

Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

<i>Staff</i>		<i>Processing Status</i>	<i>Date</i>
Program Manager	Kumari	Processing Stage	
Implementing Agency	UNDP	Concept Pipeline Discussion	
Regional Coordinator	John Hough	PDF A - Agency Approval	
Executing Agency	National Government	PDF B - CEO Approval	
		Bilateral Project Review Meeting	
		Work Program Submission and Approv	
		CEO Endorsement	
		Agency Approval	
		Project Completion	

Cost Summary

Cost Item	Years	Amount (USD'000)
<u>Preparation</u>		
- PDF A		\$0.02
- PDF B		\$0.34
- PDF C		
<u>Project Allocation</u>		
- Executing Agency Fees and Costs		\$0.00
- Project Management Costs		\$0.00
- Other Incremental Costs		\$0.00

Completeness of Documentation

Focal Point..... Budget..... Logical Framework.....
 STAP Review..... Increment Cost..... Length.....
 Disclosure of Administration Cost..... Complete Cover Sheet....

1. Country Ownership

Country Eligibility

Uganda is a signatory of the CBD.

Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness

(i) The letter attached is not from the GEF Focal Point; (ii) the government co-financing for the PDF-B is for \$45,000 (in-kind).

2. Program and Policy Conformity

Portfolio Balance

Uganda has had GEF biodiversity support at the national level through (i) the enabling activity (\$120,000); (ii) Bwindi (GEF: \$ 4mil; co-fin: \$2.3 mil) and (iii) the Protected Area Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU) project (GEF: \$10.3mil, co-fin: \$ 96.8 mil). World Bank is the IA for all of these. There are also several regional biodiversity projects (Cross border sites (\$ 13m GEF, co-fin: \$5.5), Institutional supportn (GEF: \$10mil), African NGO partnership: GEF: \$4.5 mil, co-fin: \$ 7 mil) and PDF-B underway (Rift Valley Lakes) - all through UNDP. Also under International Waters we have the regional Lake Victoria project (GEF: \$35 mil, co-fin: \$42mil). The PDF-B for Rift Valley has been in the pipeline for some time now, and it is unclear what the status of this is.

Program Conformity

The project complies with OP#3.

Replicability

Not addressed.

Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project

The Albertine Rift Valley forests are recognized among the World's top 200 ecosystems of extreme global importance for biodiversity conservation as the "Earth's Most Biologically Valuable Ecoregions". They have many values of global significance including: (a) Hosting many endemic species, across all taxa, several of which are rare; (b) A high species diversity of plants and animals, (c) A wide cultural diversity of human – forest interactions; (d) Acting as carbon sinks and regulating climate conditions.

Sustainability

Not addressed

Baseline Course of Action

The strategic, institutional and operational context of what is happening in the baseline situation is not clear. There is a need to articulate clearly what will take place under the business-as-usual scenario: government commitments/ownership of these (not just externally supported measures (EU, DFID, GEF etc). This baseline and its linkages to the current donor activities, previous GEF support through the various projects (especially in relation to insitutional support etc) should be clear.

Alternative Action Supported by project

There are several issues here:

1. Because the baseline situation is not clear, the value added of GEF support for the the planning and implementation of the Conservation and Management Strategy is difficult to put into context. The relationship between the CMS and the NFCMP is not clear: should the latter not already have provided the framework

context? Both the NFCMP and CMS has to be place in a strategic, institutional, legal and operational context.? A critical part of this project would be the insitutional reform and strengthening across the insitituions: not the forest separate from the wildlife institutions.

2. It is important that the Conservation and Management Strategy to be planned and implemented through this project be "owned" by the national authorities and communities.

3. The changing institutional structure, the multiplicity of agencies and their roles need to be defined, linkages clear and capacity to handle this and previous projects clear. The absorbtive capacity is a serious issue: not just of itself, but because of the changing insitutional structure. In the case of the earlier WBank PAMSU project the GEF financing was phased because of the absorbtive capacity issues: the first phase funding was to build the capacity.

4. The proposal makes reference to commercial forestry: any logging activities?

Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy

Several issues (land tenure, collaborative forest management, communities in and outside of forests etc.) make it imperative that consultation and involvement of primary stakeholders groups be open and transparent. Land tenure issues especially would have legal implications and possible need for reform which may have to be addressed in the wider policy and legal reform context.

Private Sector Involvement

Possible through tourism: not addressed explicitly at this stage.

3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing

Incremental Cost

The proposal estimates GEF financing to be about \$ 7 mil, and co-financing (for the baseline??) of another \$ 7 million. In terms of the PDF-B the GEF request is for \$335,000 with a further \$175,000 of co-financing (\$ 45,000 from GoU (in-kind).

Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed

The PDF-B request is a grant, including donor financing from EU and DFID.

Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity

Not addressed, but the cost of implementation of the Conservation and Management Strategy, and the longer term recurrent costs associated with this and other activities/reforms would have to be addressed.

Absorptive Capability

This is a serious issue: points made especially strongly in the World Bank comments.

Cost Effectiveness

4. Coordination with Other Institutions

Collaboration

Who is the lead agency for the execution of the project: FD, UWA, NEMA? Please see extensive comments on the institutional arrangements provided by the World Bank. Relationship between Forest Department and new Forest Authority; also of the latter with UWA?

Complementarity with Ongoing Activities

Linkages between this proposal and ongoing activities, and collaboration is not clear: especially with previous GEF activities that have supported institutional, capacity and protected area management components which are relevant to this new proposal. The proposal must include specific details on the contributions of other ongoing and completed national and regional projects, especially GEF funded ones. Linkages and collaboration with the WBank PAMSU project: a > \$100 mil. project which focuses on biodiversity in protected areas. Even if the current project does not intend to focus directly on PAs, linkages through the UWA would need to be spelt out. The PDF-B for the Rift Valley has been in the pipeline for some time: what is its status, and would it not have some bearing on this proposal?

The MSP project that is being absorbed into the project: any PDF-A funds disbursed through that project? further indication for the need of a strategic think

5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations

Core Commitments

Not clear what core commitments of UNDP will be used, nor the comparative advantage of UNDP in this project.

Linkages

Consultation and Coordination

Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions

Monitoring & evaluation: Minimum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study

Lessons from the other projects should be elaborated if proposal is to be developed further.

Indicators

To be defined.

Implementing Agencies' Comments

Comments have been provided from the World Bank: and they expressed serious concerns, especially on the institutional and capacity aspects.

No comments from the Ias have been received for this re-submission. A response, particularly from the World Bank, is needed.

Comments submitted by the Bank on January 11, 2000 are reflected below:

"1. A good argument is made for the global biodiversity value of the Albertine rift valley forests. There is considerable opportunity for cofinancing for baseline and complementary activities such as institutional strengthening and community-based forest livelihoods, through associated bilateral financing.

2. The pdf will support development of a detailed forest conservation and management strategy, building on the existing 1998 forest Conservation Plan. Given that the Albertine Forests are a WWF Ecoregion and that WWF is currently undertaking ecoregional planning initiatives, it should be possible to benefit from that WWF process and avoid duplication of effort. Or perhaps this initiative is intended to provide the funding for Ecoregion planning, given the expectation that WWF will be involved?

3. The planning will define areas for GEF intervention, including important forest areas (both gazetted and ungazetted forest reserves) that serve as biological corridors. Given the fragmentation of the Albertine forests, maintenance of corridors and/or clusters of forests that serve as one 'unit' will be important to longterm viability of the area's biodiversity.

4. Many of the remaining forest blocks are very small (only five above 10,000 ha and many very small indeed) - it will be important to identify criteria for selection, including biodiversity value, size, representativeness, irreplaceability, complementarity degree of threat, but also perhaps factors of adjacency and contiguity to maintain larger blocks of habitat - see above. There may be useful lessons to be learned from similar planning efforts in other fragmented forests elsewhere e.g. Atlantic Forests of Brazil.

5. Expected interventions are likely to include both sustainable management (by communities?) and conservation - such interventions will have both national and global benefits and differential incremental costs. The pdf has good synergies with other projects to provide cofinancing for preparation of community interventions.

6. The pdf proposal rightly recognises the likely impact on forests of policies related to land tenure and decentralisation but does not identify how these might be addressed, either through this or associated projects.

7. Kibale is already receiving GEF support through the PAMSU project and the MSP for wild coffee - further efforts to better protect/maintain adjacent forests may help to conserve earlier GEF investments.

8. The revised pdf seems to have addressed WB concerns re NEMA as executing/coordinating agency - financing is now being coordinated by the Government Aid Liaison Dept although NEMA is still listed as a partner (presumably only as a member of the consultative committee given the explanation upfront?)."

STAP Review

n.r.

Council members' Comments

n.r.

Technical Assurances

Convention Secretariat

not received.

Other Technical Comments

Further Processing

The GEF Secretariat will not recommend the proposal as it stands for CEO recommendation for the reasons discussed above.

Summarised, these are:

1. The strategic, institutional and operational context of what is happening in the baseline situation is not clear.
2. Because the baseline situation is not clear, the value added of GEF support for the the planning and implementation of the Conservation and Management Strategy is difficult to put into context.
3. The changing institutional structure, the multiplicity of agencies and their roles need to be defined, linkages clear and capacity to handle this and previous projects clear. The absorptive capacity is a serious issue: not just of itself, but because of the changing insitutional structure.

4. Linkages between this proposal and ongoing activities, and collaboration is not clear: especially with previous GEF activities that have supported institutional, capacity and protected area management components which are ver relevant to this new proposal.

A bilateral was held with UNDP on 13th August:

A discussion took place on the proposal and the points that had been raised in the review sheet. As presented, the proposal could not be recommended for CEO approval. A major issue is the need for the institutional and policy reform to be closely linked to the activities being proposed in the PDF B (i.e. the Conservation and Management strategy and capacity building). There needs to be commitment from the government on the institutional and policy reforms (with benchmarks even at the PDF B) as this would be critical both to this current proposal, and previous GEF support in the country. It was concluded that there was a need for further dialogue (and commitment) with the key partners and agencies in the country and the World Bank in defining the proposal.

A proposal was re-submitted on January 6, 2000. The revised draft includes extensive comments responding to Secretariat concerns and a strong rebuttal to World Bank comments. Key issues have been addressed in the revised draft. These include: LACK OF CLARITY IN THE STRATEGIC, INSTITUTIONAL AND OPERATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE BASELINE; THE VALUE ADDED OF GEF SUPPORT, THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO HANDLE THE PROJECT IN VIEW OF THE CHANGING INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT; AND LINKAGES BETWEEN THE PRESENT INITIATIVE AND OTHERS UNDERWAY and other points. The Secretariat comments are mostly well addressed, However, there is still very substantive concerns about the requested consultation/coordination the World Bank and its concerns. The Bank provided comments for the re-submission, and are included in the appropriate section. As the issue of inter-agency coordination is key, and one likely to have a substantive impact on project implementation, the PM suggests a discussion on the issue during the bilateral meeting scheduled for January 18, before reaching any conclusion about possible inclusion of the concept in the pipeline and potential recommendation of PDF B approval.

A bilateral meeting took place on January 18, 2000. Key issues related to inter-institutional coordination among Ias were discussed. Comments from the World Bank were also stressed again. The meeting agreed to leave the record open. Ms. Torres will confer with Mr. Vidaeus on the follow-up needed ASAP.