



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

GEF ID:	5718		
Country/Region:	Uganda		
Project Title:	Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4634 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; CCM-5; CCM-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,620,320
Co-financing:	\$7,630,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,300,320
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	3/10/2014 The UNCCD entered into force the 23 of September 1997, the UNFCCC on March 21, 1994.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3/10/2014 Yes. There is a letter dated February 25, 2014, signed by the OFP, mentioning the project name, the GEF amount, and the GEF Agency.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3/10/2014 Based on the available data in the PMIS, three projects have been cleared for	

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Uganda: 1 BD, 1 MFA/SFM, and 1 GEF SGP. \$1,829,000 are still available in the STAR allocations (CC: \$819,000; LD: \$1,010,000). These amounts comprise the project grant, the PPG if any, and the associated agency fees. Project grant: \$1,620,320 PPG: \$50,000 fees: \$153,930 + \$4,750	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	3/10/2014 Please, revise the table D: The amounts presented in this table should not include the PPG. CCM: 733,586; 69,114; 802,700 LD: 886,734; 84,816; 971,550 Sub-total: 1,670,320; 158,680; 1,774,250 The total c (a+b) should be \$1,774,250. March 25, 2014 Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help</i>	3/10/2014: No. (a) The project is using CC and LD resources and have to report on each focal area results framework. Please revise the table A to include the appropriate CCM objective(s) (probably CCM-5). The LD3 objective is fine.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><i>achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>(b) Please, check the template and use the last version available on the GEF website.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>3/10/2014</p> <p>Problems that baseline projects seek to address:</p> <p>(a) It seems that scientific information and knowledge are missing in the Mount Elgon Landscape. How will the project fill in this gap? Could you include a partnership with an national research center to design a robust monitoring program and capture scientific evidences?</p> <p>(b) It is mentioned that unsecure land tenure is a major driver of LD. How land tenure insecurity will be address within this project or the cofinancing? Please clarify the specific issues pertaining to the land tenure with description of the current practices. Please add details on how insecure land tenure is driving land degradation. We do not clearly see whether the proposed plans are an appropriate response. Please, explain.</p> <p>(c) Please provide information on the extent of soil erosion and the potential</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>loss of soil carbon.</p> <p>Baseline Projects</p> <p>(d) There are a number of GEF funded projects in Uganda and also in Mt. Elgon region. Please determine whether the projects could serve as a baseline for the proposed project.</p> <p>(e) LDCF funded, AfDB implemented project "Uganda: Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector" focuses on Mt. Elgon region as well and also deals with erosion issues. Please check whether the project could be considered as a baseline project.</p> <p>(f) Even though the identified baseline projects may not be noting their interventions as sustainable land management (SLM), the work on the ground could be considered SLM (for example sustainable use of resources through MERECP, Ecosystem-based Adaptation related approaches) or their work could directly affect land management (building capacity for climate resilient local communities). Please describe the baseline projects in a manner that their linkages with the proposed project are clear and it is easier to determine any redundancies that may exist between the proposed project and the baseline projects. Ensure that baseline climate change mitigation activities are described, and how those relate to the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proposed climate change mitigation project activities.</p> <p>March 25, 2014 Explanation on land tenure is helpful. Thank you for also clarifying that carbon content in the soils is low in the project area.</p> <p>April 3, 2014: Some comments have not been addressed from CCM perspective. - The comment (f) has not been addressed. Please clarify how the baseline projects are inadequate to address the main sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the target area.</p> <p>- The project needs to identify and enhance coordination or partnership with existing initiatives. In particular, please clarify opportunities to coordinate with LDCF funded, AfDB-implemented project "Uganda: Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector."</p> <p>5/12/2014 CCM JS Addressed. It has been clarified that most baseline activities are limited to the lowlands. Due to the risk of duplication Bududa has been removed from the list of potential sites.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>3/10/2014 No. Please see the following: (a) Please revise expected outputs; they should describe concrete deliverables</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>from the project components (for example-X number of resource maps developed), including outputs for climate change mitigation activities.</p> <p>Component 1 (b) Please clarify how the component will address insecure land tenure issues.</p> <p>(c) In addition to the output 1.4 related to the monitoring and enforcement of land use plans, we would like to clearly see a scientific monitoring that will improve the science based evidence about SLM in the Mont Elgon landscape</p> <p>Component 2 (d) The baseline scenario explains that over 90% of the cultivated land is used for subsistence crops. The component focuses mainly cash crops, please explain. Please clarify whether the project intends to switch farmers from subsistence to cash crops.</p> <p>(e) From climate change mitigation perspective extraction of fuel wood and loss of soil due to erosion could be of significance. Please develop project activities that will address these drivers directly. Without strong activities on climate change mitigation, this project will not be eligible to use CCM funding.</p> <p>(f) The background describes a number of important drivers for degradation of ecosystems in Mt. Elgon. The components need to be further defined to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>address either all of these drivers or explain how addressing one or two will make a significant impact.</p> <p>(g) Please analyze the possibility of leakage in the project and implement necessary solutions.</p> <p>March 25, 2014 cleared.</p> <p>Please note that soil erosion and fuel wood were mentioned in the previous review as suggestions on how the project could introduce climate change mitigation related issues. The GEFSec does not require the agency to include soil carbon details if it is not relevant to the project.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement: - explain the strategy and the way to promote cash and subsistence crops with the appropriate partners (farmer organizations, extension services). - explain how land tenure insecurity will be addressed in the final project document.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>3/10/2014 Not enough. - Global Environment Benefits (a) We take the point that the GEB will be developed during the PPG. However, at PIF level, a minimum of information is needed. For instance, can you describe the main biomes where the 5000 ha of vegetation will be restored. As you know, the LD focal area supports sustainable</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>management and restoration only of productive landscapes (farmlands, rangelands, grasslands, agrofresty parklands, for instance). Please, confirm.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>Yes. Nearly 2 million of people are living in the surroundings of the Mont Elgon area. The project will target livelihoods of the poorest. Gender issues are mentioned and will be developed during the PPG phase.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>3/10/2014 No. (a) Please clarify the role of local populations including indigenous peoples with respect to the land tenure system that currently exist in the country.</p> <p>(b) Please comment on the likelihood and interest level of their participation and complementarity of the project approaches to the customs and priorities of the local communities.</p> <p>Addressed. At CEO endorsement, anticipate the risk of dispute between land occupiers and owners and include/train communal land dispute committees, as well as the traditional authorities.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,</p>	<p>3/10/2014 No. Please see section 10.</p> <p>A very concise list of risks is proposed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)	Please, develop a comprehensive risk assessment during the PPG. Addressed.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please, consider the coordination with other GEF projects and those financed by the LDCF: - #4644, UNDP, Addressing Barriers to the Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach - #4993, UNDP, Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Africa to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change; - #5603, UNIDO, Reducing Vulnerability of Banana Producing Communities to Climate Change Through Banana Value Added Activities - Enhancing Food Security And Employment Generation. -#5204 Uganda AfDB Climate Change Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector March 25, 2014. As requested please explore possibility of partnership with ID 5204 Uganda AfDB Climate Change Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector. The project has components that could provide support to the proposed project.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for	No. Please, following the section B, describe the innovative aspects, sustainability, and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>potential for scaling up.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The resources are limited and we suggest to focus the resources on a small number of outcomes and outputs. We would like a justification on the breakdown of resources between the component 1 and 2. From a general point of view, we are keen to see significant resources on the ground to transform the landscapes working closely with small holder farmers. However, in this case, we wonder if it would not be strategic to focus on the enhancement of the enabling environment (capacity building, reinforcement of institutions, planning at</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>different scales) and limit income generating activities (later, at CEO endorsement, we will ask for clarifications on the decision making process, the distribution mechanism, and the monitoring of the IGA approach).</p> <p>Addressed. Confirm the breakdown at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>The ratio is acceptable (1:4.7). We appreciate the cofinancing in cash brought up by the agency. Could you explain what the donor consortium is.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please confirm the cofinancing.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>The management costs are reasonable (5%).</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>\$50,000 are programmed for the PPG. It is under the norm.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>March 25, 2014 Thanks for the revised document. Some comments have not yet been addressed, notably from a CCM perspective. We invite the Agency to directly contact the CCM team for clarification, if needed. See the cell. 6. Some comments have been transferred for CEO approval. Please, check the review, as well as the cell. 25 with the items to consider at CEO approval.</p> <p>May 22, 2014 All points have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop a comprehensive risk assessment; - Anticipate the risk of dispute between land occupiers and owners and include/train communal land dispute committees, as well as the traditional authorities. - Confirm cofinancing; 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a Monitoring Plan, including indicators to assess the Global Environment benefits; - Confirm if it is relevant to include Indigenous people issues in this project; - Detail the local governance mechanism and the role of CSO/NGO; - Show how results and lessons from recently closed projects, as the MERECEP, have informed the design of the current project. Additional information about these results will be useful to highlight how these results could serve as baseline or fit into the objective of this proposal. - explain the strategy and the way to promote cash and subsistence crops with the appropriate partners (farmer organizations, extension services). - explain how land tenure insecurity will be addressed in the final project document. Please elaborate on the provisions of the national land policy that allows for tenure security and how the communities are not utilizing it. - Confirm the breakdown between C1 and C2. Further refinement of the outputs is expected. - Promotion of agroforestry and its potential benefits towards GHG reduction is noted. Please add focus on agroforestry in component 2 and also refine project activities to establish linkages with fuelwood collection and to monitor the progress of the project in this regard. - Agroforestry has been identified as the means of climate change mitigation in the project. A sound CO2e estimate 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>including carbon sequestered through agroforestry and emissions reduced though more sustainable fuelwood collection is expected by CEO Endorsement request.</p> <p>- The section on GEB will be reviewed again on the basis of revisions done for section 7.</p> <p>- Please include a system dedicated to monitor the progress of carbon conservation/sequestration.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 07, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 03, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 22, 2014	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**