



**GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**  
**PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED PROJECT**  
**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

<b>Project Title: Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja sub region</b>			
Country(ies):	Uganda	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	9137
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	UNDP 5577 FAO 636212
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry & Fisheries (MAAIF)	Submission Date:	June 30 2016
		Resubmission Date:	December 15, 2016
		Resubmission Date:	Feb. 2, 2017
		Resubmission Date:	29 March 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-Focal Area	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Food Security	Corporate Program: SGP	
Name of Parent Program	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa an Integrated Approach Programme (IAP)	Agency Fee	USD 642,550

**A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES**

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-4 Program 9	<b>BD-4</b> - Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors, <b>Program 9:</b> Managing the human-biodiversity interface	GEFTF	<b>1,730,650</b>	<b>13,750,000</b>
LD-1 Program 1	LD1: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods: <b>Program 1:</b> Agro-ecological intensification	GEFTF	<b>1,912,450</b>	<b>15,750,000</b>
LD-3 Program 4	<b>LD3:</b> Integrated landscapes: reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape - <b>Program 4:</b> Scaling-up sustainable land management through the landscape approach	GEFTF	<b>1,679,700</b>	<b>14,750,000</b>
LD-4 Program 5	LD4: Maximizing transformational impact: Maintain land resources and agro-ecosystem services through mainstreaming at scale, <b>Program 5:</b> Mainstreaming SLM in development	GEFTF	<b>1,816,650</b>	<b>13,750,000</b>
<b>Total project costs</b>		GEFTF	<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>58,000,000</b>

**B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

**Project Objective: To contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region (Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, and Nakapiriprit Districts)**

Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type <sup>2</sup>	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1: Strengthened institutional frameworks for improving food security	TA	<p>Outcome 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> Number of supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support viable SLM/INRM approaches</p>	<p>Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels</p> <p>Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> - Number of multi-stakeholder platforms established supporting INRM per district, within which a percentage of women, men, youth, and indigenous people are represented</p> <p>-Number of legal instruments, policies, by-laws applied in Karamoja sub-region enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement</p>	GEFTF	1,600,450	2,500,000
Component 2: Scaling-up integrated approaches at national and landscape level	TA	<p>Outcome 2: Increased land area under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> -Number of hectares of cropland/rangeland/forest under integrated natural resources management and SLM per district;</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Institutional technical capacities are increased to implement INRM/SLM</p> <p>Output 2.2: Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques</p> <p>Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project</p>	GEFTF	4,318,510	52,550,000

<sup>2</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p><i>-increase in crop yields measured by farmer records;</i></p> <p><i>-increase in water availability through biophysical monitoring</i></p>	<p>Output 2.4 Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, adopt sustainable land management practices, innovate alternative livelihood options, are implemented (SGP)</p> <p><u>Indicators:</u>  <i>Number of people trained on INRM, among which a percentage are women:</i></p> <p><i>-Number of community members trained in INRM and SLM practices, 60% of which are women</i></p> <p><i>-Increase in capacity of extension workers measured by the UNDP capacity scorecard</i></p> <p><i>-Number of people participating in alternative livelihoods schemes addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape, 60% of which are women</i></p> <p><i>-Increase in household incomes measured by household surveys</i></p> <p><i>-Number of Civil Society Organisations/ groups practising SLM / INRM in Karamoja through the Small Grants Program</i></p>			
Component 3: Monitoring and Assessment		Outcome 3. Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape	<p>Output 3.1: GEBS assessed and monitored from project interventions</p> <p>Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring</p>	GEFTF	990,850	2,000,000

		and monitoring of GEBs  <i>Indicators:</i> <i>Level of resilience as measured by the SHARP, HH BAT, Vital Signs and RAPTA tools:</i>	resilience at multiple scales  Output 3.3: Project is linked to Regional Hub program for knowledge generation, exchange and dissemination  <i>Indicators:</i> <i>Number of monitoring and assessment exercises conducted during the project, within multi-stakeholder platforms;</i>  <i>Number of workshops held at regional and national level on monitoring resilience within multi-stakeholder platforms (created in Component 1)</i>  <i>Number of knowledge products produced and shared at Regional Hub platform</i>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased levels of agro-ecological and social resilience by end of project</li> <li>Reduced perception of risk and vulnerability by end of project<sup>3</sup></li> <li>Reduced levels of food incesurity</li> </ul>					
				Subtotal		<b>6,909,810</b>	<b>57,050,000</b>
				Project Management Cost (PMC)	GEFTF	229,640	950,000
				<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>58,000,000</b>

\*N. B . FAO IS ONLY WORKING UNDER COMPONENT 2 & PMC

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF **CO-FINANCING** FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	MAAIF	Grants	21,000,000
Recipient Government	Office of the Prime Minister	Grants	24,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grants	13,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>58,000,000</b>

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b

<sup>3</sup> This can be measured through the use of the Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA). See <http://adaptation-undp.org/resources/training-tools/users-guide-vulnerability-risk-assessment-english>

FAO	GEFTF	Uganda	Biodiversity	Biodiversity	262,730	23,645	286,375
FAO	GEFTF	Uganda	Land Degradation	Land Degradation	947,477	85,273	1,032,750
FAO	GEFTF	Uganda	CCM	CCM	574,655	51,719	626,374
FAO	GEFTF	Uganda	IAP Set Aside	IAP Food Security	1,765,162	158,865	1,924,027
UNDP	GEFTF	Uganda	Biodiversity	Biodiversity	262,730	23,645	286,375
UNDP	GEFTF	Uganda	Land Degradation	Land Degradation	947,477	85,273	1,032,750
UNDP	GEFTF	Uganda	CCM	CCM	574,655	51,719	626,374
UNDP	GEFTF	Uganda	IAP Set Aside	IAP Food Security	1,804,564	162,411	1,966,975
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					<b>7,139,450</b>	<b>642,550</b>	<b>7,782,000</b>

## E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	4,920 hectares
2. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	480,508 metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> -eq

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? N/A

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

#### A.1. Project Description.

There are no major changes to the project since the PIF. A more detailed description of the development challenge including the root causes and barrier analysis has been elaborated in the Project Document (*page 5 to 10*). A household survey and a resilience analysis were carried out during the PPG phase and they have informed the proposed interventions. Details of the results of the surveys are elaborated in the project document (*page 5-10*).

The project target sites were identified during the PPG phase. Four districts in the Karamoja sub region were selected in order to demonstrate the potential for upscaling SLM under different climatic conditions, agro-ecological zones and livelihoods. The districts were selected using a matrix of indicators of vulnerability, as well as consultations through the National SLM Committee.<sup>4</sup> (*see PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Annex 15 for a site selection process summary*)

The project objective has not changed, however some of the outputs and outcomes were reformulated to create a more logical flow. The table below summarises the changes. A more detailed description of the outcomes and outputs is in the Joint Project Document from Page 53-69.

Table 1: A Summary of changes to the Components, Outcomes and Outputs

<sup>4</sup> Should circumstances dictate a change in districts or sub-counties, changes can be made under the leadership of the MAAIF and the project steering committee during the inception period.

Project component/ Outcomes at PIF stage	Project component/ Outcomes at CEO endorsement	Expected Outputs at PIF state	Outputs at CEO endorsement	Justification for the change
<p>Outcome 1.1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms in support of policy and institutional reform and upscaling of integrated natural resources management in place (such as the Market and Watershed platforms based on the country SLM frameworks)</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Supportive policies and incentives in place at local level to support smallholder agriculture and food value-chains</p> <p>□</p>	<p>Outcome 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM</p>	<p>Indicators and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms in place in Karamoja - at local/landscape scale</li> <li>- At least one Gender/age sensitive decision-support tool and participatory processes applied</li> </ul> <p>Indicators and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Value chain approaches integrated with sustainable production systems approaches, including consideration of post-harvest losses</li> <li>- Gum Arabic, Amarula, Tamarind, Palm value-chains strengthened</li> <li>- Increase in value chains supporting smallholder farmers to scale up good practices</li> </ul>	<p>Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels</p> <p>Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place</p>	<p>Outcome 1.1 was recast as an output, as it was considered a lower-level result contributing to the achievement of enabling frameworks.</p> <p>Indicators and targets were reformulated in line with project outputs and activities. Activities intended under this output were maintained, but some were moved to Outcome 2.</p> <p>Please refer to Annex A of the CEO ER and PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Annex 1 for the updated results framework.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1: Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management and SLM (including practices linked to GHG emission reduction -CSA)</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Increase in investment flows to integrated natural resources management</p> <p>□ □</p>	<p>Outcome 2: Increased land area under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape</p>	<p>Indicators and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X million ha with improved soil and water management</li> <li>• X million ha under diversified production</li> <li>• X million of ha of agro-pastoral systems under integrated management</li> <li>• # of farmers with increased access to food</li> </ul> <p>Indicators and targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• X million in increase from the local private sector;</li> <li>• X number of innovative funding</li> </ul>	<p>Output 2.1: Institutional technical capacities are increased to implement INRM/SLM</p> <p>Output 2.2: Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques</p> <p>Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project</p> <p>Output 2.4:</p>	<p>Outcome 2.1 was maintained and reformulated.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 was considered as a means to achieve outcome 2.1 and therefore was downgraded to the level of activities (the activities are included under Component 1). The activities to which outcome 2.2 referred have been integrated in the project's sustainability strategy, including through the Multistakeholder platforms developed under Component 1, which will work to leverage increased investment flows towards INRM.</p> <p>During the PPG's consultation mission, we found that the lack of capacity on INRM and SLM was an important obstacle in developing resilient practices for livestock and</p>

Project component/ Outcomes at PIF stage	Project component/ Outcomes at CEO endorsement	Expected Outputs at PIF state	Outputs at CEO endorsement	Justification for the change
		mechanisms/ schemes in place	Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, adopt sustainable land management practices, innovative alternative livelihood options, are implemented (SGP)	agriculture. Therefore, in order to reach the new Outcome 2: - Output 2.1 was added on increasing the institutional technical capacities on INRM. - Output 2.2 was added to reflect the dissemination of SLM techniques - Output 2.3 was added to include the need for livelihoods diversification to increase all season income and ensure food security. - Output 2.4 was created to allow for the earmarking of resources towards the Small Grants Program.  Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Annex 1 for the updated results framework.
3.1 Capacity and institutions in place to incorporate resilience into project design and implementation, and for monitoring of GEBs  3.2 Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscapes	Outcome 3: Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscapes and monitoring of GEBs	Indicators and targets: • Multi-scale monitoring of ecosystem services and global environmental benefits established at national level  Indicators and targets: • Framework for monitoring of resilience established at national and landscape level • Key Program socio-economic and gender indicators mainstreamed	Output 3.1: GEBs assessed and monitored from project interventions  Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales  Output 3.3: Project is linked to Regional Hub program for collaborative knowledge generation, exchange and dissemination	Outcome 3.1 was recast as an output as it is a tool to achieve the development of frameworks for multi-scale assessments.  Indicators and targets were reformulated in line with project activities.  Please refer to Annex 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Annex 1 for the updated results framework.

### A.1. 1) The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;

#### *Land degradation and loss of ecosystem services*

Productive land and soil are critical natural capital assets essential for agricultural productivity, conserving biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural). For those communities that rely heavily on land as their main source of livelihood, particularly the rural poor, human health and wellbeing are completely dependent upon and intricately linked to the health and productivity of the land. Thus, the vital functions of land and soil underpin the nexus of food, renewable energy and water security.

The loss of traditional grazing grounds, brought about by insecurity, drought, and restrictions on cattle movement (e.g. from conservation areas), has increased the concentration of cattle, and contributed to encroachment onto lands more suitable for cropping, during the wet season. As grazing ground decreased, forests on mountain slopes were burned to convert them into grazing ground. This reduced the forest cover's contribution to rainfall regimes. Furthermore, the cessation of annual burnings accelerated the growth of termite and harvester ant populations. Harvester ants destroyed the plant cover and, with exposure to the sun, the loss of soil moisture followed. The cumulative result of this process of erosion was a complete change in the land cover, grass savannah changed into huge expanses of barren soil punctuated with shrubs. This had led to widespread sheet erosion of the biologically active top soil and the loss of much potential soil moisture.

#### *Increasing climate variability, frequency of extreme events and climate change*

Future predictions of the impacts of climate change in Karamoja are fraught with inaccuracies, due to the very sparse availability of data. The analysis of weather and climate at national level used the records from only a single weather station in the sub-region (Kotido), as this was the only one with sufficient data for analysis – thus the analysis has been severely constrained.

Communities such as those in Karamoja used to know their local weather and climate relatively well and indeed relied on this knowledge for planning of their farming activities. Knowledge of local weather patterns was augmented by indigenous knowledge such as appearances of specific bird species, sprouting of particular plants and flowers to assist land users in planning when / whether to sow crops – and where to move livestock to ensure good grazing. The communities were also able to deduce good and poor seasons and therefore make adequate preparations to cope with weather / climate variability and its adverse effects. However, increased weather variability and evolving climate change has rendered this mechanism less effective – in some parts of Karamoja, for example, the unimodal rainfall pattern is reportedly becoming increasingly bimodal – attributed to climate change.

To date, the increasing frequency and intensity /duration of droughts remain the dominant and most widespread risk factor attributed to climate change in Karamoja. Since 2001, there has been an increase in extreme weather patterns in the region resulting in a higher frequency of extended dry spells. For example from 2001, there have been extended dry spells every second year (2002 & 2004) and also during the three consecutive years (2007 – 2009), resulting in repeated crop failures and low livestock productivity. There was also a serious drought across most of the region in 2015 – with total crop failure reported. Drought most severely affects land users, causing widespread food insecurity, malnutrition and low productivity of crops and livestock, particularly imposing severe losses and hardships on the poorest communities, whose livelihoods are more sensitive to the adverse impacts of climate change. Across the sub-region, formerly perennial rivers and streams are now seasonal, riverbeds that traditionally were reliable dry season sources of water often now yield no water.

In addition, the magnitude, frequency and severity of floods have also increased over the past decades, with deleterious impacts on productive assets and traditional coping capacities that support livelihoods.

A number of barriers constrain the ability of the local government and local communities in Karamoja to address food insecurity and environmental degradation:

#### *a) Insufficient policy and legal guidance on the management of natural resources*

The lack of completed policies and their application in the field is another barrier to addressing environmental threats in Karamoja. Among these policies, the Rangeland Management and Pastoralism Policy (Jan 2014) and the Pastoral Code (Jan 2007) both remain in draft form or are yet to be adopted. Their implementation would be pivotal for the success of this project, as for instance, the Rangeland Management and Pastoralism Policy “offers a framework for sustainable management of range resources, with ideas on areas for investments, managing livestock numbers and their water and feed resources, mitigating climate change and degradation, improving agro-pastoralism, protecting biodiversity and indigenous knowledge, research and training, and engaging communities in decision making and range development process” (GoU, 2014). Furthermore, some districts of the sub-region have draft ordinances that have yet to be implemented on the ground and that the project will strive to implement or enforce, for example:

- Nakapiripirit District: the Food Security and Environment Conservation Ordinance has been drafted and includes guidance on how to manage soils, vegetation and wetlands, but needs support on how to implement or enforce it;
- Napak District: an ordinance on environmental management, including on bush burning, is at the last stage of approval. Awareness raising is underway.

The policies and laws of the various sector ministries, such as agriculture, wildlife, minerals, lands, transport, need to be aligned and connected to overcome the past piecemeal approaches to development in Karamoja. This project will work at the local level to demonstrate that alignment through a stronger district-level institutional and legal framework and by ensuring that participatory development planning processes are in line with national policies through the multi-stakeholder platform to facilitate intersectoral dialogue.



In addition, the area of land available for pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and crop farmers is gradually declining in Karamoja due to areas of formerly communal land being procured for other private uses (inter alia for national parks or wildlife reserves, mining, quarrying), hence reducing Karamojong's food security and increasing their vulnerability to shocks. There is a poor understanding by local land users of their land rights and on how development actors can support responsible land and water governance and strengthen capacities at community and local levels. While communal rights are formally recognized in the Land policy, there have yet to be instances where Certificates of Customary Ownership (CCO) have been granted – whereas private ownership is easier to formalize. FAO has recently supported the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD) through its Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National of Food Security (VGGT) in developing a digital low-cost system to implement such measures, which has been tested in Kasese District in 2015. However, procedures are long and cumbersome, and the local populations and the organizations supporting them do not always have the capacity to intervene on these issues. Women's rights to land are also lagging behind.

As more pastoralists are encouraged by the government to engage in the riskier practice of crop production in the region, pressures on grazing land and conflicts among land users also risk increasing, particularly in the absence of any real community participation in land use planning at the sub-county or district level. There is also a strong push towards sedentarization of pastoral populations including through the increased supply of perennial water sources – which risks exacerbating land degradation as herds graze continuously in the areas around these supplies. Trust levels in the area are generally low, and there are no strong mechanisms for conflict prevention or arbitration. The role of local leaders in land attribution and distribution is also being overlooked in the efforts made by the government to formalize land tenure arrangements.

#### *b) Fragmented technical capacity at district and household levels to support food production*

At the district level, there is fragmented technical knowledge on sustainable land management and on the various integrated approaches that can be taken to promote resilient food security. While district technical staff are trained in some traditional areas of expertise, such as crop production, livestock production or soil and water management, they do not receive training on ecosystem-based or integrated approaches. It is worth noting that among 70 technical officers who attended the SLM workshop held in Moroto in January 2016 for this project's preparation, none claimed to have knowledge of rangeland management – yet the whole sub-region is mainly rangeland with limited areas of cropland mainly to the more humid west.

In addition, most of the districts of Karamoja are new and remain quite weak from an institutional perspective, with few personnel or financial resources to support activities, which limits the district resource base and constrains the rate of development. The agricultural extension service, which had been weak during the NAADS years, is gradually being recreated, with the recruitment of extension officers for each district and sub-county.

Technical staff at all levels in the range of sectors and decision makers are not fully aware of the value of ecosystem services and how SLM and agro-ecological approaches can contribute to increasing the resilience of the fragile, degraded ecosystems and the associated livelihoods of the local people. Lastly, technical staff and NGO staff expressed the need for a much improved weather forecasting service, recounting that the current weather forecasts from the Meteorology Department are not made widely available, and are often unreliable for this sub-region. Although early warning systems in the sub-region are under implementation through UNDP's early warning system project, effects of such systems are yet to be seen in Karamoja.

Many land users are also facing challenges, beyond the scope of their local knowledge, inter alia:

- Pastoralists and agropastoralists are re-establishing transhumance – which was disrupted during the recent period of insecurity, when livestock were kept in kraals guarded by the army to reduce cattle raiding;
- In some areas pastoralists are becoming sedentary and trying to manage their reduced livestock numbers without transhumance;
- Sedentarized former pastoralists are struggling to grow crops, without the requisite knowledge of how to maintain their soil's health and productivity (i.e. physical, chemical and biological properties to produce yields);
- There is progressive degradation of the rangelands due to massive removal of trees for charcoal production and fencing of manyattas (homesteads).

#### *c) Lack of coordination between stakeholders and among projects*

Stakeholder groups, such as the Karamoja Development Partners Group, NGOs, CSOs, exist in Karamoja, but they are not necessarily connected or promote an integrated approach, as they do not involve local communities directly within their decision making processes. The absence of a multi-stakeholder platform at the local district level but also at the sub-regional level creates a barrier to adopting an integrated approach in the management of natural resources which would improve food security and enhance livelihood diversification.

#### *d) Weak evidence base to support decision-making*

The long history of conflict in the region has created a setup where local, development-relevant data, is scarce and dispersed. Information on climate, crop-yields, and land productivity is not readily identifiable, and despite a number of household surveys, there does not exist a framework that can enable all sectors to adequately monitor development progress. As a result, development policies for the sub-region are often based on outdated or fragmented information, which does not allow for the kind of paradigm shift that would be required to lift Karamoja from the dire conditions it currently faces. Information that supports integrated planning and policy making is not yet making its way into the development programs of major donors and the government continues to adopt sector-based, siloed approaches to programming. Furthermore, most development-related data and information systems make abstraction of the degradation of environment, for which there is no systematic monitoring in the region. As a result of this, decisions on land use could be based on erroneous information, leading to poor choices in land management, and aggravating the pre-existing fragility of the natural resource base. Finally, communities are not typically involved in the monitoring and assessment of their own development programs, which – combined with the prevalence of food aid in the area – contributes to creating a climate of disempowerment and dependency.

### **A.1.2 The baseline scenario and associated baseline projects**

The baseline scenario and associated projects were reevaluated during project design. In some cases, baseline projects cited at PIF had already ended or new, more relevant initiatives emerged. The baseline projects are as follows:

1. The first baseline initiative on which this project will build is the **Karamoja Livelihoods Programme (KALIP)** in its forthcoming second phase, supported by EU through the Prime Minister’s Office in all seven districts of Karamoja for a total of 140 million Euros under the 11thEDF. This program is scheduled to start in early 2017 and end in late 2021. While the objective of the first KALIP phase was to “promote development as an incentive to peace by supporting livelihoods including agro-pastoral production and alternative income generation opportunities for the people of Karamoja”, the second phase will focus on consolidating stability in the region and strengthening the foundations for sustainable development in Northern Uganda in order to reduce the developmental gap existing between Northern Uganda and the rest of the country. Its specific objectives include: i) reinforcing the sustainability of primary transport networks and of the connections with production areas, ii) increasing food security, nutrition and household income through the promotion of development and resilience as an incentive of stability in the region and the promotion of inclusive growth in agriculture with value chain support, and iii) strengthening good governance, capacity and rule of law at the level of local government agencies.

While KALIP does not aim to promote resilient livelihoods, the proposed project will build on lessons learned from KALIP1 and complement KALIP2 by strengthening climate change resilience of Karamoja’s food systems and associated livelihoods by promoting sustainable land management and integrated natural resources management and by introducing alternative income-generating activities and reinforcing value chain development. More specifically, this project will seek synergies and complement the new KALIP in three ways: it will build technical capacity to improve productivity in livestock rearing and crop farming by demonstrating the benefits of pasture improvement for rangeland rehabilitation, reinforcing the support to agro-pastoral field school (APFS) and farmer field school (FFS) networks, and implementing rainwater harvesting (RWH) techniques for livestock, crop and household uses. In addition to building technical capacity, it will also create new opportunities for Karamojong communities to diversify their sources of income by supporting the organization of producer groups to develop income generating activities such as cereal banking systems to improve supplies of local seeds, bee keeping, or soap making (Component 2). Finally, this project will not only complement the new KALIP but also benefit from the reinforcement of the primary transport networks which will facilitate access to markets, encouraging value chain development.

2. **Africa Regional Pastoralism Livelihood Resilience Project (RPLRP) (2014-2019: 40,000,000 US\$ for Uganda - World Bank, implemented by MAAIF).** The objectives are to enhance livelihood resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in cross-border drought prone areas of selected countries and improve the capacity of the selected countries’ governments to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency in Kenya, Uganda and Ethiopia, facilitated by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). Specifically, this project has four priorities which will be put into action in five of the seven districts of Karamoja<sup>5</sup>: i) enhance the secure access to land of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities to sustainably manage pastoral-related natural resources, ii) improve market access of agro-pastoralists and pastoralists to the intra-regional and international markets of livestock and livestock products, iii) enhance livelihoods of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists communities, and iv) improve drought-related hazards preparedness, prevention and response at the national and regional levels. While RPLRP priorities are closely linked to the IAP project’s objectives, by the time the IAP’s implementation starts, the RPLRP will have reached its mid-term evaluation, which will be useful in terms of lessons learned and best practices. Therefore, synergies and coordination will be established at the inception phase in order to avoid duplication. The IAP project will be implemented in three of the five RPLRP-selected districts (Kaabong, Kotido and Moroto) and will therefore seek synergies and complement the RPLRP in three ways: 1) by strengthening links

---

<sup>5</sup> Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak and Amudat districts.

between government and local communities through district level multi-stakeholder platforms to support participatory and community-based land use planning, INRM plans and SLM practices, hence building an enabling environment for communities to sustain their livelihoods in the longer-term (Component 1), therefore contributing to RPRLP's first and third priorities; 2) by contributing to its fourth priority by integrating Karamoja into the national early warning system through the dissemination of agrometeorological information and advisories to local government and to the general public through radio broadcasting (Component 2); and 3) by acting at both Africa regional level and Uganda's national and sub-regional levels through linking the Karamoja process and actors with science - policy platforms at national and regional levels for scientific guidance and policy support.

**3. Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) – 3rd phase.** This program, which entered its third phase in 2015, is funded by the Loan from the World Bank (130 million US\$) through the Prime Minister's Office. Its objective is to expand income-earning opportunities for poor households and to put in place the building blocks of a social protection system. The program is delivered through labour-intensive public works initiatives. This includes the provision of regular, seasonal employment opportunities by recruiting local workers for the construction of public infrastructure and assets such as rural access roads, soil and water conservation infrastructures, flood control structures, market shelters, rural health facilities and schools. The NUSAF will also support environmental rehabilitation by promoting cash for work approaches in afforestation, erosion control and the establishment of tree nurseries. NUSAF also intends to support the government in promoting sustainable agriculture activities such as animal husbandry, non-timber forest products, fisheries and value addition in the agricultural sector. This will be done through the provision of grants to households that meet a certain set of criteria (e.g. have a business plan, construct a latrine), supplemented by skill development and coaching. NUSAF 3 will also support specific vocational training for youth. In its third component, the NUSAF 3 will support the government, through the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, in developing the formulation and implementation of the Uganda Social Protection Policy.

The proposed GEF intervention will build on this baseline initiative in the following manner. First, the IAP project proposes an integrated approach to achieving lasting food security, that not only considers income as a measure of resilience, but also provides stronger opportunities for participating in development planning, and that also considers the natural environmental constraints faced by households in the region. The proposed GEF intervention will build on the baseline of social infrastructures built by NUSAF in the project sites, in particular roads that facilitate access to markets, post harvest infrastructures, water conservation structures, schools and health services. The proposed initiative will also complement the grant scheme put forward by NUSAF by supporting community-based planning that will help households and villages in identifying their own resilience-building income generating activities, making it easier for communities to access NUSAF grant funds. Furthermore, through Component 1, the proposed GEF initiative will also build local government capacity to access, manage and plan NUSAF funds through multi-stakeholder platforms that create linkages beyond traditional administrative boundaries

### **A.1. 3) Proposed alternative scenario**

The theory of change for this project was refined in light of findings of baseline studies, consultations and assessments. There was however, no major change since the PIF. This project is premised on the recognition that reducing food and nutrition insecurity and climate vulnerability requires a multi-pronged approach that leads to an increase in food production and availability and a diversification of livelihoods options. In order to implement these two key strategies, a number of enabling and supporting interventions are also necessary in order to remove potential barriers. This includes addressing the main drivers of environmental degradation and reversing ecosystem services loss, and providing an enabling development planning framework. The integrated approach embodied in this project therefore addresses the environmental, socio-economic, and institutional barriers to increased food availability.

The overall goal of the project is **to improve food security** by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity and their root causes in Karamoja sub-region. The specific objective of the project is to contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region.

In order to achieve this objective and to contribute to achieving the goal, three mid-level results need to be achieved, and these will be organised around two main components: **Component 1:** Strengthened institutional frameworks for improving food security; and **Component 2:** Scaling-up integrated approaches at national and landscape level. These will be supported by a dedicated **Component (3)** on Monitoring and Assessment to facilitate learning, knowledge exchange and monitoring of interventions and their contribution to the main goals and objectives. The main strategy to be pursued is to significantly increase the land area and agro-ecosystems that are under integrated natural resources management (**Outcome 2**). This will support increased production and productivity, and ensure the continued maintenance of ecosystem services that are the foundation of food security. In order to provide conditions for sustainability and upscaled transformation of the local food systems, it is also required to put in place supportive policies and incentives at local, district and landscape levels (**Outcome 1**). These will contribute to lifting the structural barriers preventing communities from pursuing viable food security strategies. In addition, a system must be set up where development decisions at all

levels are taken on the basis of a comprehensive, scientific information base (**Outcome 3**). This will help create a feedback loop to the local planning frameworks as well as to help inform national development policies of direct relevance to Karamoja.

#### A.1. 4) Additional Incremental Cost Reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, GEF TF and co-financing

The GEF intervention comes at a time when many baseline investments have been targeted towards ensuring access to basic services, such as security, healthcare, education, drinking water, and fundamental rural infrastructure (roads and markets). These large-scale investments do not have an immediately visible impact on the root causes of food insecurity. Indeed, 8 years after the end of the war, over 90% of the population still lives in extreme poverty and food insecurity and households are not yet resilient. As a result, a single drought season can erase all development gains and plunge the communities back into a downward spiral of food insecurity. This project will ensure that sustainability and resilience for food security are fully integrated into all aspects of development planning and programming in the Karamoja region. The table below presents the incremental cost reasoning for each project component:

Table 2: Incremental Cost Reasoning

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF alternative scenario
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM</p>	<p>In the baseline situation, development interventions are planned in a segmented or fragmented manner, with development partners targeting interventions towards their sector of choice. There is no single framework for development and no integrated approach that allows for the full consideration of environmental and climate constraints facing food production systems. Local government budgets often fail to provide sufficient resources towards addressing environmental degradation and concerns, resulting in an imbalance between development sectors. In addition, legal frameworks at local level are often inadequate to support the sustainable management of resources, resulting in a lack of enforcement of national policies.</p> <p>Furthermore, existing development planning frameworks are not fully inclusive, and communities are often faced with development decisions made without their having been fully consulted. This results in a lack of ownership and top-down attitude to local development. In addition, land tenure uncertainties and the difficulties in resolving land tenure issues also weaken the traditional stewardship systems, leading to further environmental degradation. Current land use planning frameworks do not include environmental services, leading to a disregard for the degradation of the production base.</p>	<p>The GEF project will be used to address these barriers to the full integration of environment and climate concerns in development processes at the sub-regional and local levels. Under the alternative scenario, GEF funds will be used to support the creation or strengthening of development planning forums or multi-stakeholder platforms to ensure full participation from local communities, NGOs and CBOs, starting from the district level and aggregating towards the landscape/watershed levels and sub-regional level. The project will build on existing venues and platforms to create avenues for a stronger dialogue that restores trust, promotes integration of environmental sustainability, and allows for the emergence of better ownership by local communities themselves. This will be embodied in community-based land use plans that take ecosystems and their services into consideration. The project will also support the integration of environmental and climate issues in district level budget lines, along with support for the establishment of stronger local legal frameworks.</p> <p>The project will also work with communities and local governments to address land tenure issues, and to raise local awareness of the links between food security and sustainable natural resources management.</p> <p>The total value of incremental costs of this outcome is 1,664,223 US\$.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Increased land area under integrated natural resources management and SLM practices for a more productive</p>	<p>In the baseline situation, efforts at addressing food insecurity have had mitigated success due to the widespread lack of technical capacity for sustainable production among communities and extension services, and have been undermined by climate shocks in the past few years. The current approach to providing extension services has not proven effective in Karamoja, due to the remoteness of communities, a lack of</p>	<p>In the alternative GEF scenario, the project would work with local communities towards achieving a sustainable increase in production and productivity, while protecting the environmental services that supports it. The project would deploy efforts using an integrated watershed management approach that integrates land, water and biodiversity concerns into agricultural production. As such, agricultural landscapes would be considered within the broader watershed. Catchment planning and management</p>

<p>Karamoja landscape</p>	<p>trust among communities and governments, and a lack of financial and operational means. In addition, efforts aiming at transforming pastoral systems into agro-pastoralist or sedentary cropping systems have met with some cultural resistance on the part of the Karamojong. As a result, communities are left struggling in a semi-transhumant pattern with little or no knowledge of the means by which they can achieve sustainable food security. In addition, there is a continued dependency on single-commodity food production systems, which accentuates vulnerability to climate shocks and food insecurity.</p> <p>As a result of this situation, natural resource use patterns in the region are increasingly unsustainable, further eroding the environmental basis for food production. Deforestation and over-grazing have led to the rapid degradation of fragile lands, soil erosion and the gradual disappearance of agrobiodiversity. Traditional land use patterns and cattle corridors have been disrupted, first due to the conflict, and now due to inadequate land tenure and land management arrangements.</p> <p>There is currently no significant efforts to promote the emergence of community-based small to medium enterprises. As a result, efforts to promote poverty reduction and food security continue to rely on traditional single-commodity approaches, which accentuates vulnerability to external shocks such as price fluctuations, market failures or climate extremes.</p> <p>Furthermore, while there have been sporadic attempts at supporting alternative livelihoods and diversification, these are usually undertaken in small isolated pilots and are not available to all communities. This stems in part from the fact that communities are not always involved in land use planning and development planning decisions (see Outcome 1) and therefore that they themselves do not have an opportunity to identify viable livelihoods pathways.</p>	<p>will therefore inform the interventions to be undertaken and promoted by the project as to increase the building of resilience against the shocks and stressors faced by the ecological and livelihood systems in the Karamoja region. The project will facilitate training of government and non-government land use planners and resource managers on the use of LADA and WOCAT tools to build capacity for assessments and informed land use and resource planning.</p> <p>The project will also work to upscale available knowledge on successful INRM approaches and SLM practices based on lessons available from previous projects. In order to achieve this, the project will work through a farmer-based extension approach, embodied in the Agro-pastoral and Farmer Field Schools. This will entail training of existing and prospective extension officers, as well as local facilitators who can contribute to extending knowledge locally. The project will work not only with government institutions but also with local communities, traditional leaders and farmers to disseminate sustainable practices for SLM, rangeland management, catchment/watershed management, climate smart agriculture, integrated crop-livestock farming and horticulture. In this regard the project will focus on traditional (existing) food and fodder value chains, and will also (through Outcome 3) promote alternative and new value chains for diversification. In addition, the project will ensure adequate attention is paid to the conservation and sustainable use of indigenous agrobiodiversity, which is being eroded by single commodity approaches to food production.</p> <p>Using the APFS/FFS methodology, the project will demonstrate the food security, environmental and economic benefits of pasture improvement and rangeland rehabilitation, natural regeneration of soil cover, agro-forestry, and rainwater harvesting techniques – all of which will contribute to increasing production and incomes.</p> <p>Using the farmer-based extension system referred to above, the project will identify a set of viable alternative livelihoods that can provide income diversification and can help alleviate pressures on rare natural resources. These include for example of sustainable charcoal production, fodder production, basket making, thatching and seed multiplication, small stock raising (pigs, poultry), egg, milk and hide processing, and honey or horticulture production. These avenues will be studied for viability from an environmental and economic standpoint and market prospects will also be studied, so that support is provided all along the value chain. Target groups for this support will include women and youth, as well as NGOs and CBOs. This will contribute to expanding the prospects for agricultural diversification, leading to the conservation and sustainable use of local biodiversity, reduced pressures on the environment, and increased value addition. Incomes generated from alternative livelihoods will directly</p>
---------------------------	---	--

		<p>contribute to reducing vulnerability and to increasing resilience of target groups.</p> <p>The total value of the incremental costs under this outcome is \$4,350,024, of which \$800,000 is earmarked for execution through the SGP.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs</p>	<p>In the baseline situation, there is no comprehensive effort to conduct an assessment of ecological services and their status. Data on environmental trends in Karamoja is fragmented and often gathered using diverging methodologies. This does not allow for the adequate measurement of the impact or environmental cost of development initiatives. Furthermore, while lessons are being continuously identified, these are not properly integrated into the next phases of development planning at the local or regional level. The feedback mechanisms that are required to achieve qualitative increases in development are not existent and donors and planners alike are left responding to crises in an ad hoc manner.</p>	<p>Under the incremental scenario, the GEF funds will be used to support the identification of a single comprehensive set of methodologies and tools for the assessment of environmental degradation trends and their links to food security and resilience. This will include assessment of land degradation, water availability and watershed degradation, forest cover, agro-biodiversity assessments, and measurements of the socio-economic aspects of vulnerability. This information will feed into the land use planning and development planning exercises foreseen in outcomes 1, 2 and 3, and will support the identification of alternative livelihoods pathways. The information will also be mobilized through the use of the multi-stakeholder platforms that are being set in place under Outcome 1, to allow for the integration of project successes and lessons into continuous development planning.</p> <p>The project will begin by identifying an appropriate framework for monitoring and assessment, such as for example the HH-BAT SHARP tool or the Vital Signs Resilience Framework (or a combination thereof), and will provide training to project stakeholders, including local governments, extension services, development officers, NGOs and the project staff. All monitoring and assessment will be conducted using a participatory monitoring approach, through the multi-stakeholder platforms. A baseline study will be conducted, followed by bi-annual monitoring of project results and indicators and a final impact study.</p> <p>Finally, the GEF funds will also be used to promote the project's linkages to the broader regional IAP platform (i.e. the IFAD-led Regional Hub project). This will include benefiting from enabling services, knowledge and science products, technical support, exchange visits and study tours.</p> <p>The total incremental cost of activities under this outcome is 789,023 US\$.</p>

### A.1. 5) Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs)

The project will contribute to addressing land degradation and maintaining globally significant biodiversity in Karamoja, especially within Kidepo's critical landscape (two protected areas are located in this region: Kidepo National Park (1,442 km<sup>2</sup> in size) and Mt Moroto Forest Reserve (483 km<sup>2</sup>), collectively hosting over 77 mammal species and over 400 bird species, as well as several species of flora. This biodiversity will be protected through improving sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forests) in the communal areas adjacent to these PAs, and contribute to the reducing of pressure from a growing population and unsustainable land management practices. Building the resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja landscape will contribute to the productivity of landscapes and food production systems. Rehabilitation of degraded catchments and watersheds (including rangelands, grasslands and forests) will contribute to increased water availability and pasture, and the ability

of watersheds and ecosystems to recover from shocks and stressors and build long-term resilience against climate change and variability, and contribute to the addressing land and ecosystem degradation.

The project will directly contribute to the reversal of land degradation trends and restore vegetation cover on over 4,920 hectares of land, avoiding 20,178 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq emissions. The improved practices will lead to not only increased productivity and biodiversity, but also reduced land degradation and carbon emissions. The current gaps in available baseline data on biodiversity and land degradation will be filled thanks to participatory monitoring and assessment methods introduced through APFS/FFS, engaging communities to do so, as well as training on LADA/WOCAT and HH-BAT (refer to project description in project document).

Pasture improvement and rangeland rehabilitation, natural regeneration of soil cover, agro-forestry, and rainwater harvesting techniques, introduced through the APFS and FFS approaches, will contribute to increasing production and incomes of community members. In terms of biodiversity, it is expected that the combination of project activities will lead to improved in situ conservation and restoration of tree species and local varieties of seeds through training on seed multiplication, introduction of drought tolerant varieties; the restoration of fauna habitats through reforestation and conservation of forests; the reduction of encroachment into natural reserves and protection of animal and plant reserves in the selected sites (Component 2); and improved identification and knowledge of species of significance thanks to building capacity on assessing agro-biodiversity (Component 3).

These biodiversity related benefits will be supplemented by reduced land degradation and the creation of 480,508 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>eq over the duration of the project and 10-year capitalization phase (or 98 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq per hectare over the project's duration and 10-year capitalization phase) (see EX-ACT results in Annex E of this document).

### **A.1. 6) Innovativeness, sustainability and scaling-up**

#### *Innovativeness*

Despite the project being located in a risk averse area, it has several innovative characteristics: The concept of multi-stakeholder platforms is a relatively innovative one in the Karamoja context. As noted above, while there exists some sectoral or interest-based coordination, multi-stakeholder forums are very weak in the region. The use of such platforms as both beneficiaries and actors in the project will support the emergence of new patterns of cooperation among the different social groups. It is also expected that private sector participation in these platforms will contribute to stronger market organization and to increasing demand for sustainable production. The use of these platforms as mechanisms for land use planning, within the current system, could also be an innovation, particularly if it considers issues related to land rights.

The project will also seek to introduce technical innovations and to pilot SLM / INRM technologies that have not yet been promoted in the Karamoja region. This includes for example rainwater harvesting and rangeland rehabilitation techniques, in addition to sustainable and climate smart land management practices in crop, grazing and forest lands. The project will also seek to promote alternative sources of livelihoods within existing value chains, by using the strong agro-pastoral traditions to take communities from subsistence to (where feasible) more market-oriented practices. Transformation and value addition will provide welcome innovations in an area where traditional livelihoods are weakening.

Finally, the project will also innovate in that it will create mechanisms for monitoring and assessing resilience through a series of tools such as the **Resilience Atlas**<sup>6</sup>, the **STAP RAPTA** framework, the SHARP tool<sup>7</sup> and the **Vital signs**<sup>8</sup> protocols that combine natural resources, ecosystem services, and community well-being. This will create a feedback loop that will contribute to sound policymaking for the North. Resilience Atlas (<http://www.resilienceatlas.org>) and Vital Signs data collection and monitoring programmes, are Conservation International initiatives designed to facilitate informed decisions-making for agricultural production, ecosystem management and human well-being. Uganda is already part of CI's Vital Signs program, and this child project will therefore easily integrate its assessment and monitoring activities into the existing work. The key focus of this project's interventions will therefore be to highlight and provide up-to-date data on the specific sites that the project will work in (i.e. Karamoja region). The project will also develop a project page on the Resilience Atlas to store baseline data, and will add new layers to the Atlas as the project progresses.

The project will ensure the direct linkages between the child project's activities under Component 3 - Monitoring and Assessment, with those of the IFAD-led Regional Hub Project, especially its work under Outcome 3.1. The child project will participate at regional learning and exchange platforms that will be organised through the IFAD-led Regional Project and use those platforms to present results of the monitoring and assessment work, and compare lessons with other child projects participating in the Food Security IAP.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.resilienceatlas.org/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.fao.org/in-action/sharp/en/>

<sup>8</sup> <http://vitalsigns.org/>

Beyond the life of the project, the results from assessments conducted in the Karamoja region will be publicly available through the Resilience Atlas and other information platforms.

### *Sustainability*

To further strengthen the sustainability of the IAP project, interventions will be implemented in a phased approach. This includes the development of technical capacity, which will be pre-requisite to working with communities. Government staff (extension agents) will be trained in the farmer field school approach, so that they may adopt this methodology in all their work – and continue doing so beyond the project life-span. Additionally agreements will be established with individuals trained to ensure that they remain in the relevant government departments for the minimum period after receiving the training.

Ultimately, the sustainability of the project will largely depend on the willingness of stakeholders to adopt the interventions and continue to pursue them beyond the duration of the project. Suitable technical, legal and institutional capacity is necessary at both local and sub-regional levels for sustainability to be achieved. Although restoring the degraded landscape will be a long-term result of the project, a range of activities have been included in the project which link the land users to value chains, to ensure they can see the returns of their investments (of time, energy – and in some instances money) - “quick-wins”. This also includes the development of a financial sustainability strategy through the multi-stakeholder platforms that will seek to enhance the investment flows targeted towards SLM and INRM.

Through the use of the APFS and FFS and other participatory approaches, inclusion of exchange visits and activities to share information on project achievements are designed to ensure that post-project, other land users in Karamoja may learn of and emulate the achievements of the project.

The sustainability of IAP project interventions will be strengthened through a range of activities. It is expected that the multi-stakeholder platforms established under Component 1 will be maintained after project completion, using local and regional governments’ own resources. The project will work to demonstrate the clear development benefits of these platforms to encourage their continued use. Component 2 includes a wide range of awareness raising and training activities to ensure that the project beneficiaries, wider communities in the sub-region and technical staff will be supported to better conserve, protect and enhance the natural and ago-ecosystems of Karamoja, also how these actions can improve their livelihoods through increasing the efficiency of their resource use. This will build on their indigenous knowledge.

The project is expected to lead to significant environmental benefits, namely through the reversal of land degradation trends and through the restoration of key ecosystem services. This will include restoration of vegetative cover, sustainable management of soils and water, sustainable harvesting of biomass and biodiversity. The project does not anticipate any negative environmental impacts. An Environmental and Social Screening was conducted on the project. The project is category as Low Risk.

*Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, section 2.3 for additional information on sustainability.*

### *Scaling-up*

The project’s activities, if successful, can be scaled-up in other communities of Karamoja, within project districts, but also to the districts not included in the project, through the creation of other district level multi-stakeholder platforms and the multiplication of the agropastoral / farmer field school approaches, which can be easily adapted and disseminated. In addition to their participatory and community-based land-use planning mandate, the multi-stakeholder platforms will participate in participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises during and at the end of the project, and it is expected that this will assist district administrations in taking up the project’s successful practices in other villages and sub-counties. Linkages between district-level and regional-level platforms will also assist in replication and scaling up.

Importantly, it is expected that the field school approach will lead to the broader dissemination of knowledge on sustainable and profitable agricultural practices that can be replicated in other areas. As communities demonstrate success and increased economic benefits, this will create incentives for other communities to spontaneously replicate approaches and practices demonstrated in this project. Field visits and study tours among communities will be organized, along with a strong awareness raising campaign, which will assist in the dissemination of lessons learned to other parts of Karamoja and, eventually, the rest of Uganda.

There are many plans for channelling significant development investment in the Karamoja sub-region. This project will help leverage these investments towards increased sustainability and resilience by building the capacity of local land users and planners to understand and assess vulnerability (Outcome 2, Outcome 3). The project will also create a knowledge and information base on which to plan future development investments (Outcome 3). Furthermore, it is expected that the multi-platforms will serve as forums where



development priorities are identified and addressed in an integrated manner (Outcome 1). *Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, section 2.2.*

## A.2. Child Project

This is a child project of the overall GEF FSIAP program, which includes 12 other countries. The three outcomes of this child project are closely linked to the intended results of the overall program. Outcome 1 will contribute to achieving the Program component on the establishment of institutional frameworks for influencing sustainability and resilience; Outcome 2 will contribute to achieving programmatic outcome 2 on the scaling up of integrated approaches and outcome 3 will contribute to Program level outcome 3 on monitoring and assessment. This project will participate actively in activities foreseen under the framework of the regional hub project, which is designed to create linkages among sub-projects and beneficiary countries.

**A.3. Stakeholders.** *Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes  /no )? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no )?*

In order to ensure buy-in and ownership of project activities, the communities, institutions and partners in this project have been involved from the start in the project's design, during the project preparation phase. The project preparation phase included a Project Preparation Inception Workshop (held in November 2015) and brought together all stakeholders and potential partners, and other prospective stakeholders that were identified during the course of project preparation. A second design and consultation mission took place in January 2016, during which the preparation team visited potential project sites and conducted focus groups and discussions with communities and with district technical officials on food security, environmental degradation, and climate change impacts on local livelihoods.

During the focus groups, vulnerable groups such as women, youth and the elderly were particularly targeted in order for them to be able to voice their concerns (for more detail on vulnerable groups, please refer to Section 2.3 of the Project Document). They will be specifically targeted in this project, in particular through Component 2, which will provide activities designed around their specific needs, capacities, knowledge and social roles with the objective to increase the land area under INRM and SLM and enhance productivity to contribute to food security. Furthermore, district technical officials will all also be particularly targeted in order to enhance and build up their institutional and technical capacity in terms of implementing integrated natural resources management and sustainable land management.

To ensure effective and informed participation of stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of this project, the inception and consultation missions engaged community stakeholders and district officials through focus groups, which involved two stages. In district government, the consultation first held a meeting with all the district's employees and then divided into thematic groups, such as agriculture, livestock, land management and alternative livelihoods to focus on certain issues. Within communities, large meetings involved everyone in the community, then, the smaller focus groups included groups of women, youth and elders. This allowed for fair and representative participation of all affected populations, especially the most vulnerable and marginalized. Questions to communities allowed the design preparation team to understand the current and past issues in the sub-region as well as to identify needs of communities in order for them to reach resilient livelihoods and food security. In addition, mapping of land use systems was conducted by national experts, and a stakeholder workshop was held in Moroto in January 2016 to conduct a participatory assessment of land degradation and existing SLM practices in the seven districts in Karamoja sub-region, however, more information is required from the districts to complete the database and mapping.

The validation workshop took place on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and brought together all relevant stakeholders, including representatives from NGOs and specific sectors to discuss the final list of project activities and expected results. Detailed report of the inception, consultation and validation missions are provided in the project document's Annex 12, Annex 14 and Annex 15.

Through the large set of activities, this project design strives to respond to all concerns expressed by communities and will be in line with what the communities need to enhance their food security in the long term. The beneficiaries and stakeholders described in the table below have participated in the design stage of the project and will continue to do so during project implementation.

Stakeholders	Details	Contributions to the project
<b>Government</b>	District local governments in the Karamoja sub-region – technical staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the district multi-stakeholder platforms and linking to the regionally established platform</li> <li>- Recipient of training on INRM and SLM</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues</li> <li>- Providing technical advice on rangeland management / SLM etc</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Details	Contributions to the project
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support enforcement environmental management regulations / by-laws / EIA regulations etc.</li> <li>- Support for the main-streaming/ institutionalisation of APFS/FFS through district plans and budgets</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices</li> </ul>
	District local governments in the Karamoja sub-region – extension staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the district multi-stakeholder platforms and linking to the regionally established platform</li> <li>- Recipient of training on INRM and SLM</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues</li> <li>- Master Trainers for APFSs and FFSS</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Project Executing Partner</li> <li>- Recipient of training on INRM and SLM</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues</li> <li>- Contributor to the introduction of INRM and SLM into public policy and practice as an adaptation strategy</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries – Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Guidance and training for farmers (e.g. hay making, seed multiplication, SWC, AF, woodlots, root crops)</li> <li>- Support to the training on INRM, SLM and seed multiplication</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices</li> </ul>
	National SLM committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Part of the PSC, through a designated focal point</li> <li>- Responsible for project coordination and monitoring of project activities</li> </ul>
	National Environmental Management Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Participate in monitoring environmental benefits of activities, including biodiversity and land rehabilitation</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Recipient of training on INRM and SLM</li> <li>- IWRM for agriculture, livestock and human consumption, sustained surface and ground water supply and watershed management</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Recipient of training on INRM and SLM</li> <li>- Support to Sustainable charcoal production/value chain development</li> <li>- Support to the awareness raising on Energy saving stoves, biogas, solar energy or other energy saving measures e.g. for agro-processing</li> </ul>
	Ministry of Lands and Urban Development (MLUD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Support to the establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM and SLM.</li> <li>- Providing information on community land tenure and access rights including forest and fisheries to support project activities</li> <li>- Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues</li> </ul>
	Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the regional multi-stakeholder platform during and after the project's implementation</li> <li>- Support for coordination and links to numerous existing projects and programmes (e.g. DFID Resilience Programme, World Bank Africa Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Project, Strengthening capacities for DRM and resilience)</li> </ul>
	National Forestry Authority (NFA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with the project coordination unit and support the potential for sustainable charcoal production among youth and women groups.</li> <li>- Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>- Providing information on choice of tree species choices, also tree management</li> <li>- Liaise with project on interventions in forest reserves (e.g. Mt Moroto)</li> </ul>
	Office of Karamoja Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contribute to the assessment of existing sub-regional platforms and to the needs assessment for a sub-regional multi-stakeholder platform</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Details	Contributions to the project
		- Coordinate the regional multi-stakeholder platform gathering all relevant stakeholders - Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms
	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives	- Provide vital inputs and links to value chains to develop markets for produce from Karamoja (initially, local markets – longer-term consider wider markets) - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform
<b>Land Users, their groups and leaders</b>	Pastoralists	Beneficiaries <sup>9</sup>
	Agro-pastoralists	Beneficiaries
	Rainfed cropping farmers (including traditional and recently settled pastoralists);	Beneficiaries
	Small-scale irrigated horticulturalists – mainly but not exclusively women – usually part of APFSs;	Beneficiaries
	Woodland- and forest-dependent communities.	Beneficiaries
	Women and youth associations/groups in Karamoja (active in agriculture and other non-farm activities)	Beneficiaries
	Representatives of local NRM mechanisms (i.e. water user associations, catchment committees, basin organizations, pasture committees, etc.)	Beneficiaries
	Traditional leaders/Elders of various ethnic groups in Karamoja	Beneficiaries
<b>International development agency</b>	UNDP	GEF Implementing Agency, responsible for Outcomes 1 and 3, contributing partner to outcomes 2 and 4. Member of the Project Board, quality assurance.
	FAO	GEF Implementing Agency, responsible for Outcomes 2 and 4, contributing partner to outcomes 1 and 3. Member of the project board, quality assurance.
<b>Other</b>	Academic and Research Institutions	- Research support to sustainable rangeland and integrated crop-livestock management and activities to enhance food and livelihood security
	World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)	- Providing information on choice of tree species choices, also tree management – and advice / germplasm of appropriate domesticated fruit trees
<b>Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) &amp; Civil Society Organization (CSO)</b>	NGOs such as: - Community Integrated Development Initiative (CIDI) - Hope for Humanity Karamoja (HHK) - Concern Worldwide - Bicycles for Humanity (B4H)  A lit of relevant CSOs can be found in Annex 6	- Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues - Contribute to reforestation and rehabilitation activities - Participate in the implementation of SLM practices and INRM - Support farmer groups in developing resilient value chains for increased income - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices - Recipient of training on methods and tools on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (Output 3.2) - Strengthen capacity of CSOs/CBOs to become effective service providers for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• developing and implementing community /catchment action plans</li> <li>• facilitating/supporting APFS and FFS</li> </ul>
	Existing APFS and APFS networks	- as above also exchange visits, participatory evaluation etc.
<b>Private sector</b>	Traders in inputs supply, agricultural food produce, charcoal and other value chains in Karamoja and other parts of Uganda	- Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms - Provide vital inputs and links to value chains to develop markets for produce from Karamoja (initially, local markets – longer-term consider wider markets) - Establish linkages with communities to provide value addition in traditional and innovative value chains through existing and new APFS/FFS.

<sup>9</sup> Please refer to the social context (Section 1) for more information on beneficiaries, including: different roles and responsibilities of women and men (of different age, ethnicity and socioeconomic group), and their access to resources and services.

Stakeholders	Details	Contributions to the project
		- Recipient of training on methods and tools on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (Output 3.2)

### **Indigenous Peoples**

The Ugandan population is made up of 65 different ethnic groups but there is neither an official definition of indigenous peoples, nor any criterion for their identification. Using the international criterion, the indigenous peoples in Uganda include the Batwa, Benet and Karamajong. The main ethnic groups of Karamoja consist of the Karamojong, which include three main ethnicities: the Dodoso (north), the Jie (central) and the Karimojong, which further include the Pokot (Kenyan border); Bokora, Matheniko and Pian (south). There are also smaller ethnic groupings: the Tepeth, Nyakwe, Ik, Ngipore and Ethur. Whereas all Karamojong in general are categorised as indigenous and marginalised, there are specific ethnic minority groups that are more marginalised and disadvantaged. These include the Ik who live on Mount Morungole in relative isolation after having been evicted from the fertile Kidepo Valley upon establishment of the Kidepo Valley National park in the 1960s. Others are the Tepeth or So and the Nyangeya to the North West. These minority tribes are essentially sedentary agriculturalists, with a liking for hunting and fruit-gathering as well as clay and iron working. The Ik were particularly vulnerable to raiding by neighbouring pastoral groups, and their insecurity has deterred them from accumulating even basic assets (such as oxen for ploughing) that might attract raiders. Mountainous areas of the Tepeth lack access to social services because of the terrain, which impedes service delivery. There are however other marginalised ethnic groups in Karamoja but with limited information on the ways of life and cultures. These include the Napore and the Nyagia. Despite the fact that Uganda has adopted a number of acts and policies that advance the position of women in society, the majority of the women remain marginalised. This includes indigenous women, who are marginalised both within the group of marginalised peoples and outside as members of that group. *Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, section 2.3.4 for additional information on vulnerable groups and indigenous peoples.*

**A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.** 1) *did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes /no )?* 2) *did the project incorporate a gender-responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes /no )?* and 3) *what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 60%, men 40%)?*

Karamoja has many gender specific issues that a project attempting to address food insecurity cannot avoid. Traditions such as child marriage reduce girls' access to education and therefore development and productive contribution to society. Tackling the practice is a challenge, because early marriage is a means of increasing family and community assets. A national survey found that 45 % of women in Karamoja compared to the national average of 19% had experienced sexual, physical or emotional violence. This violence is linked to alcoholism and changing gender roles, in particular men's alienation from the economic opportunities being taken up by women. Food insecurity and malnutrition is also linked to alcoholism and negative cultural beliefs. For instance, the practice of selling food to buy alcohol; or prioritizing food for men's consumption and ceremonies. According to the FSNA (UNICEF, 2014), female headed households are highly vulnerable as they are worse off on several measures compared to their male counterparts with; lower access to land, fewer households with at least one income earner, and poorer food consumption scores, among others. According to this assessment, approximately 16% of female household heads are either disabled or chronically ill and therefore vulnerable.

Although women and men play complementary roles in guaranteeing food security, women tend to play a greater role in natural resource management and ensuring nutrition. Women often grow, process, manage and market food and other natural resources, and are responsible for raising small livestock, managing home gardens and collecting fuel and water over long distances. Men, by contrast, are generally responsible for cash cropping and larger livestock. Women's involvement in an agricultural production is adversely affected by the impacts of climate change, particularly drought-induced crop and livestock failure. In this context, responsibility for adaptation is likely to fall on their shoulders – including finding alternative ways to feed their family. However, statutory and/or customary laws often restrict women's property and land rights and make it difficult for them to access credit and agricultural extension services, while also reducing their incentive to engage in environmentally sustainable farming practices and make long-term investments in land rehabilitation, seed multiplication technologies, cereal storage systems and soil quality. Therefore improving seed and food security in Karamoja, will require greater participation of women, in for example local seed technology development that is built on farmers' knowledge to increase yields through improved quality of the farmers' seed and diffusion of the improved practices and seeds. Because of the formal seed system constraints and to ensure sustainability for the target beneficiaries to participate in the strengthened value chains, focus will be given to the informal seed multiplication process. This will ensure that women farmer group members continue to produce and disseminate seeds on their own - selling some, reinvesting some for the next season, and training other interested farmers in quality production methods. In addition, the production expansion of the new, climate resilient, higher yielding seed will strengthen women's role in household food security and nutrition

District gender and food production profiles with analytical data on women's relative to men's needs in project implementation and coordination are not readily unavailable, yet they are necessary for planning and project design by district local governments and CSOs. District planners and NGO project officers with no gender-lens in their approach to food security and sustainable natural

resource management, often make project decisions that treat gender issues as simply cross-cutting or requiring unavailable resources. If gender concerns are not identified at project design, implementation and coordination usually puts the rights and privileges of women at risk.

Based on the gender analysis conducted during the project preparation phase, a set of gender-specific interventions have been devised, with dedicated consultation and participation mechanisms designed to empower women. An estimated 60% of the overall project budget is dedicated to activities that contribute specifically to the empowerment of women and the reduction of their unique vulnerabilities. The project includes a sex-disaggregated results framework. *Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, section 2.3.2 for additional detail on gender.*

#### A.5 Risk.

The following table describes the risks that might prevent the project objective from being achieved the proposed interventions and measures to mitigate them.

	Description	Date identified	Type	Probability & Impact (1–5)	Mitigation measures / Countermeasures	Owner
1	Current climate and seasonal variability and/or hazard events prevent implementation of planned activities.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Economic, Environmental	Economic loss or physical damage to project activities; the implementation timing of the project is delayed  P = 3  I = 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider current climatic variability during the implementation process.</li> <li>Focus on climate-resilient species and techniques to: i) assist plant growth particularly in the seedling/sapling phase; and ii) reduce risk of damage from hazard events.</li> <li>Take meteorological predictions and seasonal variability into account to reduce the risk of damage to plants.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
2	Karamoja sub-region's development priorities are undermined by national emergencies	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Social, environmental	Project activities are interrupted. Natural and financial capital is lost.  P = 3  I = 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project manager and coordination committee will keep abreast of national events and politics to plan contingency activities when/if necessary.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
3	Lack of funds after project may reduce sustainability of project outcomes	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Economic	Financial instability may undermine the efforts established during the project implementation, leading back to maladaptive practices (institutional and social) due to lack of funding.  P = 2  I = 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will pay particular attention to the key factors of success in the implementation of SLM and INRM as a strategy for adaptation in the rest of Uganda.</li> <li>The project will support the development of multi-stakeholder platforms to discuss project implementation exchange knowledge and lessons learned, assess the potential for replication, develop an up-scaling strategy, a mainstreaming strategy, and a financing strategy that will consider all possible future sources.</li> <li>The project will also work with district administrations to leverage an increase in budgetary allocations for NRM.</li> <li>The project will also explore alternative and innovative sources of financing, such as payment for ecosystem services.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF

4	Poverty and other social factors prevent local communities from adopting resilient livelihoods for the long-term, instead opting for maladaptive activities for short-term benefits	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Social, environmental	<p>If local communities do not fully get involved in the project due to social factors, they will perpetuate maladaptive practices that will result in a spiralling of the root causes underlying what the project seeks to address – i.e. unsustainable use of natural resources, which will then lead to further degradation of ecosystems. Consequently, the community will continue to be vulnerable.</p> <p>P = 2</p> <p>I = 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During project preparation, stakeholders have been engaged since the design to make sure they own the project and that the project implements “no-regrets” options.</li> <li>• The project will carry out information dissemination activities at the local level ensuring that communities are aware of the benefits of ecosystems and adaptation.</li> <li>• Inclusive interventions such as building participatory and community-based land use plans and the establishment of APFS/FFS will ensure that individuals have a role and stake in the project.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
5	Weak institutions and government capacity cause delays and logistical challenges to support project implementation	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Institutional	<p>Given that the institutional capacities are generally low and coordination between different government agencies is not optimal, this could impede the implementation of the project and reduce the number of activities that could be delivered.</p> <p>P = 4</p> <p>I = 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government officials have been engaged since the preparation stage to promote ownership of the project.</li> <li>• Government officials will coordinate the activities of all the partners and stakeholders ensuring that the civil service has a central role in the project’s success, maintaining their interest and accountability of the project.</li> <li>• The project will promote inter-ministerial collaboration so as to ensure cross-departmental accountability and cooperation.</li> <li>• Training and capacity building will also be provided, which will allow this project to provide learning incentives.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
6	Communities do not support interventions and do not adopt ecosystem management activities during or after the term of the proposed project because of limited immediate benefits of SLM/INRM	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Social, environmental	<p>Unsustainable use of natural resources continues, leading to further degradation of ecosystems. SLM and INRM techniques are not implemented in the long term. Consequently, the community continues to be vulnerable.</p> <p>P=1</p> <p>I=4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community stakeholders have been engaged since the PPG phase to strengthen their buy-in into the proposed project.</li> <li>• Actively involve local communities in project implementation.</li> <li>• Foster a bottom-up, grassroots approach throughout the project’s development and implementation phases.</li> <li>• Implement alternative livelihoods that have proved to be financially, technically and socially viable/feasible to reduce reliance on intensive land use.</li> <li>• Raise public awareness on the capacity of the restored ecosystems to increase community resilience to climate change.</li> <li>• Improve capacity building and training of the communities to improve their understanding of the adaptation benefits of the SLM and INRM activities.</li> <li>• Implement activities that have direct benefits to local communities which will be ensured through the APFS/FFS structure..</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF

7	Loss of government support may result in poor prioritisation of proposed project activities.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Institutional	Project activities are delayed.  P=1  I=3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage with the government to maintain its commitment to the proposed project.</li> <li>Integrate the objectives of national development policy in decision making throughout the project to maintain government commitment.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
8	Institutional capacity and relationships between line ministries are not sufficient to provide effective solutions to food security problems that are complex and multi-sectoral.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Institutional	Multi-sectoral adaptation interventions are compromised and interventions are confined to those sectors willing to engage in cross-sectoral dialogue. The vulnerability of certain sectors and Uganda as a whole is not fully addressed.  P=2  I=3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the development of institutional capacity and the enforcement or set up of cross-sectoral and cross-ministerial exchange platforms throughout the project implementation. This will ultimately lead to the development of an appropriate institutional framework for analysing food security dynamics, amending policy and implementing SLM and INRM interventions for climate change adaptation.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
9	Limited technical capacity to conduct preliminary studies and design the implementation of activities.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Technical	Preliminary studies do not take place resulting in delayed implementation of project activities.  Interventions are not designed appropriately.  P=2  I=2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and develop human resource capacity as required.</li> <li>Include funds in the project budget for preliminary studies to hire international consultants to complement the research team.</li> <li>Engage field officers to work closely with the project manager of the proposed project to ensure timely delivery of project outputs.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
10	Priority interventions implemented are not found to be cost-effective.	May 5 <sup>th</sup> 2016	Economic	Project interventions are not upscaled for large-scale SLM and INRM programmes  P=2  I=4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct baseline studies on cost-effectiveness and pilot each proposed alternative livelihoods in demonstration sites.</li> <li>Record detailed information on cost-effectiveness. Such information will be widely disseminated to allow future projects to use them</li> <li>Use cost-effectiveness as a core principle in the implementation of adaptation measures.</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF
11	Indigenous peoples targeted by the project activities or living outside direct project intervention areas block the project	May 2016	Social	Project interventions cannot go ahead or are unsustainable due to the lack of buy-in from indigenous peoples.  P = 2  I = 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities targeted by the project have been engaged in project design consultations and will keep being engaged and be duly consulted in PY1 before starting project operations, to ensure stakeholder engagement and sustainability through strong community ownership of the project.</li> <li>According to FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples<sup>10</sup> and the Environmental and Social Management Guidelines<sup>11</sup>, a Free, Prior and Informed Consent process should be conducted, and a</li> </ul>	UNDP FAO MAAIF

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1857e/i1857e00.htm>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4413e.pdf>

					Grievance Mechanism will be made available.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

## A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

### *Institutional arrangements*

UNDP and FAO will both act as GEF Implementing Agencies for the project. They will be jointly responsible for project results achievement and for ensuring the project's linkages to the overall GEF FSIAP program. UNDP will be responsible for implementation of Outcome 1 and Outcome 3 while FAO will be responsible for Outcome 2, except for the Small Grants Program, which will be managed by UNDP. Funds will flow from the GEF Trustee separately for each agency according to the established output-based budgets. Applicable GEF Fees will be attributed to each Agency according to the budget they will manage. The two agencies will develop protocols for regularly reviewing budgets and expenditures and, together with the Project Steering Committee, will agree on any budget adjustments to be made between outputs or components, should the need arise. Furthermore, each agency shall make available detailed expenditure reports through the MAAIF on a regular basis.

Both agencies will be jointly responsible for reporting to the GEF on finance and project results. This will include the submission of joint annual PIRs and collaboration on the day to day supervision and monitoring of project activities. UNDP will use the National Implementation Modality (NIM) for the component it manages, with MAAIF designated as Implementing Partner. MAAIF procurement procedures will be used in line with the findings of the latest HACT assessment (Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers). The FAO will use the Operational Partner Implementation Modality (OPIM) and the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) programme Management Unit (PMU) of MAAIF as Operational Partner. To the extent possible, national entities will be sub-contracted to conduct parts of the work. Arrangements such as LoAs, MOUs and sub-contracts can be pursued by either agency and the MAAIF based on agreed intervention strategies for specific activities. Agencies will, at the beginning of the project, and in discussions with MAAIF, specify direct project services they will provide and related costs and will ensure these are appropriately documented in project budgets and financial reports.

Both FAO and UNDP will be part of the project steering committee, which will be chaired by MAAIF under the supervision of the SLM team.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established and chaired by MAAIF. It will be comprised of representatives from the following:

- MAAIF (SLM Team),
- FAO,
- UNDP,
- MAAIF directorates (production, livestock, water, etc)
- Ministry of Water
- Ministry of Environment
- Office of Karamoja Affairs
- PMO-RALG
- Representatives of local governments
- Representatives of NGOs and CBOs
- Representatives from the private sector

The National Project Manager will be the Secretary to the PSC. The PSC will meet at least two times per year to ensure:

- Oversight and assurance of technical quality of outputs;
- Close linkages between the project and other ongoing projects and programmes relevant to the project;
- Timely availability and effectiveness of co-financing support;
- Sustainability of key project outcomes, including up-scaling and replication;
- Effective coordination of government partner work under this project; and
- Approval of the six-monthly Project Progress and Financial Reports, the Annual Work Plan and Budget.

The members of the PSC will each assure the role of a Focal Point for the project in their respective agencies. Hence the project will have a Focal Point in each concerned institution. As Focal Points in their agency, the concerned PSC members will (i)



technically oversee activities in their sector, (ii) ensure a fluid two-way exchange of information and knowledge between their agency and the project, (iii) facilitate coordination and links between the project activities and the work plan of their agency, and (iv) facilitate the provision of co-financing to the project.

A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be established within the MAAIF, and will be hosted in a MAAIF District office, preferably in Moroto to ensure proximity to all project sites. The PMU, whose personnel will be jointly recruited by MAAIF, FAO and UNDP, will include:

- a full time National Project Coordinator (NPC);
- a full time monitoring and evaluation expert;
- a full time operation and administration officer.

The ToRs of the PMU staff are provided in Annex 7 of the Project Document. PMU staff will be supported by national and international consultants who will be recruited during project implementation as needed. The list and ToRs of required consultants are presented in Annex 7 of the Project Document. *Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Section 3 for further details.*

### ***Linkages and coordination with other initiatives***

The proposed project will coordinate with existing projects in order to promote synergies when appropriate, support other interventions, share knowledge and resources when possible, avoid duplication and ensure value-added to the development sector in Karamoja. The potential initiatives that the project could coordinate with are listed below:

- 1. The Green Charcoal Project – Addressing Barriers to the Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach (US\$ 3.48 million – GEF MFA through UNDP; 2014 - 2018), UNDP ID 4493.
  2. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (4.5 million – GEF/LDCF; 2013 – 2017). UNDP ID 5093.
  3. The Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical (KCL) Landscape in North Eastern Uganda project (US\$ 13 million by UNDP, GEF, USAID and the Government of Uganda; 2013 – 2016) is being implemented by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in collaboration with the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), National Forestry Authority (NFA) and the six districts namely Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Otuke, Agago and Kitgum that surround Kidepo National Park.
  4. Strengthening Adaptive Capacity of Agro-Pastoral communities and the Local Government to Reduce Impacts of Climate Risk on Livelihoods in Karamoja, Uganda (US\$ 9 million, DFID resilience programme, implemented by FAO; 2013 – 2017).
  5. Strengthening Seed Delivery System for Dryland Cereals and Legumes in Drought-prone Areas of Uganda, implemented by the National Semi Arid Resources Research Institute - National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO) and The International Treaty on Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA).
  6. The current Sawlog Production Grant Scheme Phase III (SPGSIII) project aimed at encouraging private sector investment in commercial timber plantations through provision of grant and technical support is implemented by FAO on behalf of the Ministry of Water and Environment and funded by EU.
  7. The Uganda Climate-Smart Agriculture Program (2015-2025), is jointly implemented by the MAAIF and the MWE.

*Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, Section 1.3.5 for further detail.*

**A.7 Benefits.** *Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits?*

*The project intends to deliver the following socio-economic benefits:*

- A 25% reduction in the number of households suffering from moderate or severe hunger, among which 35% are female-headed households, by end of project.
- A 20% increase in productivity of maize, sorghum, cassava and sweet potato, vegetables and beans, in 1,800 hectares by end of project.
- A 15% increase in cattle and small stock productivity (milk/meat/eggs), by end of project.

These increases in agricultural productivity are also expected to have significant socio-economic co-benefits, including increased income, allowing for across the board improvements in living conditions, such as for example the construction of solid homes, acquisition of productive assets, such as bicycles and tools, or the ability to engage in education, especially for girls, and reduced disease burdens for children, women and the elderly. It is expected that increases in living standards will allow communities to continue to practice more sustainable land use practices. This will support the generation of environmental benefits in 450 ha of cropland, 180 ha of rangeland and 600 ha of forests per district, such as reduced land degradation, increased vegetative cover, increased biodiversity and carbon sequestration.

*For additional detail please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document.*

**A.8 Knowledge Management.** *Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder meetings, virtual networks, project twinnings) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experiences) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community practices, organise seminars, training and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.*

Knowledge management is integrated throughout the project approach, starting with the Farmer Field School approach, which allows farmers to access up to date knowledge and information on an as needed basis, in coordination with extension services. The project has also learned from past experiences in Uganda and Karamoja and intends to replicate best practices. The project will generate new knowledge and information through Component 3, in particular the use of the innovative resilience monitoring tools and approaches such as SHARP, RAPTA and Vital Signs, in order to provide avenues for upscaling to the rest of the country and to the broader region. Furthermore, the project will generate information products for dissemination through extension services, such as guidelines, tools and methods, and conduct participatory monitoring, which will ensure that local communities also have access to information in their local language, relevant to their context. It is expected that the multi-stakeholder forums created under Component 1 will play a key part in knowledge dissemination throughout the region. Finally, the project will be closely linked with the Regional Hub project under the IAP, which intends to provide shared technical services, joint trainings, site visits and discussion forums among project participants. Activities supported by the regional program will include:

- Data integration, including global monitoring of a set of key environmental indicators (land cover, land under sustainable management, conservation of genetic diversity, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions avoided, etc.)
- Supporting regional institutional frameworks: the establishment of a science-policy interface (SPI)
- Sharing information on best approaches: Support on the development of a greening of value chain approach, regional conferences, training at national and regional level, the development of scientific products and technical studies, study tours and visits, from which this project will benefit.

The project will also work with Ministry of Karamoja Affairs and other relevant ministries/stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Land and Ministry of Trade) to bring together platforms at the sub-regional level to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration on INRM (exchange and harmonization of approaches, joint awareness and capacity development events, including linkages with regional platforms such as the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub or the World Initiative Sustainable Pastoralism – WISP. Through the PCU, the project will also facilitate active participation of the project beneficiaries (government, local communities, CBOs) in the IFAD-led Regional Hub Project activities (e.g. exchange visits, workshop presentations) and will develop specific knowledge products on lessons emerging from the implementation of interventions at the local level (e.g. best practice pieces, policy briefs, tool-kits etc.) on topics relevant to the child project and the GEF IAP in general (e.g. greening of value chains, integration of sustainability and resilience into agricultural value chains, monitoring and assessment of resilience at local landscape levels, findings of studies/assessments conducted at household and local community levels etc.). Specific topics for research, analysis and knowledge will be identified during the initial phase of implementation and through/during interactions with the Regional Hub Project platforms.

## **B. Description of the consistency of the project with:**

### **B.1 Consistency with National Priorities.**

This project contributes to the achievement of the SDGs, in particular SDG 2 on the reduction of hunger, SDG 13 on climate change, SDG 15 on biodiversity, land degradation and deforestation, and their related targets, as follows:

- By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round

- By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons
- By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment
- By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality
- Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries
- By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements
- By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally
- By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world
- By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development
- Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species

The project also makes indirect contributions to other SDG targets, including conservation of agricultural biodiversity (seed banks - Component 2), improving water use efficiency and increasing access to water (Component 2), and Goal 5 on gender.

***Alignment with national development goals and policies*** This project is consistent with the development priorities for Uganda, as embodied in the 2nd National Development Plan (2015-2020), whose objective is to propel the country to middle income status by the middle of the century. For example, under NDP2, the government of Uganda has a target of reducing the number of the labour force in subsistence production from 6 million in 2012/13, majority of who are women, to 3 million in 2019/20. The NDP foresees investments in the four key pillars of agricultural production: i) increasing production and productivity through the promotion of ecologically sound and climate resilient agricultural practices; ii) addressing challenges in the selected thematic technical areas including critical farm inputs mechanization and Water for Agricultural Production; iii) improving agricultural markets and value addition, and iv) institutional strengthening for agricultural development.

The project is consistent with priorities enunciated under the Vision 2040 which outlines the goals and aspiration that Ugandans have set to achieve by the year 2040. The goals range from political, economic, social, environmental, and cultural among others. Concerning the agricultural goals as under chapter 4 (4.1.2), Uganda aspires to transform the agriculture sector from subsistence farming to commercial agriculture. The project is in line with key legislation and development priorities in Uganda, including the following:

- Uganda National Land Policy 2013
- The National Soils Policy for Uganda 1999
- The Land Act Cap 227
- The National Environment (Minimum Standards for Management of Soil quality) Regulations, 2000
- The National Agricultural Policy 2013
- The National Agricultural Research Policy 2003
- The National Agricultural Advisory Services Act, 2001
- The Seeds and Plant Act, 2006
- The Prohibition of Burning Grass Act, Cap 33
- Draft Rangeland Management and Pastoralism Policy 2014
- The Uganda Forestry Policy 2001
- The National Forestry and Tree Planting Act, 2003
- The National Water Policy, 1995
- The National Environment Management Policy (NEMP) 1994
- The National Policy for the Conservation and Management of Wetland Resources, 1995

Please refer to PIMS 5577 Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document, section 1.5.1 for further detail.

#### Alignment with NAPA, NAPs, NBSAP, NIPs, NAMA

This project is well aligned with the **National Adaptation Plan of Action** as it shares the following prioritized intervention strategies (p49) in the agriculture and water sectors, weather and climate information sectors and forestry sector. This project also contributes to the **National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP – 2002)** priorities through Outcome 1. The project is also consistent with the **National Action Plan developed under the UNCCD**, as it contributes to the NAP priorities.

Finally, this project is also aligned with the **Strategic Investment Framework for SLM (U-SIF SLM)**, which was developed through the GEF-funded **SIP - Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda**, aimed at strengthening sector cooperation in order to halt, reverse and prevent land degradation / desertification and mitigate the effects of climate change and variability. The U-SLM SIF focuses on: (i) Supporting on-the-ground activities for scaling up SLM; (ii) Strengthening the enabling institutional and policy environment for SLM; (iii) Strengthening commercial and advisory services for SLM and alternative livelihood options; and (iv) Supporting SLM research and dissemination of best-bet technologies provides a broad coverage of interventions to improve the needed technological base and capacity as well as institutional synergies to effectively deliver impact on SLM in an integrated and participatory approach by a wide array of stakeholders. The IAP project will contribute directly to the framework through activities aimed at training government staff and community members on SLM practices and implementing INRM and SLM practices under Outcome 2. Please refer to section 1.5.2 of the Joint Project Document for further detail.

#### Alignment with GEF Focal Area Strategies

This project will contribute to two GEF focal areas, namely land degradation and biodiversity: LD-1 –Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods: Program 1: Agro-ecological intensification. LD-3: Integrated landscapes: reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape - Program 4: Scaling-up sustainable land management through the landscape approach. LD-4: Maximizing transformational impact: Maintain land resources and agro-ecosystem services through mainstreaming at scale, Program 5: Mainstreaming SLM in development. BD-4 - Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors, Program 9: Managing the human-biodiversity interface. There are 2 outcomes within Program 9 that relate to this project. Please refer to section 1.5.3 of the Joint Project Document for further detail.

#### C: DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>12</sup> (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Inception Workshop</b>	UNDP Country Office	USD 6,063	USD5,000	Within two months of project document signature
<b>Inception Report</b>	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
<b>Standard UNDP/FAO monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP and joint ProDoc</b>	UNDP/FAO Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, six monthly, annually
<b>Monitoring of indicators in project results framework</b>	M&E officer Project Manager	None	None	Annually
<b>GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)</b>	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
<b>NIM/OPIM Audit as per UNDP/FAO audit policies</b>	UNDP Country Office FAO Country Office	Per year: USD 5,000 = \$25,000 \$3,000 for UNDP & \$2,000 FAO)		Annually or other frequency as per UNDP/FAO Audit policies

<sup>12</sup> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.


GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>12</sup> (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager	USD 80,000 (over 5 years)	USD10,000 per annum (Total USD50,000)	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP/FAO CO	None	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager UNDP/FAO Country Office BPPS as needed	None for time of project manager, and UNDP CO	None	
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP/FAO Country Office Project Manager	Per year = USD 1,000 (1,000 x 5) = \$5000	USD5000 per annum (Total USD25,000)	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office FAO Country Office	None <sup>13</sup>	USD25,000 per annum (Total USD125,000)	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team FAO GEF Team	None <sup>13</sup>	None	Troubleshooting as needed
Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 3	Project Manager	USD 300,000	USD 50,000 per annum (Total USD250,000)	On-going
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by (add name of national/regional institute if relevant)	Project Manager	NONE	USD10,000	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP/FAO Country Office and Project team and UNDP/FAO-GEF team	USD 35,000	USD5,000	Between 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR.
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by (add name of national/regional institute if relevant)	Project Manager	NONE	USD10,000	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP/FAO Country Office and Project team and UNDP/FAO-GEF team	USD 35,000 -	USD5,000	At least three months before operational closure
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		<b>USD 486,063</b>	<b>USD485,000</b>	

<sup>13</sup> The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>14</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/ yyyy)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		2 February 2017	Phemo K. Kgomotso - Regional Technical Specialist	+251-912-503309	<a href="mailto:phemo.kgomotso@undp.org">phemo.kgomotso@undp.org</a>
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management. FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy			Fritjof Boerstler Technical Officer, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division.	+39 06570 55398	<a href="mailto:Fritjof.Boerstler@fao.org">Fritjof.Boerstler@fao.org</a>
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division.				+3906 57055680	<a href="mailto:GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org">GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org</a>

<sup>14</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Uganda PIMS 5577 Food Security IAP

**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).

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
<p><b>Goal: to improve food security by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity and their root causes in Karamoja sub-region</b></p>	<p><b>Percentage of households suffering from hunger in Karamoja</b></p>	<p><b>92% of households suffer from moderate or severe hunger in Karamoja (preliminary results from HH-BAT, January 2016)</b></p>	<p><b>A 15% reduction in the number of households suffering from moderate or severe hunger, among which 35% are female-headed households, at mid-project.</b></p>	<p><b>A 25% reduction in the number of households suffering from moderate or severe hunger, among which 35% are female-headed households, by end of project.</b></p>	<p><b>Household Surveys/HH-BAT (FIES)</b></p>
<p><b>Objective: to contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region</b></p>	<p><b>Increase in intra and inter-seasonal livestock and crop productivity arising from SLM and INRM practices</b></p>	<p><b>At present, the only available data is the average district level yield. During the baseline study, the project will strive to collect household level data. Maize 1.2 Sorghum: 0.65 Beans: 0.35 Cassava: 8.0 Sweet Potato:8.0</b></p>	<p><b>A 20% increase in productivity of cereals, pulses and vegetables, in all seasons, in 900 hectares by mid-project.</b></p> <p><b>A 10% increase in cattle and small stock in all seasons productivity (milk/meat/eggs) by mid-project.</b></p>	<p><b>A 20% increase in productivity of maize, sorghum, cassava and sweet potato, vegetables and beans, in 1,800 hectares by end of project.</b></p> <p><b>A 15% increase in cattle and small stock productivity (milk/meat/eggs), by end of project.</b></p>	<p><b>HH-BAT (SLM)</b> - Food security and livelihood surveys - Seasonal crop production reports by District production Departments and MAAIF - Market surveys - Systematic data collection and analysis by FFS/APFS through links with ZARDI / University</p>

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
OUTCOME 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM	Number of supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support viable SLM/INRM approaches	While some enabling policies are adopted at the national level, their local implementation and application is weak. For example, the land policy is not fully implemented and customary rights are not formally recognized. The pastoral policy remains a draft at national level, and cattle corridors are not formally re-established.	Mechanisms for enhancing the application of SLM/INRM policies identified, by mid-project	At least 1 policy or 1 incentive in force to support viable SLM/INRM approaches and related food value-chains at landscape level in each selected site, by end of project	Progress report, Policy briefs
<i>Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels</i>	<i>Number of multi-stakeholder platforms established supporting INRM per district, within which a percentage of women, men, youth, and indigenous people are represented</i>	<i>At the moment, there are a few regional stakeholder platforms, such as the donor coordination group spearheaded by the Ministry of Karamoja Affairs, a few ad hoc local NGO coordinating groups, and some private sector associations. There is no single multi-stakeholder platform for the region and collaboration is unequal from site to site. There is no platform for coordination at district level that brings together all relevant stakeholders.</i>	<i>An analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities related to multi-stakeholder platforms at the district and regional levels is complete by mid-project.</i>	<i>At least 1 multi-stakeholder platform per district, supporting INRM, within which at least 30% are women, 30% are men, 20% are youth, and as appropriate 10% are indigenous people to represent communities, by end of project. One operational and comprehensive regional multi-stakeholder platform that includes meaningful participation by NGOs, private sector, CBOs, CSOs, government and development partners and that is linked to district level platforms, by end of project.</i>	<i>Meeting reports, outlining participating actors, institutions, NGOs, CBOs, private sector organization and meeting agenda</i>
1.1.1. Assessment of existing sectoral, interest-based and stakeholder-based platforms in Karamoja and needs assessment.					
1.1.2 Create/strengthen multi-stakeholder platforms at the local (district) level with CBOs, NGOs and private sector and government, working through extension services and focused on value chain development, SLM and INRM.					
1.1.3 Work with Ministry of Karamoja Affairs and other relevant ministries/stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Land and Ministry of Trade) to bring together platforms at the regional level to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration on INRM (exchange and harmonization of approaches, joint awareness and capacity development events, including linkages with regional platforms such as the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub or the World Initiative Sustainable Pastoralism – WISP)					



COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
1.1.4 Facilitate the integration of the priorities expressed by local multi-stakeholder platforms into district planning and budgeting and to increase budget lines for SLM and INRM in line with the various national action plans for food security, SLM strategic investment plan, for climate resilience and preventing land degradation and biodiversity loss.					
1.1.5. Produce and disseminate a wide range of awareness raising materials on the project, SLM and INRM (pictorial, in local languages for print, radio, dramas etc.) as well as relevant case studies.					
<i>Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place</i>	<i>Number of legal instruments, policies, by-laws applied in Karamoja sub-region enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement</i>	0	<i>A thorough assessment of legal gaps and needs for each district is completed by mid-project.</i>	<i>At least one INRM-enabling legal instrument, policy or by-law under implementation in each district by end of project.</i>	<i>Reports on best practices , Policy briefs, legal documents, council documents</i>
1.2.1 Facilitate the review / amendment / drafting of by-laws & ordinances to ensure the integration of INRM and diversified production systems on the basis of a legal framework assessment for each district and training of local council personnel, and work with MoJ to support LGs in securing final approval and gazetting legal instruments.					
1.2.2 Support local councils, including all relevant departments, through multi-stakeholder platforms in the review or establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM / SLM and land use conflict prevention/reduction, linked to the national and district level physical development plans, and inclusive of cattle corridors, conservation and migration routes/cattle corridors.					
1.2.3 Train local councils, NGOs and CBOs on the application of appropriate guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests for resolving land tenure issues, within the framework of the established Land Act, Land and Land Use Policies and regulations, and provide support for the formalization of customary collective rights to support collaborative rangeland management.					
1.2.4 Facilitate the formalization of land ownership rights particularly for women, elderly and the youth					
OUTCOME 2: Increased land area under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape	Number of hectares of cropland/rangeland/forest under integrated natural resources management and SLM per district	0	225 ha of cropland, 90 ha of rangeland and 300 ha of forests per district are under INRM / SLM systems, by mid-	450 ha of cropland, 180 ha of rangeland and 600 ha of forests per district are under INRM / SLM systems, by end of project (4,920 ha in total)	Annual technical reports, Visual observations, Annual reports on production numbers per district or per

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
	Increase in crop yields by farmer records; Increase in water availability through biophysical monitoring		project (2,460 ha in total)		landscape, Annual APFS/FFS reports
<i>Output 2.1: Institutional technical capacities are strengthened to implement INRM/SLM</i>	<i>Number of people trained on INRM, 60 %of which are women</i>	0	<i>At least 25 people per district, trained on INRM, among which half are women, by mid-project</i>	N/A	<i>List of participants to training (by gender), Training reports, training manuals</i>
2.1.1. Train district technical staff / extension staff and volunteer community members in participatory SLM and INRM approaches including pastoral/rangeland management, catchment /watershed management, agro-ecological approaches, climate smart agriculture and the APFS/FFS methodology and energy savings approaches					
2.1.2 Provide training for decentralized MAAIF, DLG and APFS trainers on agro-meteorological information dissemination (with MAAIF and UMA)					
2.1.3 Integrate Karamoja Drought Early Warning System into the national EWS through the dissemination of agro-met info and advisories to local government and to the general public through radio and other fora such as local elders forums, etc..					
<i>Output 2.2: Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques</i>	<i>Number of community members trained in INRM and SLM practices, 60% of which are women</i>	0	6,000 community members trained in INRM/SLM (soil, water, biodiversity) by mid-project, among which half are women	12,000 community members trained in integrated natural resources management and SLM, among which half are women by end of project	<i>Visual observations, yield data, Annual reports on production numbers per district or per landscape, HH-BAT</i>
2.2.1. Build capacity of men, women, youth, elders and newly sedentary former pastoralists on integrated crop-livestock farming and horticulture / catchment and territorial management / SLM technologies conservation agriculture / and climate smart agriculture (CSA) through the establishment of and technical support to new and existing APFS and FFS (including field demonstration and other training events).					
2.2.1b Build capacity of implementing partners, service providers and farmers on relevant approaches for SLM/INRM					

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
2.2.2 Demonstrate the benefits of pasture improvement for rangeland rehabilitation and sustainable management (linked to 1.2.3), using resilient species of grass/shrubs, including the demonstration of holistic grazing management.					
2.2.3 Establish temporary enclosure areas for farmer assisted natural regeneration of vegetation in line with a land use plan agreed in Outcome 1 (1.2.2).					
2.2.4 Undertake reforestation and rehabilitation in hotspots identified in community land use plans (1.2.2.) (e.g. riverine areas, watering points, steep slopes, gullies) with a focus on increasing biodiversity, productivity and climate resilience using beneficial indigenous tree species such as Acacia gum, tamarind, shea nut and palatable grasses and shrubs.					
2.2.5. Implement rainwater harvesting techniques for enhanced productivity and resilience to drought in fields (e.g. tied ridges, retention ditches, zai, half-moons, stone lines) and sand dams (where feasible) for crop, livestock and household use (e.g. roof where feasible or below ground collection tanks).					
<i>Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project</i>	<i>Number of people participating in alternative livelihoods schemes addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape, 60% of which are women</i>  <i>Increase in household incomes measured by household surveys</i>	0	<i>At least 1000 community members, of which at least 60% are women, participate in alternative livelihoods schemes and small grant projects addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape by mid-term</i>	<i>At least 2500 community members, of which at least 60% are women, participate in alternative livelihoods schemes and small grant projects addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape by end of project</i>	<i>Annual reports on production numbers for each value chain, per district, HHBAT, producer surveys</i>
2.3.1 In cooperation with Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI), organize youth and women in producer groups or in VSLAs, to develop seed multiplication skills and cereal banking systems among crop farmers to improve supplies of local seed varieties, especially those with drought coping mechanisms and / or a high % recovery post-drought.					
2.3.2 Work through existing or new APFS/FFS to disseminate improved crop/livestock production techniques (linked to 2.2.1) for increased household income, including through linkages with the private sector and provision of technical and physical capacity for value addition in traditional and innovative value chains.					
2.3.3. Perform viability and feasibility assessments for preselected value chains, including detailed economic and market studies					
2.3.4 Develop resilient value chains for increased income:					
2.3.4a Explore the potential for sustainable charcoal production working with the NFA and Ministry of Energy, youth and women groups, to promote the introduction of retort kilns and improved cookstoves for energy savings and establish dedicated woodlots for wood fuel at household and manyatta level to produce charcoal more efficiently (with GHG mitigation benefits) under a value-chain approach, and to explore other sources of energy.					

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
2.3.4b Work with local NGOs and small industries to develop practical skills and encourage youth and women to set-up businesses that make better use of grassland such as fodder harvesting, storage and sale under a value-chain approach; basket making, thatching, seed multiplication (link to 2.3.3) of fodder crops etc					
2.3.4c Work with local NGOs to train farmer groups in processing and transforming indigenous plants which have food security and global ecological importance (Local, National and International benefits)E.g: Aloes, Tamarind, Acacia Spices, Amarula, among others					
2.3.4d Work with local NGOs to organize farmers in beekeeping production groups and provide support based on a cost sharing arrangement (equipment and storage facility) and training in bee-keeping, also processing of honey and related products (learn from APFS networks in Amudat District and the Tepeth Community in Moroto District)					
2.3.4e Organize women and youth in producer groups to establish piggeries and small stock rearing facilities (chickens for egg production, goats, ducks) in communities and in landscapes where it is appropriate					
2.3.5 Conduct FPIC assessment and consultation					
<i>Output 2.4 Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, sustainable land management, innovate alternative livelihood options, are implemented</i>	<i>Number of Civil Society practising SLM / INRM issues in Karamoja through the Small Grants Program</i>	0	25% of grant amount disbursed by mid-term, of which at least 50% is allocated to women and youth groups	100% of grant amount disbursed by end of project, at least 50% of which is disbursed to women and youth groups.	project reports, SGP reports
2.4.1 Deliver small grant projects focusing on a set of agreed themes including: restoration of ecosystem services, forest cover and biodiversity, water harvesting and conservation, implementation of erosion control techniques, innovative sustainable livelihoods and livelihoods approaches, post-harvest management, business skills development, with particular attention to gender-based strategies					
OUTCOME 3. Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs	Level of resilience as measured by the SHARP, HH BAT, Vital Signs and RAPTA tools:  - Increased levels of agro-ecological and social resilience by end of project - Reduced perception of risk and vulnerability by end of project - Reduced levels of food insecurity	There is little available data on resilience and no data on GEBs, including biodiversity	Low level of available data on resilience and GEBs by mid-project	At least, medium level of available data on resilience and GEBs by the end of the project	Annual technical reports and specific survey results

COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output	INDICATOR	BASELINE	Mid-term target	End Term TARGET	Means of Verification
<i>Output 3.1: Assessment and Monitoring of GEBs from project interventions</i>	<i>Number of monitoring and assessment exercises conducted during the project, within multi-stakeholder platform</i>	<i>There are no monitoring and assessment exercises</i>	<i>Two M&amp;E exercises by mid-project (baseline, MTR)</i>	<i>Three statistically representative M&amp;E exercises conducted and changes analysed (baseline, mid-term and end of project assessment and monitoring) over the duration of the project per selected landscape, by end of project</i>	<i>Maps, technical reports</i>
3.1.1. Select assessment methodology and tools and conduct baseline survey for selected sites including household survey and local landscape diagnostics (Land degradation types, severity and causes, effectiveness of SLM measures and impacts on ecosystems and livelihoods)					
3.1.2. Provide training to PCU and project beneficiaries in methods and tools for rigorous Monitoring and evaluation of project indicators and participatory monitoring					
3.1.3 Regular assessment of agro-biodiversity at the district level including varieties/breeds, species and habitat diversity and associated functions (e.g. pollination, pest and disease control) and impacts in terms of resilience					
3.1.4 Train technical and extension staff (GO and NGOs) in the use of selected methodology and tools to perform assessments of local land resources (LD and SLM) and livelihoods diagnostics and to assess and document INRM best practices					
<i>Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales</i>	<i>Number of workshops held at regional level on monitoring resilience within multi-stakeholder platforms (created in Component 1)</i>	0	<i>2 workshops by mid-term on monitoring resilience and building capacity for M&amp;E, within the multi-stakeholder platforms, to which 50% of participants are women</i>	<i>At least 1 workshop held per year on monitoring resilience and building capacity for M&amp;E, within the multi-stakeholder platform, among which 50% of participants are women</i>	<i>List of participants of workshops</i>
3.2.1. Within multi-stakeholder platforms created at the district level in Component 1, conduct participatory M&A using the selected methodology and tools and hold annual workshops to learn from M&A and disseminate the use of appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience					
3.2.2. In partnership with relevant projects and partners in the region, exchange on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (ecosystem services, food and livelihood security, climate resilience) and train local NGOs and private sector actors (data collection and analysis of costs, benefits and impacts towards SDG targets)					

<b>COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output</b>	<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>BASELINE</b>	<b>Mid-term target</b>	<b>End Term TARGET</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>
<i>Output 3.3. Project is linked to Regional Hub program for knowledge generation, exchange and dissemination</i>	<i>Number of knowledge products produced and shared at Regional Hub platform</i>	<i>N-A</i>	<i>At least 2 thematic knowledge products developed and shared at a regional meeting of the FSIAP programme countries and other platforms</i>	<i>Atleast 5 thematic knowledge products developed and shared at the regional meeting of the FSIAP programme countries and other platforms</i>	<i>Thematic knowledge products, MTR and final evaluation</i>
3.3.1. Participation in regional program activities including study tours, research, knowledge sharing					



**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).

<b>GEF Review</b>	<b>Response</b>
STAP Review comment	
<p>3b. How will local knowledge and scientific knowledge be combined so they are mutually reinforcing in describing, monitoring, and assessing land degradation and environmental changes (e.g. climate risks) in ways that are pertinent to a diversity of stakeholders?</p>	<p>This will be done through the combined use of the multi-stakeholder platforms, which will design and implement a participatory monitoring process, as well as through the FFS, where local knowledge and scientific evidence will be jointly applied at farm level.</p> <p>As discussed under section 2.5 (Capacity Building) in the Joint IAP Prodoc, training to develop capacity for monitoring will also target pastoralists, traditional crop farmers, ‘new’ crop farmers and recently settled pastoralists, landless youth and disarmed groups and other community members and topics for training will include the use of indigenous knowledge for livestock management, management/ conservation and utilisation of crops, medicinal plants, fruits, vegetables, cropping methods, post-harvest storage and seed management, and soil fertility management, among others. This knowledge will be combined with ‘new’ scientific knowledge to inform climate-smart, cost-effective and locally-acceptable methods and approaches to ensure improve sustainability and resilience of production systems and practices.</p>
<p>3c. What are the factors that are likely to influence the adoption of a technology (e.g. conservation agriculture, agro-biodiversity, integrated management of mixed crop and livestock systems) across a wide spatial area? Some factors to consider include labor, cost of introducing or maintaining the technology, local and cultural factors.</p>	<p>The project designers considered carefully the different factors influencing the adoption of a technology. In particular, cultural issues appeared as foremost in Karamoja and a careful analysis was conducted as part of the PPG. The second factor of significant influence is the cost of initial investment, whether labour, capital, land or productive assets. For this reason the project has integrated a process where communities will be consulted again prior to commencing field work, using anthropological studies and experts, to inform the selection of technologies, approaches and diversification options.</p> <p>As discussed under section 1.3.1 – Project Strategy, the project will, mainly utilize the Agro-Pastoral and Farmer Field School (FFS) approach to provide capacity building and support smallholder and rural communities in the adoption of resilient agricultural technologies and livelihoods practices. The FFS approach is particularly valuable for integrating the learning about various topics in a local agro-ecosystem specific context, and for mobilising</p>



	<p>farmers and pastoralists in the dissemination of new technologies and practices across the FFS groups and networks. APFS are flexible in that they can respond to local demands or problems as they are identified. They are based on an “experiential learning cycle”. The experimental, learning-by-doing approach facilitates the adaptation of the technologies to local agro ecological contexts, including climate risks and production practices and the adoption by farmers in the wider area.</p>
<p>4b. Drawing from the application of Resilience, Adaptation, Transformation and Assessment, how can resilience assessments can be strengthened in the GEF.</p>	<p>This project used the HH BAT tool developed by FAO to carry out a preliminary baseline resilience assessment. There is need to do more on monitoring and measuring resilience during implementation – including looking at how other tools such as RAPTA, Resilience Atlas, Vital signs and others can work complement each other. Outcome 3 of the project will explore several approaches and methods for assessing resilience at household, landscape and production system level.</p>
<p>7a. identify monitoring and evaluation methods to measure the scaling-up impact and process <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b.determine the cost-effectiveness of scaling-up <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c. detail how partnerships, mechanisms for policy dialogue and uptake, and effective communication between multi-stakeholders will be developed<input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d. define how cross-sectoral learning will be encouraged and achieved</p>	<p>The nature of the project is that it will build on previously proven models. It will use a multi-stakeholder platform approach, the APFS and FFS approaches to identify, test, demonstrate and promote adoption of locally-acceptable, cost-effective and relevant INRM and SLM practices in agro-pastoral landscapes as outlined under outcomes 1 and 2. Through outcome 3, the frameworks will be put in place to facilitate multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience and sustainability into production landscapes. As noted in the response to comment 4 above, the appropriate methods to monitor, assess and evaluate will be explored during implementation to build on the assessments carried out during the PPG stage to ensure comprehensive understanding of what resilience means for the different land-user groups (e.g. female-headed household, males, youth), production systems (e.g. agro-pastoral, crop) and ecosystems/landscapes and how to enhance the resilience of these systems in Karamoja, and what the policy and legal implications of these processes are at the local, regional and national levels.</p> <p>Mechanisms have been put in place to further upscale project results. These include the establishment of multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral platforms in all districts and across districts to enhance policy discussion and uptake of promising results; and the integration of this project under the SLM task force (which is cross-sectoral) at national level will allow for national-scale upscaling. It is expected that the mechanisms</p>

	identified at national level for scaling up will be analysed for their cost effectiveness.
8. Under risks, STAP suggests adding the challenges of scaling up technologies and practices, and how the project intends to reduce this risk	<p>This has been addressed, and included as risk no. 10. As noted in the Risk table, the project proposes the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct baseline studies on cost-effectiveness and pilot each proposed alternative approach in demonstration sites.</li> <li>• Record detailed information on cost-effectiveness. Such information will be widely disseminated to allow future projects to use them</li> <li>• Use cost-effectiveness as a core principle in the implementation of adaptation measures.</li> </ul>

### Response to Council comments

From	Comment	UNDP/FAO Response
Germany	Land tenure issues are mentioned as major barriers for Integrated Natural Resources Management (INRM) in certain contexts but the programme does not address these. It is recommended to support ongoing land policy reform processes where possible, particularly through capacity development of local level institutions.	Agreed. Land tenure issues formed part of the analysis of the project's baseline situation and proposed activities were further tested in light of current tenure realities. As a result, it was agreed that Component 1 and 2 would support the process of formalization of customary rights of tenure, in particular collective rights exercised by pastoral and agro-pastoral beneficiaries of this project. To this end the project will work with local governments and communities under the aegis of the newly revised Land policy. Policy level intervention was being supported under other projects and therefore not included in this proposal.
	Technical innovation needs to be fully adapted to physical and socio-economic conditions at target group level (critical example: Biogas in regions with extreme lack of biomass). Piloting exercises should as far as possible be redesigned in favour of broad application of simple technologies. Particular emphasis needs to be given to up-scaling of organic fertilization technologies and management of biomass.	Agreed. It is for this reason that the project has proposed a two-step process to selecting technological innovations that will include a full feasibility assessment (incl. anthropological and cultural factors, economic viability and technical aspects) as well as a participatory process for selection of any diversification ventures. The Farmer Field School approach central to the project will also enable for more adaptability among beneficiary groups. Finally, all technologies promoted are based on sound ecological practices, in particular conservation agriculture, organic fertilization and pest management.
	Rain fed agriculture and upland parts of the landscapes need not to be neglected. Both, livelihood perspective and value chain approach can therefore be considered within the landscape framework.	Agreed. Although there are no uplands in the project zone, all livelihoods zones were represented in the site selection process. The value-chain approach is an integral part of the project and will be promoted not only for livestock and crop production systems, but also through the introduction of alternative income-

		generating activities, such as beekeeping with honey and wax making or Aloe vera processing of soap, ensuring smallholder farmers a predictable all-season income.
	Since the non-sustainable provision of wood energy is one important element of forest and landscape degradation and since wood energy plays a key role for food security, Germany suggests addressing this theme within strategies for food security. Existing good practices for sustainable wood energy production can be up-scaled within the project component “scaling up integrated approaches for sustainability and resilience”	Agreed. This aspect has been thoroughly analysed and considered and the project has included specific activities designed to address this issue. This will include developing more flexible and adapted legal frameworks at local levels, promoting collaborative forest and rangeland management, increasing awareness of the potential economic value of trees and forests, as well as building capacity of producer groups to sustainably produce charcoal while increasing protected forest areas.
	Strengthening evidence of the benefits of investment into SLM is a priority issue for monitoring and research and a key motivation for investing in SLM. This is the special focus of the Economics of Land Degradation Initiative ( <a href="http://eld-initiative.org/">http://eld-initiative.org/</a> ) which is preparing also a regional approach in Sub-Saharan Africa. Links and synergies could be established	Agreed. Component 3, will generate data on the economic value of SLM and related practices. Some of the project’s indicators will allow for tracking of economic benefits of SLM as well. It is expected that linkages with the ELD project will be established at the regional level through the Regional Hub Project.
	The monitoring system which will be established within the programme could be aligned with / made applicable for national monitoring systems, in order to establish / support long term monitoring of food security progress and resilience.	Agreed. The project intends to link to the national early warning system as well as national level monitoring frameworks, under the supervision of the SLM Task Force. Under Component 3, the Task Force – along with project stakeholders – will consider the adoption of one or more methodologies for measuring resilience, which would be adaptable to the rest of the country.
USA	There is a wide scope of activities centering on intensified agriculture, but no specificity on a framework for how these activities will proceed without impacting forest and key biodiversity areas that will be opened or face pressure from expanded agriculture. With new financing and access to markets, new lands will be opened on the periphery of high-density rural areas as populations take part in training and gain market access. Expanded agricultural production could have the unintended result of rapidly increased deforestation absent more carefully defined strategies to avert it.	This project will not lead to intensified agriculture, but it will lead to an expansion (or re-opening) of land under cultivation, lands that had previously been abandoned due to conflict and degradation. However, this will be carefully balanced with measures to increase productivity per hectare, as well as measures to protect and conserve biodiversity and fragile systems.

	<p>An equally significant concern arises from the goal of creating multi-stakeholder frameworks at the national and local levels. While a necessary and laudable goal, it is also an extremely <b>elusive</b> one given the reality of current patterns of lands occupation and stakeholder access to resources such as credit, training and extension services across most countries of sub-Saharan Africa. We recommend that, prior to implementation of this IAP, the agencies and participating countries better define the process for creating viable and inclusive multi-stakeholder groups at national and local jurisdictions, with specific attention to including traditionally marginalized groups such as rural smallholder agriculturalists and shifting subsistence farmers who are most in need of extension services, training and improved livelihood strategies. Without this level of inclusiveness, the effectiveness of the large number of proposed activities will certainly be compromised.</p>	<p>Agreed. Project preparation consultations provided a working concrete definition of what the multi-stakeholder platforms would be or would aim to achieve. The focus will be on local platforms, where the need is more pressing, whereas the project will build on existing platforms at sub-regional level. Marginalized groups will be included in all such platforms, as well as public and private sector actors.</p>
--	--	---

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>15</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: \$200,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
<p>Project scope and strategy defined, and GEF full proposal documentation prepared and approved. The following PPG Activities have been completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Baseline data collection and information gap analysis;</li> <li>b. Pre-feasibility studies on upscaling of technologies for climate smart agro-production and food security management ;</li> </ul>	200,000	13,083.25	186,917

<sup>15</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to 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. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

c. Stakeholder consultation and engagement; d. Preparation of the ProDoc.			
<b>Total</b>	200,000	13,083.25	186,917

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

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

N-A

## **ANNEX E: GHG assessment using EX-ACT (detail results, input data and assumptions)**

### **Detailed results:**

The project activities will avoid 20,178 tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions, or 1,345 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq per year and create 480,508 tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq of carbon sink or 30,689 tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered per year.

Total tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered over the 15 years (5 years for implementation + 10 year capitalization phase): 480,508

Tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered per hectare over the 15 years: 98

Tons CO<sub>2</sub>eq sequestered per hectare per year: 6.5

See Table 1 for detailed assessment results.

**Table 1: Results from EX-ACT simulation according to LDFS's activities**

Project Name	<i>Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja sub region</i>		Climate	<i>Tropical (Dry)</i>		Duration of the Project (Years)		15			
Continent	<i>Africa</i>		Dominant Regional Soil Type	<i>HAC Soils</i>		Total area (ha)		4920			
Components of the project	Gross fluxes			Share per GHG of the Balance					Result per year		
	Without	With	Balance	All GHG in tCO2eq			N2O	CH4	Without	With	Balance
	All GHG in tCO2eq			CO2							
	Positive = source / negative = sink			Biomass	Soil	Other					
<b>Land use changes</b>											
Deforestation	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
Afforestation	0	-356,915	-356,915	-216,885	-140,030		0	0	0	-23,794	-23,794
Other LUC	0	-14,905	-14,905	7,040	-21,945		0	0	0	-994	-994
<b>Agriculture</b>											
Annual	3,417	-21,974	-25,391	0	-23,100		-116	-2,175	228	-1,465	-1,693
Perennial	0	-49,995	-49,995	-47,520	-2,475		0	0	0	-3,333	-3,333
Rice	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
<b>Grassland &amp; Livestocks</b>											
Grassland	16,761	-16,540	-33,302	0	-32,842		-239	-220	1,117	-1,103	-2,220
Livestocks	0	0	0				0	0	0	0	0
<b>Degradation &amp; Management</b>											
Coastal wetlands	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inputs &amp; Investments</b>											
Fishery & Aquaculture	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	20,178	-460,329	<b>-480,508</b>	-257,365	-220,392	0	-355	-2,395	1,345	-30,689	-32,034
<b>Per hectare</b>	4	-94	<b>-98</b>	-52.3	-44.8	0.0	-0.1	-0.5			
<b>Per hectare per year</b>	0.3	-6.2	<b>-6.5</b>	-3.5	-3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-6.2	-6.5

**Input data and assumptions:**

<b>Karamoja: 4 districts</b>	<b>Hectares</b>
<b>Croplands</b>	<b>1800</b>
Sorghum	900
Maize	900
<b>Sorghum</b>	
Traditional sorghum cultivation	900
Improved sorghum	600
Perennial tree/crop (Agroforestry)	300
<b>Maize</b>	
Traditional maize cultivation	900
Improved maize	600
Perennial tree/crop (Agroforestry)	300
<b>Rangelands</b>	<b>720</b>
Traditional rangeland management to improved without inputs	360
Traditional rangeland management to improved with inputs	360
<b>Forest</b>	<b>2400</b>
Reforestation from degraded land	2400
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,920</b>