



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

GEF ID:	<b>9137</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uganda</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Food-IAP: Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja Sub Region</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP and FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5577 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$200,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,139,450</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$58,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$65,339,450</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Fareeha Iqbal</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Alice Ruhweza</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	FI, 7/26/2016: This is a child project under the Food Security IAP, for which there was no PIF stage required. The wording of Components, Outcomes and Outputs are in line with the program framework.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	FI, 7/26/2016: No. Despite the detailed narrative on socio-economic and biophysical challenges underpinning food insecurity, the project structure / design falls short of demonstrating actual transformational change in the Karamoja region. Please provide a clear quantitative assessment of the target area (4 districts) relative to the 27,200 km <sup>2</sup> total land area and 1 million population. How will the GEF alternative influence shift toward sustainability and resilience for food security, with measureable GEBs? Explanation or further information is requested on the points below:  A) Gender has been well-addressed; there is evidence that the social/gender analysis has informed the theory of change and key principles of the project, which has	Dec. 15, 2016: The total area being targeted by the project is 15,723 s.km. This represents 64% of the Karamoja sub-region, which is where food security issues are most prevalent. It represents 7% of the total country. The number of people in those 4 districts is 609,000, representing 63% of the Karamojong, and 1% of the national population. The aim of this project is to achieve transformational effect in Karamoja where it is urgently needed, rather than the whole country. The GEF alternative is expected to influence a policy shift for the Karamoja sub-region by promoting an integrated approach which is not currently being used, resulting in partial results and a precarious situation in terms of food security and environmental degradation. (The expected transformative effect and theory of change is detailed in section 1.3.3 (Incremental cost reasoning) of the Joint Prodoc (page 68-74), and section A.1. 4) (Additional Incremental Cost Reasoning and expected contributions from the

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>translated into a set of well-targeted activities for women and youth. However, Agency is requested to address the sub-questions of section A.4 of the CEO Endorsement: 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 X%, men X%)?</p> <p>B) Please bear in mind that although livelihood diversification is a good way to reduce household vulnerability, many of the livelihood diversification options selected may be vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change themselves (e.g., beekeeping, poultry/livestock rearing, business in farm products). We recommend research and care in selecting appropriate options.</p> <p>- Please provide further detail on how resilience will be monitored (including proxy measures) over the project lifetime. The Results Matrix shows that change in "level of data" on resilience will be monitored (which does not equate to "level of</p>	<p>baseline, GEF TF and cofinancing) of the CEO ER (Table 2 -Incremental Cost Reasoning) on page 12-13.)</p> <p>A) The project did indeed conduct a gender analysis and assessment, as well as gender differentiated SHARP assessment. The report is included under Appendix 8 (SHARP Resilience Assessment Results). The results framework is gender-disaggregated and the number of female beneficiaries (average 60%), along with the proportion of budget dedicated to gender activities (58%), was also calculated.</p> <p>B) This is noted, and we agree that some of the proposed options for diversification may remain vulnerable to climate variability and change. However, prior to selecting options, a more thorough analysis of their effectiveness, profitability and adaptability to the specific conditions, including climate. This activity is included under Output 2.3. Furthermore, analysis of available economic development pathways revealed a lack of options that are not dependent on natural resources or climate-sensitive ecosystems, owing to the very low institutional and private sector development, and years of conflict. Diversification within the natural resource based economic sectors remained the most viable alternative. The indicator for Outcome 3 has been changed to read as: Level of resilience as measured by the SHARP, HH BAT, Vital Signs</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>resilience").</p> <p>- Please discuss how measurements from the household rain gauges will be used. How will they be compiled, and with what frequency and format (including, after project completion)? Will this data contribute to official meteorological records?</p> <p>C) Address inconsistencies with respect to GEBs: Please clarify how reversing land degradation on 6,000 hectares is linked to improvement in production for food security. Given the reference to significance of Karamoja for biodiversity conservation, please clarify how mainstreaming through "integrated watershed management" will be achieved, including in planning processes and/or on-the-ground actions. What specific biodiversity conservation mainstreaming measures will take place? What data sources will be incorporated into planning processes to monitor this? How will this be done? And, how will this be ensured beyond the life of the project? In the case of on-the-ground activities, how and why were the areas selected? What types of activities will be undertaken and what will be their benefit for biodiversity?</p>	<p>and RAPTA tools and the project will target the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ï, Increased levels of agro-ecological and social resilience by end of project</li> <li>ï, Reduced perception of risk and vulnerability by end of project</li> <li>ï, Reduced levels of food insecurity</li> </ul> <p>In terms of measuring resilience, the project theory of change states that resilience in the region can be defined as avoiding shocks in the food security sector. Therefore, achieving resilience will in this project entail ensuring adequate food security and income at all times, including during times of drought. The project will monitor this using the methodologies proposed under Component 3, which all provide a framework for measuring resilience, including the SHARP and HHBAT assessment tools, RAPTA as well as the Vital Signs resilience framework. The proposal is for APFSs / FFSs (perhaps at household level, or in school grounds), to make their own simple rain gauges (using for example a plastic bottle, ideally with a funnel to reduce evaporation) and set it up away from huts / trees etc. - and make measurements as and when rain falls (thus not daily) using a school ruler or marks on the side of the bottle. This was not intended to be a formal system, but rather to help land users understand changing weather also make links between that and changes in livestock / crop productivity. It could (should)</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>D) Please discuss more clearly how the proposed project will deliver additional sustainability and resilience benefits over baseline initiatives, particularly relative to planned KALIP2 activities and RPLRP. It would be useful to have a clearer idea of (i) the gaps that the current project will address, and (ii) how the proposed project will connect and scale up the baseline actions.</p> <p>FI, 12/30/2016: Yes, the Agency has explained that the project seeks to achieve transformative change in the Karamoja sub-region, where it is urgently needed. IAP funding will be used to create or strengthen development planning and multi-stakeholder platforms and apply integrated watershed management approaches to sustainably boost productivity while identifying a combination of monitoring and assessment frameworks and linking the emerging knowledge to the IAP hub project.</p> <p>A) Yes, questions on gender issues have been adequately addressed. A</p>	<p>be linked by APFS facilitators to discussions on climate change and fits very well with the APFS / FFS approach of "learning by doing". APFS will be encouraged and trained to record the rain gauge data, but not necessarily on a formal basis, but rather for learning purposes. As noted in the ProDoc: "there is only a single weather station in the sub-region (Kotido)" "according to the HH-BAT results, only 59% of the respondents had access to weather forecasts in February 2016" "current weather forecasts from the Meteorology Department are often unreliable for this sub-region". However, the proposed simple rain gauges would not contribute to official meteorological records, as the WMO have very strict criteria on siting rainfall stations, the equipment must be standard and calibrated (thus costly) and records need to be measured very frequently (at least daily for manual).</p> <p>C) Reversing land degradation is expected to restore productivity and therefore allow for increased local food production. Current states of land degradation are leading to the abandonment of cultivation practices and the dependency on food aid. Land degradation in Karamojong is caused mainly by conversion of forests, woodlands and bush lands to agriculture; overgrazing of rangelands; unsustainable agricultural practices on croplands; and excessive exploitation of natural</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>gender analysis will be conducted, gender-responsive results framework included, and information on beneficiaries provided by gender.</p> <p>B) Questions on resilience of proposed livelihood diversification measures, and on rain gauges, have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Regarding the monitoring of resilience, we recommend that the Agency also make note of processes that are put in place to enable resilient planning and development at various scales (rather than focus solely on measuring outcomes), and convey this information to the hub project. Agency is requested to discuss how this will be done.</p> <p>C) Not yet fully addressed. Agency response is noted; however, in addition to description of the IWM approach and project outputs, a clear section on GEBs is needed. Please see comment for Item 6, below, for further additional detail.</p> <p>D) Yes, explanation provided is adequate. The proposed project has a much broader/expanded scope than the baseline initiatives. While the</p>	<p>resources. Land degradation is highlighted as the greatest contributor to annual cost of environmental degradation, manifested in soil nutrient loss through soil erosion. Loss in soil productivity results in income loss to farmers in the range of \$USD39 to 56 per hectare per year. Studies indicate that Uganda loses about 11 percent of its Gross National Income per annum as a result of excessive soil erosion alone.</p> <p>Therefore reversing the land degradation trends through sustainable land management practices will lead to increase in production, and subsequently improved food security for the people. On 'integrated watershed management' and biodiversity conservation mainstreaming - The project will promote integrated landscape management by applying the integrated watershed management approach (see related components/activities below). The sustainable use and increase in productivity of local agro-biodiversity (benefitting from safeguarding ecosystem services) will be key. The project will focus on conservation of and develop seed multiplication skills for local seed varieties that are drought-tolerant/with drought coping mechanisms and/or a high percentage of recovery post-drought, to increase food security. As far as local animal breeds are concerned the project will focus on indigenous breeds such as the short horn Zebu for cattle, Small East African Goats and the East African fat tailed Sheep. Components of the integrated</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>latter are targeted toward ensuring access to basic services, the IAP program child project seeks to address the underlying causes of vulnerability and food insecurity.</p> <p>FI, 2/15/2017: Yes. All comments have been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>watershed management approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Soil and land management</li> <li>(2) Water management</li> <li>(3) Agricultural Development with focus on agro-biodiversity</li> <li>(4) Bio-energy development/ wood lots</li> <li>(5) Livestock/ Pasture development</li> <li>(6) Afforestation and Forestry management</li> <li>(7) Rural Enterprise Development/livelihood diversification</li> <li>(8) Bio-diversity conservation and use</li> <li>(9) Capacity building</li> <li>(10) Food and nutrition</li> </ol> <p>Note: The watershed sites selected for GEF/IAP were defined by a DFID-supported project which ended in May 2016 (Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Program). The IAP project will build upon the outcomes and interventions of that project. On the ground biodiversity activities will also include the exploration of payment for ecosystem services schemes where feasible. The biodiversity related activities will be implemented in all project sites, fully integrated within the proposed framework of IWRM and the Farmer Field School approach. As such they were not subject to a separate site selection method. In terms of biodiversity related benefits, it is expected that the combination of project activities will lead to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Improved identification and knowledge of species of significance, including</li> </ol>



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>specifically assessment of agrobiodiversity and conservation options (Comp.3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ī, Improved in situ conservation and restoration of tree species and local varieties of seeds and plants.</li> <li>ī, Restoration of fauna habitats through revegetation, reforestation and conservation of forests.</li> <li>ī, Reduction of encroachment into natural reserves and protection of animal and plant reserves in the area.</li> </ul> <p>D) This project will deliver additional sustainability benefits by addressing the root causes of vulnerability and food insecurity in the Karamoja, which are mainly attributable to land and ecosystem degradation. As noted in the Joint IAP Prodoc, the current baseline of development projects in Karamoja are targeted towards ensuring access to basic services, such as security, healthcare, education, drinking water, and fundamental rural infrastructure (roads and markets), and many do not address issues of land degradation and climate change and the environmental causes of vulnerability. For instance the RPLRP project is designed to respond to crises, emergencies and hazards. Although some of the project interventions under the RPLRP are meant to address natural resource issues (e.g. access to land; improved access to markets; droughtpreparedness), they are limited to the pastoral subsector and take a narrow view of environment and climate change</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>vulnerability and do not address the underlying causes of vulnerability and food insecurity. The GEF project is directly related to KALIP2, in particular the component that addresses food security and promotion of inclusive growth in agriculture. As discussed in section A.1.2 of the CEO ER 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.</p> <p>2/6/2017:</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>The project will support resilience assessments, and will utilize existing tools, including SHARP, RAPTA and HH BAT and Conservation International's Vital Signs approach. Preliminary assessments have already been conducted during the PPG, and detailed ones will be conducted at project inception. The results of these assessments will inform resilience planning at household, community and landscape levels by informing the planning processes and approaches about what potential stressors and shocks the livelihood systems, geographies and landscapes are exposed to (i.e. mapping vulnerabilities) and therefore inform the types of interventions that should be put into place. Planning for resilience and development in the Karamoja region will require a serious integration of the socio-cultural, environmental and economic dynamics at play and a comprehensive understanding of what households vulnerable and food insecure and the role played by environmental degradation and climate change in determining these outcomes.</p> <p>The data and results from the resilience assessments to be conducted by the project will be captured through the Vital Signs to be created through the IFAD-led Regional Hub Project of the GEF Food Security IAP, which Conservation International is a part of. The text in the CEO ER (page 15-16) has been revised to read as follows: [revised text not entered in</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>review platform]</p> <p>Resilience planning in Karamoja will largely entail designing interventions that contribute to reducing the vulnerability of the agro-pastoral production systems to seasonal scarcities and climate-induced shocks such as droughts and water stress. As discussed in the section on Project Strategy (see page 50-52 of the Joint Prodoc), a planning system that considers a catchment or watershed as the basic unit for planning will be promoted by the project, and technical support and capacity building will be provided to the local government institutions mandated with planning and management, to be able to adopt this approach. The Agro-Pastoral Field Schools and Farmer Field Schools methodologies, together and the multi-stakeholder platform approach, will serve as the key entry points for facilitating resilience planning at district, landscape and farm/household levels. Extension officers and other local level representation of the key resource planning and management institutions will be targeted for training and capacity building on resilience assessments and planning to ensure the sustainability of results and impact beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>c) Section A.1.5 of the CEO Endorsement Request has been revised and the following text added: [revised/new paras not pasted in review platform]</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>GEBs are also described in Section 1.5 Alignment with GEF Focal Areas (1.5.3 pages 96&amp;#x2013;97) as follows: [revised paras not pasted in review platform]</p>
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>Yes. Please ensure that the GEF Project Financing and Agency Fee amounts in Tables B and D add up to the shown totals. Currently there are errors and the actual totals do not match the shown totals.</p>	<p>Dec. 15, 2016: Tables have been corrected.</p>
	<p>4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?</p>	<p>FI, 7/26/2016: Further information is requested. (i) GEF has only received a co-financing letter from the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), regarding the RPRLP. There should also be a letter confirming baseline co-financing associated with the KALIP2 project. However, this letter is not on file. Please submit.  (ii) The letter from MAAIF shows that it is providing \$20 million in grant financing through the RPRLP, whereas Table C shows this as \$10 million.</p>	<p>Dec. 15, 2016: The co-financing from MAAIF is associated with the World Bank-funded RPRLP for \$20 million in grant. An additional \$1 million from MAAIF is confirmed as in-kind support. An additional letter has been received from the Office of the Prime Minister (dated 28 November 2016), confirming baseline cofinancing associated with NUSAF 3 for \$24 million.  The co-financing table (Table C) in the CEO ER has been corrected to reflect the correct amount of \$20 million grant co-financing from MAAIF. While it is expected that NUSAF 3 will provide a baseline on which this project</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please explain this difference.</p> <p>(iii) Will NUSAF3 also contribute co-financing? It is not listed in Table C but is discussed in ProDoc Section 1.2.3 on baseline initiatives.</p> <p>FI, 12/30/2016: Yes, letters confirming grant and in-kind co-financing of \$58 million have been submitted.</p>	<p>will build, it was not possible to discuss cofinancing with its implementers, given that specific interventions under Phase 3 were not finalized. So no financing from NUSAF is yet confirmed. Collaboration will be sort during implementation to establish complementarity and crossâ€ learning between the GEF IAP project and NUSAF 3.</p>
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>FI, 7/26/2016: Please use the correct IAP tracking tool which was developed at time of PFD approval. All relevant and applicable cells must be filled in correctly, such as putting "x" where required, and actual numbers where implied. In doing so:</p> <p>(i) Please ensure that baseline values (current day) are filled in for the focal area objectives identified.</p> <p>(ii) Please ensure that for 'value at project completion' the tracking tools present a total figure that matches what is shown in rows 1 and 2 of Table E of the Datasheet (i.e., BD conservation and sustainable use mainstreamed into 5,000 ha of production landscapes and sectors; and 6,230 ha under sustainable land management).</p>	<p>Dec. 15, 2016: The correct tracking tool (Tracking Tools for Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot) has now been filled. An estimation of GHG benefits has been provided using EXACT. A more detailed assessment of GHG benefits will be conducted during inception, when plans for FFS implementation and land use plans are developed.</p> <p>2/6/2017: GEBs have been described as indicated above. Credible baseline data on biodiversity is lacking and will be completed at inception phase, see response to comment 2 below concerning biodiversity baseline data. Improvement in vegetative cover is measured through the following interventions: SLM in agriculture, rangeland and pasture as well as reforestation activities, all of which are accounted for in EX-ACT simulation annexed to the CEO ER and Joint PRODOC. Biodiversity will be assessed particularly</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(iii) Please note that including improvement in "vegetative cover" as GEB also implies potential for GHG mitigation. Therefore a quantitative measure on this must be provided, together with a clear description of how it is derived and subsequently monitored.</p> <p>FI, 1/3/2016: Not yet cleared. Further information on global environmental benefits (GEBs) is needed. Please provide more information on biodiversity benefits and how these will be assessed and sustained (see question 2(C) of 7/26/2016 review, above). Section A.1.5 on GEBs, in the CEO ER, directs the reader to pages 15-35 of the ProDoc, but the information there is not relevant to GEBs.</p> <p>A dedicated section on GEBs is needed, covering the significance, sustainability, and data aspects of GEBs in LD and BD in the relevant section of the CEO ER or ProDoc. Further:</p> <p>1) It is unclear how the number 6,230 ha has been calculated for Table E of the Datasheet (area under sustainable</p>	<p>through use of the LADA - WOCAT, HH-BAT - also APFS participatory monitoring (see Component 3: Monitoring and Assessment, p66-68 of ProDoc).</p> <p>1) The number 6,230 ha was incorrect. 4,920 ha is the total area the project will implement in the 4 districts in Karamoja region. The tracking tool has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>2) During the PPG, a baseline land use systems map was prepared by FAO Uganda GIS experts using ten available sets of data (see Figure 6 p38 of the prodoc). The plan is for this to be used during the project inception phase, along with field verification including using the LADA-WOCAT tools, to assess wild biodiversity and land degradation in the identified intervention areas (which were selected after the field visits and LADA workshop in Moroto) in much greater details and provide more exact figures.</p> <p>3) Table E now includes CCM benefits calculated using the EX-ACT tool; it had been omitted in the previous version.</p> <p>4) The EXACT excel sheet has been provided and the detailed assumptions and results can be found in Annex E of the CEO ER and in Annex 16 of the prodoc.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>land management). The LD tracking tool only shows the numbers 720 and 1,800. The numbers in the tracking tool must be consistent with those in Table E. Also, please discuss if/how the 6,230 ha figure relates to the 5,000 ha figure in the BD sheet.</p> <p>2) As mentioned in the previous set of comments, please also include baseline values for the BD section of the tracking tool (i.e., current number of ha with globally significant landraces). At present, only the foreseen target value (5,000 ha maintained) has been provided.</p> <p>3) There is a lack of consistency on whether or not CCM benefits will be tracked. A GHG benefit target has not been included in Table E but the CCM section of the tracking tool has been submitted. In this section, please provide the estimated amount of GHG benefit that will ensure in the project lifetime, using the Ex-ACT calculations.</p> <p>4) Please also submit the Ex-ACT calculations in Excel.</p> <p>FI, 2/15/2016: Yes. Agency has provided the requested explanations/information.</p>	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		[Update, 3/20/17: Due to discrepancy between Table E (GEBs) of latest submission and the Tracking Tool, Agency was asked by email to revise and re-submit the Tracking Tool, which they did on 3/16/2017]. This section is cleared.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>FI, 7/26/2016: Please discuss the seemingly high overlap with the technically-recommended FAO-LDCF Project ID 7997 (not yet Council Approved), which is an adaptation project that covers Karamoja and other regions. It is unclear how the two will substantially differ. Similar to the proposed project, it has a focus on agricultural and pastoral production using a FFS approach, will draw on the same baseline projects, will similarly support community seed banks, and will also use the SHARP tool.</p> <p>FI, 12/30/2016: Yes, Agency has explained that the LDCF project will cover different geographies within Karamoja than the proposed IAP child project. The two projects will coordinate and exchange</p>	<p>Dec. 15, 2016: In terms of geographic coverage, the FAOLDCF project will target the Central Cattle corridor (Luwero, Nakasekke, Nakasongola, Mubende, Kiboga and Sembabule) and Karamoja (Abim, Amudat, Kaagon, Kotido, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, and Napak). To avoid any direct (geographic) overlap with the IAP child project, the LDCF project will focus on the three districts in Karamoja that are not covered by the IAP (Abim, Amudat and Napak) + the 6 districts in the cattle corridor. In terms of thematic focus and approach, though there are similarities between the GEF/IAP and the FAO LDCF project, the LDCF project will target different communities and districts (and associated baseline projects). The LDCF project will therefore complement the IAP child project activities at a wider scale. A close cooperation between the two projects will be ensured through the GEF IA (FAO) and the lead executing partner</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		information on approaches to resilience and adaptation.	(MAAIF).
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>FI, 7/26/2016:</p> <p>(i) Some information is provided on KM in the section on Output 3.3 in the ProDoc. The Agency is requested to provide additional detail on knowledge products and topics for knowledge-exchange (e.g., this section does not mention that experience will be shared on addressing resilience to climate change and other stressors, which is a valuable aspect of this project). Also, it discusses participatory activities to exchange knowledge (e.g., trainings, study tours), but not how such knowledge will be systematically captured for broader dissemination. Please provide some information in this regard.</p> <p>(ii) It would be helpful to include a table or sub-sections in the discussion on Output 3, clarifying how emerging knowledge will be shared at regional national, sub-national and local levels.</p> <p>FI, 12/30/2016:</p>	<p>Dec. 15, 2016:</p> <p>i. Topics for knowledge exchange will be identified using a participatory approach through regional meetings bringing together all child projects. A preliminary assessment was already conducted through IFAD and the Regional Hub Project, which provided avenues for potential south-south knowledge sharing.</p> <p>ii. Within this project, and within Uganda, topics which will be the object of knowledge sharing and dissemination will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline assessments and assessments/measuring/monitoring of resilience, and in particular harmonization of methodologies towards creation of a single framework for Karamoja and potentially Uganda.</li> <li>- Best Practice publications -- e.g. on integration of resilience and sustainability into agricultural value-chains/greening of value-chains.</li> <li>- Lessons-learned from implementation of innovative approaches. A knowledge management approach is also fully integrated into the Component 2 approach on farmer-</li> </ul>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Yes, cleared.	based extension (FFS), since it seeks to increase the dissemination of production-relevant knowledge and information. The main mechanisms for upscaling knowledge from the project to the national level will be the multi-stakeholder platforms established under component 1, and the MAAIF SLM Task Force, which will supervise this project on behalf of the government and which can integrate successful approaches into policymaking at national level.
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	FI, 7/26/2016: Partly. Agency is requested to provide responses to additional relevant comments provided by STAP at the FS-IAP PFD stage, e.g., 3b, 3c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, and 8 (of STAP review of PFD).  FI, 12/30/2016: Yes.	Dec. 15, 2016: The STAP comments have now been addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	FI, 7/21/2016: No. Agency is requested to please respond to Council comments on the FS IAP PFD as appropriate for this child project (for example, Germany made the following comment: "The	Dec. 15, 2016: The Council comments have been addressed.

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>monitoring system which will be established within the program could be aligned with / made applicable for national monitoring systems, in order to establish / support long term monitoring of food security progress and resilience".</p> <p>FI, 12/30/2016: Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>FI, 7/28/2016: Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11.</p> <p>FI, 1/4/2017: Not yet. Agency is requested to kindly address comments for items 2(B) and 6. Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agency is also requested to delete the frequent references made to the "PIF" in the CEO ER, as there was no PIF for this child project.</li> <li>- Agency is requested to kindly send GEF a signed version of the CEO ER.</li> </ul> <p>FI, 2/15/2017: Yes.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 26, 2016	December 15, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 03, 2017	February 06, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 15, 2017	

