing district compliance mechanisms. An activity of the project will be specifically dedicated to the dissemination and implementation of this monitoring and enforcement framework; which should ensure that land-related legislation is effectively enforced.</p> <p>Local environmental committees will also be created as task forces that</p>

		will discuss challenges and actions for the enforcement of SLM and SFM related legislation, as well as settlement of conflicts between land owners and occupiers at district and parish levels. These committees will also be engaged in the mainstreaming of SLM, SFM and CCM consideration into the District Development Plans. This will contribute to a sound appropriation of the mainstreaming process, facilitating future enforcement of the Plans.
Political will at district level does not remain constant during project duration	Low	The project will ensure a high political involvement through training, awareness raising sessions, and participatory processes (such as the development of community resources maps, local development plans, and local environmental committees for the monitoring and enforcement of SLM, SFM and CCM related legislation at district level). This will ensure the long-term involvement of local institutions and maintain a high political will at the district level.
Land conflicts jeopardize project implementation	Low	Land conflict resolution mechanisms will be considered in the gap analysis to be undertaken on the effective implementation of SLM, SFM and CCM legislation, on which basis the project will come forward with a strategy to fill these gaps. In addition, the local environmental committees will discuss challenges and actions for the settlement of conflicts between land owners and occupiers at district and parish levels, which should ensure that land conflicts remain localised and don't endanger overall project implementation.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

The project document presents a comprehensive overview of all relevant baseline initiatives in section E.1.a, including some that were not mentioned in the PIF, such as the Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services programme, the Global Ecosystem-Based Adaptation programme, the Mount Elgon Regional Ecosystem Conservation Programme, and the Resilient Framework to support Climate Change Adaptation in the Mount Elgon Region. The Project Management Unit will maintain regular communication with the representatives at the national and local levels of these projects to ensure coordination. To that end, it will share the detailed plan, the results of mid-term evaluation and any other key planning documents with these representatives so that synergies can be created and tapped.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

This project was developed on the basis of consultations with stakeholder representatives, including national stakeholders from MAAIF, MWE, MLHUD and NEMA and NARO among others. It also consulted stakeholders in the Mount Elgon region, including representatives of the three DLGs, international and local NGOs, communities, individually and collectively, and the private sector. Consultations helped understand better the context the context of the project, adapting the activities a bit only when necessary (in component 1 the resource maps will be developed in 6 instead than in 9 sub-counties and component 2 includes an output regarding improving access to inputs) so that the stakeholders will benefit from the project. Consultations also helped to increase their involvement through its implementation.

Taking an adaptive and collaborative management approach to execution, the project will ensure that key stakeholders are involved early and throughout project execution as partners for development. This includes their participation in the Project Board, review of project outputs such as resource maps, land use plans, guidelines the DDP, FFS curriculums and public-private agreements, among others, as well as participation in monitoring activities.

A key feature of this project is its learn-by-doing approach, which is intended to actively engage stakeholders. This approach should result in key stakeholders that will be more likely to validate the analysis, legitimize plans, curriculums and agreements, and approve pilot initiatives. It is also intended to catalyse the institutionalization of knowledge and experiences, which is critical for ensuring sustainability.

Given the project strategy, the key project stakeholders are government ministries and their subsidiary agencies and departments that are mandated with sustainable land use management. These stakeholder representatives, listed below, will participate in activities to better plan land uses and accordingly reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions. In addition to these governmental stakeholders, there are also non-governmental stakeholders from academia, the private sector, and civil society organizations. These non-state organizations will also be invited in project activities to share their comparative expertise, but also to undertake selected pilot activities. The project will take into consideration the interests, customs and priorities of the local communities by ensuring it is the communities themselves who develop the community resource maps and design and select interventions through the land use plans that fit with their interests and customs. The participation of the non-state organizations will be determined during project implementation when defining annual work plans.

The list below indicates the role of key stakeholders for implementing the project.

Name of Organisation	Role in the project
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project owner/Implementing partner • Member of the Project Board • Responsible for the coordination of activities 1.1.2; 1.2.2; 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3; 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3; 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3 / 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4; 2.2.1, 2.2.2; 2.3.1, 2.3.3; 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3; 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 • Contributes to all the activities it is not responsible for
Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli District Local Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project owners/Implementing partners • Members of the Project Board • Responsible for the coordination of all outputs and activities in their respective district
Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member of the Project Board • Responsible for the coordination of activities 1.1.1, 1.1.2; 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 2.3.2 • Contributes to all the activities it is not responsible for
Ministry of lands, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member of the Project Board • Responsible for the coordination of activities 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 • Contributes to outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5 and 2.5
National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO) and Busitema University	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5
NGOs, CBOs and Local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to outputs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 • Main beneficiaries of the project
Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service providers • Contribute to the implementation of outputs 2.2 and 2.3

An additional table describing the role of each stakeholder in the implementation of the project is presented below.

Expected Outcome	Expected Output	Activity	Stakeholders
1. The landscape planning and management processes in the district of Manafwa, Bulambuli and Mbale are done in an integrated manner to reduce land degradation and increase carbon sequestration	1.1 Community resource maps developed in 3 sub-counties in 3 districts	1.1.1 Participatory development of the resource maps at parish level (1 per each of the parishes in the sub-county), taking into account different ecosystems and ecosystem dynamics across parishes, in 3 sub-counties	MWE and DLGs (MAAIF, INARO, MLHUD, NGOs/CBOs)
		1.1.2 Dissemination of the resource maps, including priority areas, through publications, workshops and local media	MWE and DLGs (MAAIF, INARO, MLHUD, NGOs/CBOs)
	1.2 Land use plans developed, in line with the resource maps, in highly degraded sub-counties	1.2.1 Participatory development of land use plans at parish level (1 per each of the parishes in the sub-county), taking into account different ecosystems and ecosystem dynamics across parishes, with associated budget in the sub-counties based on the resource maps in these plans each household will point out what they will do from different options in the plan, so land use planning is related to farm planning)	MWE/MLHUD and DLGs (MAAIF, INARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		1.2.2 Dissemination of the land use plans through publications, workshops and local media.	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, INARO, NGOs/CBOs)
	1.3 District local government supported to implement clauses regarding SLM	1.3.1 Raise awareness on SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches amongst districts authorities and local communities through the organization of one workshop per district and the development of campaigns in local media, including newspapers and radios	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, INARO, NEMA, NGOs/CBOs)
		1.3.2 Carry out a gap analysis regarding the implementation of SLM and SFM clauses in existing national and district legislation related to soil and water conservation measures, land occupiers' rights including mechanism for the resolution of conflicts over land, rural and urban land use and building codes, and sanctions for non-application of SLM and SFM measures	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, INARO, NEMA, NGOs/CBOs)
		1.3.3 Implementation of strategies to fill existing gaps to implement existing relevant legislation, according to the study developed above, but including, among others, training and equipment	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, INARO, NEMA, NGOs/CBOs)
	1.4 System for effective monitoring and enforcement of the land use plans and related legislation in place	1.4.1 Train district government staff and the police in monitoring and enforcement	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, INARO, NEMA)
		1.4.2 Participatory development of a realistic monitoring and enforcement framework for the land use plans (developed in activity 2.1), national and district legislation (identified in activity 2.3.3), defining roles and responsibilities of key staff involved in supervision, monitoring and enforcement, and stipulating its integration into existing district compliance mechanisms.	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, INARO, NEMA)
		1.4.3 Diffusion and implementation of the monitoring and enforcement framework	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, INARO, NEMA)
	1.5 SLM, SFM and CCM mainstreamed into district policy planning	1.5.1 Creation of local environmental committees (committees 1 per district) and organization of committee meetings at least times a year	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NEMA, MLHUD)
		1.5.2 Participatory development of recommendations to mainstream SLM, SFM and CCM into the District Development Plans and develop District Environment Action Plans	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NEMA, MLHUD)
1.5.3 Diffusion of the guidelines for the District Development Plans and the District Environment Action Plans		MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NEMA, MLHUD)	

Expected Outcome	Expected Output	Activity	Stakeholders
2. Local communities are empowered and applying technologies and approaches to reverse and degradation and reduce GHG emissions.	2.1 Enhanced local capacities for enforcement of sustainable forest and land management and climate change mitigation through the FFS approach	2.1.1: Participatory development of training curriculum on LM, BFM and CCM technologies and approaches to be implemented in the Farmers Field Schools (FFS)	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		2.1.2: In close collaboration with the national extension system, training and equipment of FFS facilitators (including women) from the extension services staff in each of the three districts, in LM, BFM and CCM technologies and approaches	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		2.1.3: Set up 10 FFS (10 per sub-county/20 per district) within the sub-counties in intervention, provide technical advice and training for 1500 farmers (25 per FFS, including 50% women and 25% of people under 25) through the implementation of LM, BFM and CCM technologies and approaches such as: climate resilient coffee-banana production, sustainable intensification of animal crop production systems, agroforestry, conservation agriculture, afforestation, water and soil conservation practices, sustainable use of forest resources, etc.) in the framework of the FFS.	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		2.1.4: Organization of farmers to farmers visits between FFS	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
	2.2 Existing public-private collaboration is strengthened to improve farmer's access to inputs, technical support and advice, and markets	2.2.1: Participatory collaboration in action plan to improve and strengthen existing collaboration between national institutions (including research institutions, such as NARO), local governments, the private and social sectors (including academia, such as Makerere University) and individual farmers, in order to improve farmers' access to inputs (such as micro-finance and climate resilient seedlings), technical support and advice, and markets	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NGOs/CBOs, Private Sector/BCU, Mbale CAP)
		2.2.2: Support to the implementation of the action plan developed in the activity 2.2.1	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NGOs/CBOs, Private Sector/BCU, Mbale CAP)
	2.3 Pilots demonstrating SLM and BFM are implemented in the districts of intervention	2.3.1: In the selected sub-counties, set up conservation agriculture pilots covering 20,500 ha including in the FFS through the adoption of practices such as minimum tillage, soil cover maintenance, non-opening of land for agriculture, soil and nutrition management, water harvesting and use, pest and disease control, etc.	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		2.3.2: Set up pilots to reforest and assist natural regeneration in 1,000 ha including in FFS, and train local communities in sustainable fuelwood harvesting	MWE Forestry and DLGs (NFA, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
		2.3.3: Set up tree farming pilots of coffee agroforestry, boundary planting, strip planting, intercropping in 2,000 ha of farm land including in FFS	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NFA, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)
	2.4 Monitoring frameworks for carbon emission/sequestration and soil erosion are developed and implemented	2.4.1: Participatory development of realistic carbon emission/sequestration monitoring system for the region, including description of responsibilities and roles of key actors considering the one developed for REDD	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO)
2.4.2: Participatory development of realistic soil erosion monitoring and assessment system at FFS level, including description of responsibilities and roles of key actors		MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO)	
2.4.3: Implementation of the two monitoring frameworks by the key selected actors		MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, NARO)	
2.5 Best practices developed and disseminated	2.5.1: Integration of best practices in the area into the project activities implemented in the three districts	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)	
	2.5.2: Development of a strategic plan for scaling up the best practices and lessons learned in the project, publication and dissemination, including a workshop and local media in the three districts	MAAIF and DLGs (MWE, MLHUD, NARO, NGOs/CBOs)	

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Mount Elgon sits adjacent to a heavily populated agricultural landscape supporting some two million people, and has been degraded by excessive use. Yet the livelihoods and economic activities of these people depend on the goods and services that this ecosystem

provides. The project will benefit around half a million people living on the slopes of Mt Elgon⁵, and improve livelihoods for around 5,000 of the poorest and most resource-stressed households. These households will benefit from a better enabling environment, with appropriate resource maps and land use plans, clauses and systems of enforcement, and improved training and access to inputs. These changes are expected to increase productivity in a sustainable way at the same time that they reduce land degradation and carbon emissions. Increased productivity will translate into a reduction in poverty levels. The current poverty level in the target districts is estimated at 30-40%, with over 50% of households with family incomes of less than US\$ 1 per day.⁶ The total population of the 8 districts in 2010 was about 1.44 million, of whom around 0.5 million live on or adjacent to the lower slopes of Mt Elgon and of whom 85% are rural farmers. Population densities in 2010 were as high as 1,000 persons/km², up from a maximum of 660 persons/km² in 2002⁷, and population growth rate is 3.4%.⁸

Gender inequality is significant in the area of intervention. Although the Ugandan constitution grants women equality with men, men own, access or control most of the household resources. Family members, including women, often use these resources but have no right to own or control them. Overall, in the Mount Elgon region women remain the biggest group of landless people and do not have the same rights in terms of land tenure and transactions. In addition, besides internal variation, in general trees belong to men and women can't own, control or profit from any trees of higher value (Soini, 2007). While women are in control of the food crops for domestic consumption, mainly seasonal crops, such as bananas and beans, men control as well the use of perennial cash crop, such as coffee. In cases where there is surplus for sale, the men control the money and decide how much to give to women. The table below shows the resource ownership between men and women within a household in Mbale district. Although this seems to be true at the general level, and applies as well to Bulambuli, there are significant differences in Manafwa according to local stakeholders. In this district, women do own and inherit land. Indeed, according to the people met in the field, distribution of land starts with women and only then considers men, and the mother needs to sign the distribution. In any case, in the three districts, labour tends to be unequally distributed between men and women. Women tend to be over burdened with domestic works. They are responsible for household duties such as collecting water and firewood and cooking. Women also run the farm and spend much longer time on food production than men. They can spend 18 hours a day working in order to support their family. In contrast, men spend less than 6 hours on constructive work, and spend the rest hanging out in trading centres. In Bulambuli, 74.1% of females are in unpaid family labour compared to 19.1% of men (Bulambuli DDP, 2010). The gender analysis performed in the Mbale DDP shows that literacy and education rates are higher for men than women and that men dominate meetings and participation, which makes them predominant in decision making.

Gender inequality has important implications in terms of sustainable land management in the area of intervention. Women are the main tillers of the land but have limited ability and incentives to improve and diversify their livelihoods and the overall diversity of land where they work. Women are often overworked and lack proper control of the inputs and the outputs of land management, getting often discouraged and not putting much attention on protecting the land. However, despite these limits, a study by Barungi et al. (2013) on the factors influencing the adoption of soil erosion control technologies in the Mount Elgon region (Bukwo and Kween districts) found that women were more likely to adopt most of technologies than men. In particular, although the probability that a female farmer will adopt terraces is 26% lower than that of a male farmer, the probability that a female farmer will adopt trenches and Napier grass is 23% and 22% higher, respectively, than that of male farmer. In this sense, as the primary users of land, women are more likely to adopt practices and technologies on SLM than men. More female secure control over land could significantly help reduce land degradation in the area of intervention.

The project mainstream gender equality in all its activities. The participation of women in all outputs will be actively promoted. Output 2.1 sets specific targets, establishing that half of the Farmer Field Schools facilitators and the farmers trained by them will be women. Land issues will also be considered under output 1.3.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project design is expected to be highly cost-effective.

- The first component of the project will focus on raising awareness and developing planning documents to upscale SLM, SFM and CCM in the Mt Elgon area. The development of these documents, mainly the resources maps, land use plans and revised district development plans will be cost effective since it will be a participatory process involving local

⁵ The total population of Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli districts was around 1 million people in 2014. About 860,000 people lived in rural areas in these three districts.

⁶ MERECP, 2005, Baseline survey of the socio-economics of the people living in the Mt Elgon ecosystem.

⁷ The national average is 175 persons/km²

⁸ Demographic data from the website of the Uganda Bureau of Statistics

communities. The documents will feed into each other, which will turn to good account the information gathered for the resource maps and the land use plans. The same data and information basis will allow the development of resource maps, the land use plans and then mainstreaming SLM, SFM and CCM into district development plans and district environment action plans; which proves to be a cost effective approach.

- Throughout the project, capacities will be strengthened regarding SLM, SFM and CCM in different institutions at national, provincial and local level through the FFS. The staff with strengthened capacity, while staying in the country after the end of the project, will be able to upscale awareness on SLM, SFM and CCM, which will allow the project to limit the use of international experts (which would cost US\$ 187,800) in a cost-effective manner. Notwithstanding, where national expertise is not available, making international expertise unique or exceptionally credible, international expert could be used.
- The second component of the project adopts the FAO FFS approach that has proven to be cost effective in the past. In the preparation of the FAO/GEF project “Integrating climate resilience into agricultural production for food security in rural areas of Mali”, a comparison of costs for FFS and standard training approaches to extension was undertaken. Although not directly transferable to this project, the findings were that “building upon 400 existing FFS and 233 experienced facilitators (for crops such as rice, cotton and vegetable gardening) will save US\$ 251,540 in training costs alone and US\$ 220,000 in FFS operation over the project cycle.” Although not a solid economic analysis, this does strongly indicate the cost-effectiveness of the FFS approach.
- The project intends to develop an action plan to strengthen and improve public private collaboration to improve farmers’ access to inputs, technical support and advice and market. While drafting such proposal has a limited cost, its effectiveness and impacts is particularly important since it will allow future investments to mainstream SLM, SFM and CCM in other initiatives, even after the end of the project.
- The project will also develop a monitoring framework for soil erosion while also training key actors in how to use it and the carbon emission/sequestration framework developed under REDD. The costs of developing such framework and training on both frameworks are limited but their foreseen effectiveness and impacts are significant to help track and reduce GHG emissions and land degradation.
- Cost-effectiveness will also be achieved through knowledge management, synergies and complementarities. Precious knowledge on SLM, SFM and CCM does exist both at grass-root and institutional levels, but it is poorly systematized, shared and disseminated. Good operational lessons learned and practices for SLM, SFM and CCM will be developed and disseminated by the project. While the cost of producing a report on the matter is not high, the impacts of the application of such lessons learned could have is tremendous.
- The project will also seek synergies and complementarities with on-going initiatives and programs having similar objectives while avoiding overlaps.
- The project will maximize the involvement of local officials and only use consultants as needed to cut costs

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The Project Management Unit (PMU) and the Uganda UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) will undertake monitoring and evaluation activities, with support from UNDP-GEF, including the recruitment of independent evaluators for the mid-term and final evaluation. The project logical framework in Annex 1 of the project document provides a logical structure for monitoring project performance and delivery using SMART indicators during project implementation. The output budget and the work plan in the project document provide additional information for the allocation of funds, both the GEF and co-financing, for expected project deliverables and the timing of project activities to produce these deliverables. GEF tracking tools for Land Degradation and Climate Change Mitigation will be used as part of monitoring and evaluation activities to assess project delivery. The work plan is provisional, and is to be reviewed during the project inception phase and endorsed by the project board.

The project’s M&E approach will be discussed during the project’s inception phase so as to fine-tune indicators and means of verification, as well as an explanation and full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

Inception Phase

A project Inception workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, with representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) as appropriate. Non-governmental stakeholders should be represented at this workshop as well.

A fundamental objective of this inception workshop will be to further instill and understanding and ownership of the project's goals and objectives among the project team, government and other stakeholder groups. The workshop will also serve to finalize preparation of the project's first Annual Work Plan (AWP) on the basis of the project's logical framework. This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalize the AWP with precise and measurable performance (process and output) indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

The project inception phase includes the project launch that has the political function to draw beneficiaries awareness to the start of the project. During the first two months of start-up, an induction training will be organized to: (i) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF expanded team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the UNDP-CO and responsible PMU staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and PMU staff with respect to the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the combined Annual Project Reports - Project Implementation Reviews (APR/PIRs), Project Board (PB) meetings, as well as final evaluation. The inception phase will also provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing.

The project inception workshop will be held at the end of the inception phase to provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to validate the project logical framework and discuss the project's work plan. As well, the workshop will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to agree on their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for PMU staff and associated decision-making structures will be discussed again, as needed, in order to clarify for all, each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase.

The inception workshop will present a schedule of M&E-related meetings and reports. The Project manager in consultation with UNDP will develop this schedule, and will include: (i) tentative time frames for PB meetings, and the timing of near-term project activities, such as the in-depth review of literature on natural resource valuation; and (ii) project-related monitoring and evaluation activities. The provisional work plan will be approved in the first meeting of the PB.

A project inception report will be prepared immediately following the inception workshop. This report will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames as well as detailed activities and performance indicators that will guide project implementation (over the course of the first year). This Work Plan will include the proposed dates for any visits and/or support missions from the UNDP-CO, the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU), or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project decision-making structures (e.g., PB). The report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months' time-frame.

The inception report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation, including any unforeseen or newly arisen constraints. When finalized, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in that to respond with comments or queries.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Patrick Ocaïlap	Deputy Secretary to the Treasury/ GEF Focal Point	MINISTRY OF FINANCE, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	02/25/2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator UNDP – GEF		16 July 2015	Alice Ruhweza, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+251 912 503311	alice.ruhweza@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

The project result framework is provided in Annex 1 p.62 of the project document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comment	Response	Pages in the prodoc
Provide a Monitoring Plan, including indicators to assess the Global Environment benefits	A monitoring plan has been detailed in section C.5 of the project document (pp. 44-49) and indicators have been included in the logical framework presented in Annex 1 (pp. 60-63) of the project document.	pp. 44-49, and 60-63
Confirm if it is relevant to include Indigenous people issues in this project	The project incorporates local, indigenous knowledge and communities at all levels.	Cross-cutting
Detail the local governance mechanism and the role of CSO/NGO	Local governance mechanisms and the role of the CSO/NGO are presented in Section C.4 of the project document (pp. 41-44) on stakeholder involvement. This section provides a table presenting which stakeholder will be involved in which project activity.	pp. 41-44
Show how results and lessons from recently closed projects, as the MERECEP, have informed the design of the current project. Additional information about these results will be useful to highlight how these results could serve as baseline or fit into the objective of this proposal	The project document provides a detail section (E.1a -pp. 51-54) on linkages with other activities and programmes. These initiatives served as a baseline on which the proposed will build upon and seek synergies, as it is highlighted in the description of the rationale of the project (Section C.2.a -pp. 34-36- of the project document)	pp. 51-54 and 34-36
Explain the strategy and the way to promote cash and subsistence crops with the appropriate partners (farmer organizations, extension services).	Both cash and subsistence crops will be promoted through the farmers field schools approach that will involve farmer organization, extension services and farmers directly. This learning-by-doing approach will facilitate the adoption of promoted crops.	Cross-cutting. See, for instance, pp. 35
Explain how land tenure insecurity will be addressed in the final project document. Please elaborate on the provisions of the national land policy that allows for tenure security and how the communities are not utilizing it.	The project will address land tenure insecurity issues through its output 1.3 that is dedicated at supporting district local government to implement clauses regarding SLM, SFM and CCM. An analysis study will be carried out to identify gaps in existing legislation (including land occupier's right and conflict resolution mechanism), and strategies to fill these gaps will be implemented through the project. The project document also provides detailed information on the provisions of the national land policy regarding land tenure in Annex 7 (pp. 73-83) on Selection of SLM clauses amongst relevant Ugandan legislation, and Annex 8 (pp. 84-87) on Land Tenure Security Levels and Implications for Sustainable Land Management.	pp. 77-83 and 84-87
Confirm the breakdown between C1 and C2. Further refinement of the outputs is expected	The funding breakdown between component 1 and 2 is the same as in the PIF. The outputs of both have been thoroughly refined in the project document.	Cross-cutting. See, for instance, pp. 34-39.

<p>Promotion of agroforestry and its potential benefits towards GHG reduction is noted. Please add focus on agroforestry in component 2 and also refine project activities to establish linkages with fuelwood collection and to monitor the progress of the project in this regard.</p>	<p>Output 2.3 of the proposed project aims at setting up pilots to demonstrate SLM, SFM and CCM in 6 selected sub-counties. Some of these pilots specifically aims at training local communities in sustainable fuelwood harvesting and setting tree farming practices including coffee agroforestry.</p>	<p>Cross-cutting. See, for instance, pp. 34-39.</p>
<p>Agroforestry has been identified as the means of climate change mitigation in the project. A sound CO2e estimate including carbon sequestered through agroforestry and emissions reduced through more sustainable fuelwood collection is expected by CEO Endorsement request.</p>	<p>The project document takes the estimations done at the PIF as the objectives in terms of ha have not changed.</p>	<p>See pp. 62 and Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool.</p>
<p>The section on GEB will be reviewed again on the basis of revisions done for section 7.</p>	<p>As noted above, the GEB have been reviewed in the light of existing literature and consultations with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>See pp. 19</p>
<p>Please include a system dedicated to monitor the progress of carbon conservation/ sequestration</p>	<p>Output 2.4 of the proposed project is specifically dedicated to the development and implementation of monitoring frameworks for carbon emissions/sequestration and soil erosion.</p>	<p>See pp. 34-39</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁹

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Baseline data collection, information gap analysis and filling, regarding the legal/policy environment.	22,000	9,522.08	14,374.40
Pre-feasibility studies for the proposed climate smart agriculture and GHG emission reducing practices.	3,000	1,627.44	0.00
The Project Strategy, Logical Framework And Budget	25,000	4,261.71	20,214.37
Total	50,000	15,411.23	34,588.77

⁹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A