



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Lakes Edward And Albert Integrated Fisheries And Water Resources Management Project			
Country(ies):	DRC, Uganda	GEF Project ID: ¹	
GEF Agency(ies):	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	P-Z1-AAF-006
Other Executing Partner(s):	Nile Basin Initiative	Submission Date:	2016-03-01
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	769,500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-1	Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programs (SAPs) incorporates transboundary IWRM principles (including environment and groundwater) and policy/ legal/institutional reforms into national/local plans	Output 1.1: National and local policy and legal reforms adopted Output 1.2: Cooperation frameworks agreed with sustainable financing identified	GEF TF	4,600,000	14,190,000
IW-3	Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of water bodies and local ICM principles Outcome 3.3: IW	Output 3.1: National inter-ministry committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local ICM plans	GEF TF	3,500,000	9,235,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/KM/experience sharing	Output 3.3:Active experience/sharing/ learning practiced in the IW project portfolio			
Total project costs				8,100,000	23,425,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Sustainable development, management and utilization of the shared water and fisheries resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Development & Management of Sustainable Fisheries Resources	Inv	Ecosystem conservation produces sustainable benefits and LEA fisheries are increased sustainably under good bilateral management, planning and M&E practices	<p>1.1 Updated and harmonized policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, and innovative financing mechanisms jointly adopted by DRC and Uganda</p> <p>1.2 Bilateral agreement regarding the protection of fisheries and watershed resources is established and enforced by DRC and Uganda</p> <p>1.3 Bilateral Monitoring, Control and Surveillance System established and sustainably funded.</p> <p>1.4 New technology is introduced through the establishment of two fish sub-stations, a Fish Management Information System, bi-annual catch surveys and improved fish</p>	GEF TF	2,250,000	13,540,000

Project Objective: Sustainable development, management and utilization of the shared water and fisheries resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
			processing facilities 1.5 Local communities adopt responsible fishing practices and modern processing techniques. 1.6 Transboundary learning mechanisms, communications and Knowledge Management			
2. Integrated Transboundary Water Resources and Catchment Management	Inv	2.1 Countries agree on a shared water resources management vision and implement solutions to new challenges; these solutions will be based on knowledge and commitments that address key challenges related to e.g. oil exploration, increasing urbanization, land degradation and similar challenges 2.2 Enhanced capacity of basin stakeholders to manage natural resources in a sustainable manner,	2.1 Coordination capacities of NELSAP and the participating agencies in Uganda and DRC are strengthened and formalized. 2.2 Existing Integrated Lake Management Plans (ILMP) updated and adopted at ministerial level by Uganda and DRC 2.3 Establishment of a financially sustainable Basin Management Authority/ Organization for LEAB, as proposed under the Integrated Lake Management Plans 2.4 Water resources and quality monitoring strengthened and enhanced pollution control achieved at project closing. 2.5 Community-based	GEF TF	5,250,000	8,250,000

Project Objective: Sustainable development, management and utilization of the shared water and fisheries resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
		accounting also for climate change and variability	integrated catchment management plans are prepared and implemented for selected watersheds, and local capacities on land and soil conservation are strengthened. 2.6 Improved control of invasive aquatic weeds and conservation of aquatic biodiversity 2.7 M&E framework developed and applied to monitor project-related SAP implementation progress 2.8 Transfer of lessons, experiences and best practices from IWRM through websites, communication tools, technical forums, workshops, etc. (plus allocation of 1% of project budget for IWLEARN activities)			
Subtotal					7,500,000	21,790,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³					600,000	1,635,000
Total project costs					8,100,000	23,425,000

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

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

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	African Development Bank Group	Loan (Uganda) /Grant (DR Congo)	16,885,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH ⁴	Grant (Nile Basin Initiative)	6,540,000
Total Co-financing			23,425,000

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
AfDB	GEF TF	International Waters	Global	8,100,000	769,500	8,869,500
Total Grant Resources				8,100,000	769,500	8,869,500

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

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

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS⁵:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	2,737,296	3,492,713	6,230,009
National/Local Consultants	294,903	1,253,083	1,547,986

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

⁴ Nile Basin Initiative □ Biodiversity conservation and utilisation of ecosystems in the Nile Basin wetlands of transnational relevance, GIZ (Euro 6 million)

⁵ Details included in Appendix 4 of the Project Preparation Report, which includes a Procurement Plan
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶ N/A

A.1 National Strategies and Plans or Reports, Assessments under Relevant Conventions, If Applicable, i.e. NAPAs, NAPs, NBSAPs, National Communications, TNAS, NCSA, NIPS, PRSPS, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs)

The countries of the Nile Basin have prepared their NAPAs some of which have been integrated into the national development plans. The DRC and Uganda NAPAs identify sectoral vulnerability, sectoral climate change impacts, and adaptation needs per sector. As the agriculture sector which includes fisheries management is a key sector, from the perspective of food security and income generation, the impacts of floods and droughts on food security are considered to be extremely important. The project will promote the coping strategies identified in the NAPAs of the two partner states of Uganda and DRC.

The DRC has recently developed a comprehensive legal and policy framework for water governance (2015). With regard to the institutional arrangements, the Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Water & Forests, is responsible for water resource management. Key adaptation strategies (RDC 2006) include: Improvement of the management of water resources and reservoirs; carrying out rural and urban electrification projects; increasing the productivity of agricultural and pastoral systems; settle rural communities, especially those by conflict; Improvement of communication networks for example through multimedia channels; improvement of the management of forest resources, reduce erosion and land degradation ; Increasing the capacity of the meteorological service and protection of coastal zones.

In Uganda, the main policy dealing with water management is the National Water Policy of 1999, which promotes an integrated approach to water resources management. With regard to climate change adaptation, Uganda prepared its NAPA (2007). Recommended coping strategies include: documentation and awareness creation; Farm forestry; Water resources Management; improvement of Weather and climate information; Policy, legislation and planning; Land and soil management; Disaster preparedness; Alternative livelihoods; Health; Infrastructure. With regard to the institutional arrangements, the National Environment Act established NEMA is the principal agency responsible for the management of the environment of environment. A Climate Department, has

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

however recently been introduced within the Ministry of Water and Environment and is expected to coordinate climate mitigation and adaptation across sectors.

Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs)

The partner states of Uganda and DRC are signatories to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and part of the Least Developed Countries. Through regular participation in the meetings of the Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC, Uganda and DRC are keenly following the events leading to the new Climate Change Agreement negotiated in France during the UN Climate Conference in December 2015. The LEAF II project contributes towards attainment of the targets in support of Uganda and DRCs INDCs.

Consequently Uganda recognizes the importance of fulfilling the commitments under the respective article of the Convention on Climate Change, particularly the Principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capacities". In submitting their INDC (December 2015), Uganda's priority is adaptation. The country will continue to work on reducing vulnerability and addressing adaptation in agriculture and livestock, forestry, infrastructure (with an emphasis on human settlements, social infrastructure and transport), water, energy, health and disaster risk management. Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) will be scaled up to increase resilience at the grassroots level. For mitigation, Uganda plans to focus on implementation of a series of policies and measures in the energy supply, forestry and wetland sectors. In the business-as-usual (BAU) scenario the estimated emissions in 2030 will be 77.3 Million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MtCO₂eq/yr). The estimated potential cumulative impact of the policies and measures could result in approximately 22% reduction of national green house gas emissions in 2030 compared to business-as-usual. Uganda proposes to implement the identified policies and measures, and their impact may be higher or lower than these estimations illustrate. Contributions under this Intended Nationally Determined Contribution include crosscutting respect for human rights and gender-responsive climate change actions.

The DRC, in August 2015, submitted its intended nationally determined contribution (INDC), which sets a conditional emissions reduction target of 17% by 2030 compared to a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario. The Party's intended contribution is dependent on adequate support in the form of technology transfer, capacity development and financial resources. The DRC INDC covers the energy, agriculture and forest sectors, noting that the industrial processes and waste sectors have minimal greenhouse gas (GHG) emission levels. The INDC focuses on the following gases: carbon dioxide (CO₂); methane (CH₄); and nitrous oxide (N₂O). According to the INDC, approximately US\$12.5 billion will be necessary to reach the country's mitigation goal, which, if achieved, will avoid just over 70 million metric tons of CO₂-equivalent (MtCO₂e).

⁷ Uganda has one of the lowest green-house gas emissions per capita in the world, estimated at 1.39 tons carbon dioxide, far below the global average of approximately 7.99 tons of carbon dioxide. Furthermore, Uganda's contribution to world's total green-house emission is estimated at 0.099%.

On adaptation, the DRC estimates its needs about US\$9.1 billion, describing the impacts of climate change on the country and particular vulnerabilities. The INDC describes the short- and long-term goals for adaptation as: securing livelihoods and ways of life of both rural and urban communities; managing forest resources rationally; and protecting vulnerable coastal ecosystems. After describing gaps and barriers, the INDC summarizes the country's needs for adaptation

Regional Climate Strategies

In view of the high vulnerability of the region to the impacts of climate change, with the associated challenges especially for food security (which is one of the focal areas of the LEAF II project), adaptation to climate change is highlighted as priority in the region. At the regional level, the NBI Climate Change Strategy (2013)⁸, provides a framework for addressing effects of climate change and variability. NELSAP (2012) also has tools and guidelines (2012) which provide the principles and steps to mainstream climate change into water resources programmes and water infrastructure selection and implementation. Such tools are able to provide a margin, within which planning of investments are prepared. Another significant policy framework is the East African Community (EAC) climate policy (2011), of which Uganda is member. Its overall objective is to guide Partner States and other stakeholders in the preparation and implementation of collective measures to address Climate Change in the region, in the context of sustainable social and economic development.

Bank- GEF partnership in promoting climate resilience

LEAF II falls within the priorities of the AfDB – GEF partnership. With inclusive growth and the transition to green growth at the heart of the AfDB's Ten Year Strategy (2013-2022), the Bank is working to build resilience into investments to ensure the sustainability of development achievements, even in the face of increasing climatic variability. The goal is to reduce the vulnerability of people and communities to the negative impacts of climate change, which include increased instances of extreme weather events. In order to achieve these objectives, the AfDB has placed an emphasis on: building resilience (in both physical infrastructure as well as communities as a whole), sustainable management of natural resources, and creating sustainable infrastructure.

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

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

Catalytic role of GEF

The GEF is uniquely positioned to support the project's objectives and it is unlikely that these would be achieved in the absence of GEF support. Without incremental GEF finance, integrated Lake Basin Management is not likely to be emphasized in any coherent way. As a result, habitats of global importance in the Albertine Rift could suffer from irreversible degradation. GEF resources will also

⁸ The NBI Climate Change Strategy (2013) forms an integral part of the landscape of NBI policies, strategies and guidelines and complements national efforts of NBI member countries. It focuses on transboundary water resources management as a strategic element of climate adaptation and low carbon development in the region. It integrates key strategic plans and activities of the NBI sub-programmes and provides a broader framework for action. The NBI is the addressee of this Strategy
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

be used to catalyze support from the donor community in future phases to sustain and broaden project activities

Lessons learnt from 1st phase of LEAF as part of project design

The Bank has a considerable comparative advantage through its implementation of the LEAF 1 Project. This project directly reflects the lessons learned from global good practices and Bank-financed Operations under the LEAF 1, in Uganda and DRC. The design also reflects innovations from a multitude of non-Bank financed projects and programs, such as the fisheries co-management initiatives financed by the Government of Iceland⁹ (Uganda) and the FAO, financed Smart Fish Program in DR Congo.

Focus on lake the basins—The first key lesson is the need to shift focus from lake management plans to Integrated Lake Basin Management Plans in the lakes Edward and Albert basin. A significant number of problems associated with lakes originate in the lake basin, but these problems often come from a diversity of areas and so these are difficult to manage without the involvement of all groups in the lake basins. In the same vein, the success of transboundary lake basin management depends on the member states political will, commitment, and fulfilment of obligations, rather than on the particular form of institution or its legal status.

Promote a long-term, programmatic approach—From the capacity building plan, prepared under the pilot phase, it is worth noting that development of effective institutions, promotion of meaningful stakeholder involvement, and acquisition and acceptance of knowledge all require a long-term commitment by local institutions and national governments. This long-term approach should include support for national scientific research (examples of research institutions include: ICCN, Nafirri etc.) and training institutions so that there an increased critical mass of experts in the basin. However, a long-term commitment needs to be responsive to new knowledge, changing objectives, and shifts in external circumstances, like the emergence of the oil and gas sector exploration.

Encourage both governance and investments— Good governance and sustainable investments are needed to improve the environmental status of the Lakes Edward and Albert. In some cases, technological solutions can lead to rapid improvements in the environmental status of lakes – most notably with treatment of municipal and industrial effluent (example leachate discharged into the tailings of mines like Kilembe in the basin). However, these technological solutions are not sustainable if the elements of good governance (like enforcement of environmental legislation) are

⁹ The support to the implementation of the Quality Assurance for Fish Marketing Project (QAFMP) under the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), Department of Fisheries Resources (DFR) had its aim at improving the livelihoods of the fish dependent communities in selected districts in Uganda, through improvements in the quality and safety of fish for domestic and export market. The purpose of the Project was to increase the volume of marketed fish both in the domestic and export markets through reduction in post-harvest losses. As the Project developed and lessons were learned, increased emphasis was put on water and sanitation facilities in the selected communities

not in place. The governance aspects strengthened and promoted within the context of LEAF II, at various levels (basin, national, catchment, communities) respond to this recommendation.

Mainstream Lake Basin management—While Lake Basin management institutions can coordinate, the reality is that sectoral institutions (Energy, Fisheries, Agriculture, Transport, Industry etc.) will continue to take the lead in infrastructure investments and in management of the resources in the lake basins. Lake basin management institutions need to raise the awareness of institutions about the importance and the vulnerability of lakes Edward and Albert, so that these concerns are fully incorporated into their policies, programs, plans, and strategies.

Scaling up the concept of Co-management—the pilot phase demonstrated the need to further refine the co-management of the lakes Edward and Albert fisheries, in order to help achieve the objective of regional objectives of increased contribution from the fisheries to economic growth, and to help reverse the significant environmental degradation and overfishing occurring in these areas. Co-management measures work, as communities in the basin demand for increased responsibility in the management of the fish resources in the Lakes Edward and Albert. In almost all pilot sites, fishing communities have understood and appreciated the threats to the resource base, and have welcomed the opportunity to take management measures to address them. In some cases they have even begun to implement management measures without waiting for Government support (Katwe Kabatoro, Uganda, and Tchiomia, DRC). Furthermore, lessons to date have shown that co-management initiatives have a multiplier effect, whereby neighboring communities see the results of a pilot and wish to participate as well.

Need for alternative livelihoods—In order to reach the project's objective of restoration of fishery resources, many communities will need to reduce fishing activities in the near-term as part of co-management activities and the implementation of 'no-take' protected fishing zones. For such co-management initiatives to be successful, and to address the drop in livelihoods amongst the affected poor fishers, the project must support fishers' efforts to acquire new skills necessary for them to pursue alternative livelihoods to fishing outside the sector, to both help reduce pressure on the resources and compensate fishers for lost revenues as a result of management measures. The livelihood based catchment based management and equipping of artisans with skills, directly addresses this concern.

Need for knowledge based Lake basin management—Scientific information has been successfully used in the study lakes to show the limits of Lake Basin resources, enlighten hard-to-see connections, and provide innovative solutions to problems. However, the benefits from use of information have not been fully realized—for instance during the field visit, the Hoima District Local Government, indicated, that they are yet to access findings from the LEAF I ILMP. Scientific information needs to be disseminated to relevant parties and translated into the language of decision makers and stakeholders if it is to be fully applied in management. Further, scientific models have been used in

other basins to help managers at a number of study lakes example, lake Victoria basin. However, the complexity of the models needs to be matched to the capacities of the users, the available data and the demands of the task. Lastly more directed research with application in mind, having managers define the research needs, possible through a formal needs analysis, is recognized as an effective way to have research results taken up and applied in management. There is a need for a collective, widely shared knowledge base of experiences.

Banks contribution to Promotion of Lake basin Planning and regional integration

The Bank is also a key facilitator in regional coordination and linkages for integrated Basin wide planning, its considerable technical knowledge and experience in other lake and transboundary resources management, as well as in bringing communities and the private sector into Natural Resources Management. The Bank has knowledge in working in multi-state Lakes basins as it is financing the implementation of projects under the GEF International Waters Window. Examples include, (i) the Lake Tanganyika Authority (ii) implementation of the Lake Chad Basin Regional Program for the Conservation and Sustainable use of Natural Resources and Energy Efficiency¹⁰ and (iii) the Integrated Development for Increased Rural Climate Resilience in the Niger Basin¹¹. The knowledge and experience gained from implementation of these projects, including best practices in fisheries resources management and watershed management will be useful in the LEAF II project.

The Banks approach includes a political economy analysis, which has helped partners to understand what drives political behavior, how this shapes particular policies and programs in the Lakes Edward and Albert basin, relations, with Regional Economic Communities, like the EAC and Economic Community of the Central African States (ECCAS) and what the implications are for development strategies and programs. The value addition has been (i) better policy and programming, through the identification of feasible solutions to development challenges in the basin (ii) support to risk management and scenario planning by helping to identify the critical factors that are likely to drive or impede significant change in the future in the basin, given the anticipated socio-economic growth; (iii) broadened scope for dialogue with development and country partners around key political challenges and opportunities at the country and sector levels and (iv) project design of regional cooperation mechanisms most appropriate and effective for achieving regional public goods and global environmental benefit in the lakes Edward and Albert basin. The project activities thus support the promotion of regional cooperation, and would help confidence building between the two neighbors which will contribute towards reducing political tension which is common occurrence and promote economic growth.

¹⁰ The programme goal is “to maintain the ecosystem services in the Lake Chad Basin by conserving the water and agro-sylvo ecosystems and ensuring the sustainability of use of resources in the context of energy efficiency and food security”

¹¹ The project aims at Increasing the water security, climate resilience and natural resources management at regional, sub-basin and community levels in the Niger Basin by contributing to SAP/SDAP implementation and outcomes of NBA Strategic Plan.

Bank Contribution towards implementation of international treaties

Lastly, the Bank's involvement will contribute to the achievement of the commitments made and compliance with international treaties such as FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries by ensuring equitable and reasonable utilization of shared water resources; obligation not to cause significant harm to co-riparian's and information sharing which largely remain unimplemented. As example, collaboration between the AfDB and FAO led to the formulation of a project aimed at implementing the Lake Tanganyika Framework Fisheries Management Plan (1999). This has subsequently catalyzed further transformational investments in the Lake Tanganyika Basin.

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

The problem that the project seeks to address remains unchanged from the PIF. The approved PIF included numerous revisions to strengthen the alignment and suitability of the baseline programmes and to sharpen the focus of the project on a few strategically selected, GEF-eligible issues that will build on the baseline activities. During the PPG, the project development team paid particular attention to defining the baseline programme clearly and took further measures to sharpen the focus of the project. The sector goal is poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods for men and women (in the local fishing communities) and global environmental benefits in sustainable management of natural resources. The project will contribute to broad-based poverty alleviation and improvement of livelihoods of people, by supporting sustainable management of shared natural resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert basin, which many communities depend upon. The project objective is to ensure sustainable utilization of fisheries and allied natural resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin through harmonized legal framework and policies. This will be achieved by supporting interventions in two domains viz: (a) fisheries resources development and management and (b) integrated water resources management. The GEF funds, contribute towards implementation of both components. A summary of the project description is presented I section A.5, while the detailed description is attached as Annex 1- LEAF II Project Preparation Report.

The improved management of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin will arrest the deterioration of the ecosystem; help it retain its resiliency; and continued provision of environmental and economic services, such as biodiversity, hydrological cycles, production of materials and goods, extraction of resources and quality of life to communities dependent on it. GEF resources will strengthen the transboundary planning, management and monitoring of resources by strengthening institutions for governance of transboundary resources, and supporting Integrated Lake Basin Management initiatives. The project will also be able to strengthen strengthening the coping and adaptive capacities of communities to current climate variability and emerging climatic trends (e.g. increased frequencies of droughts and/or floods, more erratic rainy seasons). A comprehensive program of improving the water resources information systems, water quality management and catchment management in the basin will help reduce the impact of flooding, and nutrient flows into the lakes, avert eutrophication, while water management mechanisms and investments will help smoothen the

cyclical impacts of droughts and floods, and improve overall water resources management and availability. At the regional level, efforts will be made to identify and cross-boundary issues arising from the impact of climate change on fisheries and watershed resources etc.

The member states recognize that it will take a long time for the environmental status of the two lakes to exhibit measurable improvement after introducing the stress reduction interventions. LEAF II is therefore an instrument: (i) aiming to achieve stress reduction outcomes in priority hotspots; and (ii) laying a foundation for the long-term program for sustainable improvement of fisheries and water resources management in the Lakes Edward and Albert basin.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The project which follows from a successful pilot phase (LEAF 1) financed by the African Development bank Group, will be the first regional program to address major environmental threats to the Lakes Edward and Albert ecosystem, all of which are transboundary in character. The project objective will be achieved by supporting interventions in two domains viz: (a) fisheries resources development and management and (b) integrated water resources management. The GEF funds, contribute towards implementation of the regional components of both components. A description of the components is as follows:

Component 1-Fisheries Resources Development and Management

This component is aimed at addressing impediments to achieving sustainable fisheries management of the two lakes. These problems include: a) un-harmonized policy and regulatory frameworks; b) inadequate knowledge on the status of fish stocks, making it difficult to establish sustainable levels of fishing; c) loss of biodiversity; d) inadequate facilities for seed multiplications and artificial propagation for re-stocking and stock enhancement; improper and un-gazetted breeding/nursery grounds; e) undeveloped exploitation of ‘mukene’ and ‘ragogi’ fishery, etc. The expected outcome is Ecosystem conservation produces sustainable benefits and LEA fisheries are increased sustainably under good bilateral management, planning and M&E practices. Sub components include:

1-1: Updated and harmonized policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, and innovative financing mechanisms jointly adopted by DRC and Uganda—This sub component is key towards development and implementation of an effective and sustainable Fisheries Management Plan for Lake Edward and Albert (LEA). The Project will assist the countries in establishing and enforcing harmonized policy, legal and regulatory frameworks for fisheries development and lake management, as well as explore financing mechanisms for future investments, keeping in view the transboundary concerns.

1-2: Bilateral agreement regarding the protection of fisheries and water resources established—NELSAP shall facilitate the ratification of the bilateral agreement developed to enhance monitoring, control and surveillance activities. The outputs will be a major part of the LEA fisheries management plan to be developed as part of updating of the Integrated Lakes Basin Plan.

1-3: Bilateral Monitoring, Control and Surveillance System established and funded—The project will support a Regional Monitoring, Control and Surveillance System (RMCS). A RMCS action plan will be developed and well equipped patrol boats (2 N^o) will be procured for monitoring and surveillance of the Lakes Edward and Albert, including provisions for boat communication equipment and boat operation. The project will establish a regional fund for the operation of MSC. The funding for the provision of equipment, personnel and other infrastructure for the joint MCS activities by the two countries is provided for, from the ADF loans funding arrangements at the national level

1-4: New technology introduced for sustainable fisheries management—The project will support provision of tools for development of modern fish management innovations for sustainable management of LEA fisheries ecosystem. Key elements will include:

- Setting up of a Fisheries Management Information System (FMIS) through the procurement of necessary ICT equipment and software for the development of an integrated fisheries database for the two neighboring countries. The FMIS would be synchronized with the regional knowledge base to be developed during the update of the ILBMP.
- Support of Fish Catch Assessment and Frame Surveys so as to provide the necessary inputs needed to operate the FIMS. This will improve on the present weak data collection arrangement especially on the fish stocks and nature of the LEA fisheries.
- Support of knowledge generation activities aimed at improving the aquatic biodiversity of the LEA through the expansion of the fishing grounds and protection of sensitive breeding sites.
- Support the determination of diversity in aquatic flora and fauna in the LEA basin, document them, educate people on their importance, and propose ways to exploit them sustainably.
- Support the construction of two fisheries sub-stations (one in each country), using the ADF loans for the assessment and research of fish stocks, fish biodiversity resources, aquatic and environmental quality, fish gear and post-harvesting technology.
- Finance adaptive research regarding innovations for the efficient harvesting of the ‘ragogi and mukene’ fish species, as well as research to determine a sustainable level of fish catches.
- Support efforts aimed at reducing post-harvest loss through provision of 50 modern fish sun drying platforms/racks and 50 modern fish smoking kilns for the women groups at the landing sites. Reduction in fuel utilisation by smoking translates to decrease in rate of deforestation.
- With financing from the ADF loans, support the upgrading of the infrastructure at the landing sites through the construction 5 standard fish handling facilities (3 DRC and 2 Uganda) at major landing sites. In addition, in order to improve market access and enhance the fish quality, the NPMT will construct and rehabilitate 120km (60km per country) of feeder roads.

- Support cage fish culture technology in the two lakes. This effort is aimed at reducing pressure on the fisheries resources and improving the fish stock in the lake. 10 demonstration sites for cage fish farming (5 each in each country) and building capacity in cage culture technology (50% of beneficiaries will be women) will be established.

1-5: Local communities adopt responsible fishing practices and processing techniques—The project will support training, information dissemination and sensitization programs in sustainable fishing practices and fish processing techniques for local communities. These will focus on responsible fishing practices and water utilization methods (gradual abandoning of harmful fishing equipment and practices), improved fish processing and preservation techniques by introducing modern fish drying techniques and smoking methods. Special focus shall be on building the capacity of members of beach management units and at least 50% of the people to be trained will be women. Support of alternative livelihoods for the fishers will be promoted to reduce pressure on the fish resources of LEA while improving income generating capacity of the fishing community and food security.

1-6: Transboundary learning mechanisms, communications and Knowledge Management—Transboundary learning mechanisms, KM, communication and awareness building activities will be undertaken at community and inter-states levels. Experiences will be shared through establishment of websites, bi-annual GEF conferences, regional meetings, IW: LEARN, technical papers, video, technical forums, WWF, AMCOW and other relevant forums. The project will invest in a comprehensive information management strategy by putting in place mechanisms for quick synthesis of information, information sharing and dissemination; structured learning among similar regional transboundary projects and cooperating organization.

Component 2: Integrated Water Resources Management

The project will address the interlinked challenges of poverty and a deteriorating natural resource base in the lakes Edward and Albert Basin to reduce the process of environmental degradation and improve the productive potential of natural resources. Sub components will include the following:

2-1: Integrated Lake Basin Management Plan Updated—The project will support updating of the existing ILMPs for LEA basin. In undertaking the update, there will be a shift from a focus on lake management to Lake Basin management. The finalized Integrated Lake Basin Management Plan will refine the priorities identified in previous studies. Major result areas, will include the following:

- *Development of Regional Knowledge Base* —The project will support the development of a comprehensive spatial database for integrated Lake Basin planning. This will include collation of existing datasets, computerization of available information, and development of GIS datasets organized in a systematic manner using Geodatabases or equivalent. This will also include processing of remote sensing datasets to enable improved use of earth observation products. The NBI Interim Data and information sharing and exchange procedures (2009), and

the Operational Guideline for Implementation of the Interim Procedures, will guide the access of information from the Regional Knowledge base.

- *Accessibility of knowledge to Lake Basin management stakeholders*—The Project will support the development a variety of knowledge products. The spatial database will be used for mapping and creation of knowledge products (e.g. atlases, interactive dataset exploration and visualization toolkits, online mapping, and interfacing with modeling tools). Efforts will be made to make these products as interactive and intuitive to use as possible to improve user experience and learning.
- *Development of Lake Basin planning analytical tools*—The project will support the development of a suite of modeling tools to help simulate, optimize, and compare investment choices that affect various aspects of the water resources and environmental systems. Development of the simulation tools will be informed by experiences from the Nile Equatorial Lakes Basin Planning Model and the Nile basin Decision Support System.
- *Updating the Integrated Lakes Management Plan*—The project will then, building on the updated regional knowledge base and the analytical tools, support the update of the Integrated Lakes Management Plan (prepared under the LEAF 1 pilot phase in 2009), into an Integrated lakes Basin Management Plan (a rolling plan to be updated every 5years) that is based on both the analysis supported by the Planning tools as well as well-structured stakeholder participation. The ILBMP will include Sub-basin plans to support sub-basin investment roll-out as well as contribute to the catchment planning process.

2-2: Establishment of financially Sustainable Basin Management Organization as proposed under the LEAF Integrated Lake Management Plans. GEF financing will support the formulation of a regional Lake basin Institution by offering catalytic support for trust-building mechanisms. This builds on a regional governance baseline analysis, which was undertaken through the pilot phase, and later reinforced as part of the NBI Institutional Design Process (2012). The studies emphasize the roles and functions of sub regional organizations within the context of International waters and Global Environmental benefits. The project will enhance Multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters, through creating an enabling environment for bilateral agreement, between Uganda and DRC on Fisheries management. Detailed activities will include the following:

- *Policy and legal Harmonization*—Activities will include regional dialogue and TA for review and harmonization of policies, legislation, and regulatory standards. This will help to reduce conflicts on both the allocation of the basin's resources among competing uses and the utilization of shared transboundary natural resources (water and fisheries). This component will also establish the necessary structural arrangements for Uganda and DRC to harmonize and co-ordinate regulations and approaches for the improved trans-boundary management of issues such as downstream riparian considerations, fisheries, water quality and effluent standards, diversions and consumptive uses, and the creation and use of economic instruments;
- *Formulation of Joint Management Institution*—The project will support the formation of an institution founded on the basis of agreed core functions.

- *Financing mechanisms for a lake basin management institution*—The project will support TA to study options for establishing the Lakes Edward and Albert Fisheries and Environmental Trust Fund to provide long-term financing for management of other natural resources. All activities of this sub-component are expected to be completed by year 3 of this project. In this regard, the project will support the development of the legal and institutional framework for establishing the Trust Fund, and other sources of financing, including user fees (water, fisheries), pollution charges, and contributions from the private sector.

Sub Component 2-3: Water Resources Information System Strengthened

- *Improve Water Resources Information Systems*—The project will support the development of integrated hydrological, meteorological and water quality monitoring systems in the LEA Basin. It will support updating designs, supply, installation and operation of improved gauging systems, communication, data integration and quality management, and operating costs. It will integrate capacity building of the Uganda and DRC hydro-met agencies managing the Lakes Basin Programme. Installation of the stations will be financed from the ADF loans
- *Support to implementation of the Albertine Graben EMP*—As part of improved monitoring, the project will promote adoption of ecological impact criteria as part of Strategic Impact Assessment processes in order to minimize effects of oil exploration on the ecological character, functions and biodiversity of the lake ecosystems. The Environmental Monitoring Plan (EMP) for the Albertine Graben 2012-2017 (NEMA -Uganda, 2012), will serve as reference. The EMP is intended as a guiding tool in tracking the impact which oil and gas-related developments will have on the environment of the Albertine Graben.
- *Undertake bathymetry/hydrographic survey of the Lakes*—The project will support undertaking a bathymetric survey to facilitate research and planning decisions on the Lakes Edward and Albert. The purpose of the bathymetric survey will be to describe the physical characteristics of the bottom of the two lakes as well as the shoreline. The bathymetric data will be used to construct lake maps showing, depth contours for use in estimation of water level – volume - lake area or stage curve relationships of the lakes. This information is important for evaluating habitat suitability of the two lakes for various aquatic species, assessing the sensitivity of that habitat to development, impact of changes in lake water levels on fish habitat particularly in the shoreline areas, locating critical habitat features (e.g. spawning shoals) and selecting sampling sites for other aquatic surveys.

2-4: Catchment Management Planning

- This sub—component aims at rehabilitation and management of selected sub catchments for reduced erosion and improved livelihoods. The main outcome is Community-based integrated catchment management plans prepared (using GEF funds) and implemented for selected watersheds (using ADF loans), and local capacities on land and soil conservation strengthened.
- *Preparation of three management plans for catchments of transboundary significance*—This sub component will support the strengthening of Institutional Capacity for Catchment planning

and monitoring in Uganda and DRC, along the shared Semliki, Nkusi and Muzizi catchments with four sets of activities: (i) strategic planning and facilitation to support the development of broad catchment plans; (ii) participatory micro-catchment planning to develop integrated plans; (iii) development of guidelines for integrated catchment management and rural infrastructure development and (iv) establishment of catchment management organizations.

- *Rehabilitate Targeted Catchments (ADF Loan Financing)*—This sub component would finance restoration interventions identified in micro-catchment plans by participating communities in each of the three river catchments. Interventions will likely include: (i) soil and water conservation for sustainable and productive agriculture; (ii) forestry and rural energy interventions to restore forest cover and reduce firewood consumption within the sub-catchments; (iii) river bank protection and stabilization of the Nyamwamba and Semliki, river systems. The CDD approach will be used to scale up soil and water management interventions.

2-5: Aquatic Weeds Control on Lake Albert—This sub component aims at establishing sustainable long-term capacity for maintaining control of water hyacinth and other invasive weeds on the Lake Albert. This would be achieved by an integrated effort involving intensified publicity, legislation, and integrated weed management with community involvement. The control program would be integrated and rely on manual and mechanical methods for rapid short term control in restricted areas, and biological agents for longer term control. Reducing nutrient inflows into the lake will be a vital element in long term approaches to dealing with the problem.

Component 3: Enhanced Regional Project Coordination

This component aims at strengthening and formalizing coordination capacities of NELSAP and the participating agencies in Uganda and DRC. The project will be coordinated at the regional level by the NELSAP and implemented at a national level by the relevant country agencies. National level activities will be implemented by existing national institutions and mechanisms. In line with the guidelines for establishing subsidiary entities under the NBI, Uganda and DRC will assume responsibility for continuation of regional level activities after the project ends.

Incremental value of GEF Support

The GEF contribution is fully incremental as it will fund exclusively regional harmonization and project preparation activities. GEF resources provide an excellent portal for influencing a significant investment program in a critical ecosystem, particularly one where the most important priorities are addressing the Basin watershed degradation, and declining fish stock. Establishment of regional cooperation, through the LEAF II project, will likely trigger additional investments by the GEF and other multi-lateral partners to ensure that the NBI is able to prepare and implement sustainability strategies beyond the initial GEF funding. The project will lay the foundations of knowledge, capacity and cooperative institutional frameworks for a long-term program of investments in the LEA basin, which will rehabilitate and stabilise the ecosystem. In particular, these will be investments in

reduction of soil erosion, and sustainable management of fisheries and wetlands. There will be substantial investments guided by the integrated Lakes Basin Management Plan.

Success in the current project will lay the foundations for longer term national benefits for the two countries concerned. For example, if the long-standing barriers to regional fisheries cooperation can be overcome, the design and implementation of a regional fisheries management program will eventually contribute to a more sustainable fish catch, as well as conservation of the lake's aquatic biodiversity. There are, however, significant transaction costs which act as barriers to achieving these benefits. Examples of the barriers are inadequate institutional capacity, information and scientific understanding. The costs of overcoming these barriers are therefore truly incremental. So too are the costs of actions to achieve additional global benefits, such as aquaculture in support of endangered species, and conservation of critical habitats like the Semuliki – Bweramule wetlands.

Cumulatively, the enhanced environment will enhance the ecosystems goods and services, including globally significant biodiversity, as well as maintained capacity of natural systems to sequester carbon. Each project component involves significant regional capacity-building costs first to establish cooperative agreements, and second to implement priority elements. These costs are clearly incremental in that they are not in the national baselines, would not be incurred without the project, and address transboundary environmental issues.

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

The Basin countries have agreed, and are committed, to achieving the Project’s development objectives. They are also committed to sustaining its activities and implementing the lessons learned after Project completion. Annex A, the Results and Monitoring Framework, outlines the critical assumptions to be heeded during Project implementation to minimize risks as they correspond to the outcome indicators. Emergent risks were categorized into institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks, and for each potential risk, a mitigation strategy was developed, as reflected in the Table below

Risk	Rating	Mitigation Measure
Institutional Risks		
Riparians do not successfully or completely establish a transboundary land and water framework for the sustainable development of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin.	Moderate	Riparian governments have agreed to GEF Project goals through Project preparation workshops. Risk mitigation lies in realistic scheduling of process, timetable and budget.
Political Risk —The long term success of regional scale management programs, such as the one proposed here depend, inter alia, on the political willingness of the participating countries	<i>Moderate to high.</i>	The countries, notwithstanding the focus on short term priorities at the expense of environmental integrity, are increasingly committed to a regional approach to shared

Risk	Rating	Mitigation Measure
<p>(Uganda and DR Congo) to co-operate, their willingness to continue project programs and approaches after the life of the GEF intervention, and the extent to which activities successfully engage end users at the community level. The participating countries have witnessed recent national and regional strife and, lack of donor support, and short term priorities such as human health, education, basic sanitation, and nutrition, it is difficult to create a focus on what appears to be longer term environmental imperatives.</p>		<p>environmental concerns as a means of ensuring sustainability of their shared, fragile resources. Nonetheless, while crises seem to have abated somewhat over the past few years, a risk to the project from a return to civil unrest and other socially destabilizing events must still be seen as a significant risk to the GEF intervention follow-on project. The exit strategy for the GEF in this project is to predicate further involvement in a SAP implementation project to strong country and LEAF performance during the life of this intermediate project.</p>
<p>Basin Coordination Agency: Integrated Lakes basin management is multi sectoral in nature, and involves coordinating activities across a large number of public, private and donor agencies. Creation of a Lakes basin planning and coordination agency will be a new step for NELSAP and whilst multi-sectoral planning should produce synergies in most cases, there remains a risk that individual stakeholder agencies may feel that their actions are being constrained and therefore oppose the basin planning process or agency</p>	Moderate	<p>Design of the institutional structure of the expected basin management agency will take into account the need for sufficient status of the agency and representation of key stakeholders. The project will also greatly improve the knowledge base for decision making, including real-time spatial tracking of development activities within the Basin. It will make the knowledge base public and include a program of external relations and media activities, which will increase understanding and the onus on stakeholders to engage constructively.</p>
<p>Differential National Capacity: Different pace of project implementation among the countries (one country falling behind and dragging efforts of others) due to varying capacity</p>	High	<p>A flexible project design allows countries and implementing agencies of components to move at different pace depending on their capacity. Budgets are allocated for capacity building of national institutions. Delays to be highlighted in implementation progress reports</p>
<p>Limited capacity or willingness to enforce the agreed legal and regulatory framework</p>	Moderate	<p>Capacity of the Fisheries, Water Resources, Environmental agencies and District Environmental Units will be strengthened and common levels of enforcement sought.</p>
<p>Community involvement -There are several complexities and risks of failure involved with work at the community level: Livelihoods-based</p>	Moderate	<p>Strong community leadership and building interest are key determinants of success. Micro-catchment investments would</p>

Risk	Rating	Mitigation Measure
<p>catchment management at the community level is often unsustainable if designed without taking into account socio-economic conditions and making sufficient investments in local capacities and institutions. Participatory management of natural habitats may fail if sustainable uses promoted (e.g. community agro-forestry) do not provide sufficient incentives or income to overcome short term resource depletion incentives. Community NRM objectives may not be met if activities are not suitably gender-targeted, or may not be sustained if youth groups are not involved.</p>		<p>follow an in-depth social analysis and participatory planning conducted with local leaders and stakeholders representing the range of needs and priorities of the targeted population. Catchment management will be pragmatic, exploring a range of options and emphasizing multiple revenue streams where possible, including ongoing government support and global conservation funding. Community engagement will emphasize the participation of women along with enhancing opportunities of other vulnerable groups. The project will promote women's active participation in local institutions.</p>
Socio-economic Risks		
<p>Catchment management —Investments in catchment management are long term by nature, and their impact is difficult to monitor and dependent on a critical mass of activity being achieved</p>	Moderate	<p>The program is explicitly designed with initial phase concentrating activities to show demonstrable impact in selected hotspot catchment areas and other targeted areas critical for maintenance of ecological infrastructure. This approach will allow local experience to be gained and lessons learned to guide scaled up operations in later phases.</p>
<p>Lack of long-term financial commitments and sustainability — The risk of GEF project programs, and activities related to them, ending after the life of the project. It is unlikely that the countries can, without greater donor support than is now the case, sustain project efforts.</p>	Substantial	<p>LEAF II is included in the countries' rolling MTEFs and mechanisms would be developed under the project for sustainable financing, such as Payment for Environmental Services, Carbon Finance, and Environmental Taxes are introduced. The ability of the countries, AfDB and with GEF assistance, to solicit enhanced donor support will be crucial to sustainability of project efforts.</p>
Environmental risks		
<p>Climate change—Vulnerability to changing environmental conditions Climate change impacts are larger than anticipated levels. The region is likely to face more droughts and floods</p>	Moderate	<p>The project is flexible enough to function under changing conditions. NELSAP guidelines for mainstreaming climate adaptation into investment programming (2012) and relevant tools will be used to guide integration of climate dimensions</p>

Risk	Rating	Mitigation Measure
		into project preparation and implementation. An improved water resources information system, will also promote climate resilience growth planning in the basin. Other measures will include: adoption of “no-regrets” approaches in all IWRM and Sustainable Fisheries Management Practices and participatory M & E of climate parameters and adaptation options.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The coordination of hitherto fragmented natural resources and biodiversity management projects into an integrated basin management approach is a key outcome of the Lakes Edward and Albert project and critical to the subsequent scale-up of fisheries and watershed management with significant effects on the water resources in the basin. Before the long-term basin management entity is established, coordination between agencies and with other programs will be the responsibility of the project coordination unit at the NELSAP, supported by National Coordination Units for the ADF financed National components. The mission also had interactions with some Development Partners supporting the government in the sectors of water and agriculture including GIZ and the World Bank. The table below provides an overview of the most significant interventions which are underway in the basin related to water resources, environment management and agricultural sectors.

Program Name	Program Objective	Program Scope
DR Congo— Urban Water Supply Project for Democratic Republic of Congo, World Bank, US\$ 166 million, Effectiveness 2016	The development objective of the Urban Water Supply Project for Democratic Republic of Congo is to increase sustainable access to water in selected urban areas and the efficiency of the state water utility (régie de distribution d’eau de la République Démocratique du Congo) (REGIDESO).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – providing access to improved water services to ~ 1,395,000 additional people, increasing the project outcome target by 116 percent; – improving equity and quality in the delivery of water services to the urban population of the targeted cities through the rehabilitation and expansion of the water facilities; and – improving the governance and operational performances of REGIDESO through the extension of the ongoing arrangements for private sector participation (PSP) in the delivery of services, the improvement of maintenance and staff productivity, and effective and proactive monitoring of the quality of

Program Name	Program Objective	Program Scope
		water services
Support to the water sector reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo, German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) 2012-2016	The institutional and legal conditions in place in the Democratic Republic of Congo enable the population to have sustainable access to drinking water and sanitation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – strategic and technical advice on designing and implementing individual elements of the reform – promoting long-term policy dialogue between water sector institutions – measures to strengthen personnel and institutional skills and resources, together with measures to make authorities and municipalities more effective.
Uganda - Water Management and Development Project (2012-2018) World Bank, Ministry of Water and Environment, US\$ 135 million	Strengthen institutional capacity for sustainable Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) planning, management and development, and to improve access and reliability of water services in priority urban centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Investment in Integrated Water Resources Development and Management – Infrastructure Investments in Urban Water Supply and Sanitation/Sewerage and Catchment/Source Protection – Strengthening Institutions for Effective Project Implementation
Uganda-Water Supply and Sanitation Program II (WSSP II) ; implementation commences 2016, Ministry of Water and Environment, AfDB US \$91-million	The objective of the Water Supply and Sanitation Programme II (WSSP II), aligned to the NDP II, is to contribute to improved health and productivity of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WSSP II program has 3 components; i) Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS); ii) Urban Water Supply and Sanitation (UWSS) and iii) Sector Program Support (SPS).
Uganda, Kampala Water – Lake Victoria Water And Sanitation Project (Kw-LV Watsan Project), Ministry of Water and Environment completion 2017 (Euros 212 Million), KfW EIB AFD EU Infrastructure Trust Fund and Government of Uganda/NWSC	The project aims at addressing water supply challenges in greater Kampala metropolitan area up to the year 2035.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Packages 1&3; Rehabilitation of Gaba I & II treatment Plants and New Transmission Mains from Gaba to Namasuba – Package 2; Water network modelling & master planning, and re-zoning and extension – Package 4; Katosi water treatment plant and Water quality monitoring – Package 5; Improvement of water supply and sanitation in the informal settlements
Nile Basin Initiative ¹² Support to transboundary water cooperation in the Nile Basin (NBI), 2002 to 2016 ,	NBI's contribution to consensus building and cooperation in water resources management and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – promoting dialogue between key national stakeholders from policy making, civil society that have role to play in ensuring cooperation on issues relating to the Nile

¹² Uganda, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Sudan, DRC
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

Program Name	Program Objective	Program Scope
German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	development between the Nile Basin's riparian countries is enhanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – supporting Nile basin states to make sound decisions on cooperative water resources management – creating favorable conditions for sustainable investments in Nile basin – building technical skills for successful water cooperation among member states
Nile Basin Initiative— Biodiversity conservation and utilisation of ecosystems in the Nile basin wetlands of transnational relevance, GIZ (Euro 6 million)	The project objective is to develop the capacities of the NBI and its member states for sustainable transnational management of relevant wetlands based on an ecosystem management approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis ; – TEEB —economics of wetland conservation – Green Infrastructure Study – (4) Pilot measures - in five transnational sub-basins (Mara: Tanzania - Kenya, Kagera: Tanzania - Uganda; Sio-Malaba-Malakisi: Kenya - Tanzania; Albert graben: Uganda – DR Congo; Sudd: South Sudan) for which the NBI develops RBM plans for the White Nile
Nile Basin Initiative- Nile Cooperation for Results Project	The development objective for the proposed project is “to facilitate cooperative water resource management and development in the Nile Basin.”	<p>Advancing Nile Basin-Wide Cooperation and Analysis. Actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strengthening the platform for basin-wide cooperation (incl. riparian awareness, dialogue, and resource mobilization) and – Enhancing capacity and understanding for cooperative management and development of water resources in the Nile Basin (technical and operational support, for Nile DSS modeling tools, basin-wide real-time hydro-met monitoring network etc.) – Advancing cooperative investments

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

Throughout the preparation of this project it has become clear that a genuine commitment to stakeholder involvement is imperative as the only way of ensuring co-operation at all significant levels, promoting sustainable and productive engagement with local environments and involving the private sector and locally elected organizations in seeking negotiated solutions to environmental degradation in the Lakes Edward and Albert basin.

A stakeholder analysis and strategy was prepared during the LEAF pilot phase and updated, during the Bank appraisal of the LEAF II project in 2014. Management of the Lakes Edward and Albert basin involves a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups, including various water withdrawal operations such as wastewater management systems, fishery organizations, local and regional governments, business operations (including the tourist industry), park operations, research and educational institutions, environmental protection and nature conservation groups, citizen organizations, politicians, women, youth, indigenous people, and the poor. While some of the stakeholder groups have a vested interest in Lake Basin resources themselves, others, like politicians, have an interest in performing catalytic roles.

Extensive engagement was undertaken during project preparation involving consultations with relevant government entities and fisher communities along Lakes Edward and Albert. The Mission met with various agencies as part of the consultation process in project formulation (the *detailed consultation report is attached as appendix 7 in annex 1 attached to this letter to the CEO*). In Uganda the agencies included: the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; the National Environmental Management Agency, the World Bank, Uganda Country Office; the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; the Ministry of Water and Environment, Directorate of Water Resources Management; the Albert Water Management Zone, Hoima District Local Government, the Nile Basin Discourse (Civil Society); the Kasese District Local Government; the Katwe-Kabatoro Fisheries co-management unit (community group); the African Development Bank Group- Uganda Field Office.

In the DRC, the mission met and consulted with the following agencies: The African Development Bank Group- DRC Field Office; the Ministère de l'Environnement, Conservation de la Nature; the Ministère Développement Rural; the Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche and the Goma, North Kivu Province and the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature, ICCN (Virunga) who are responsible for management of the Lake Edward. Other agencies consulted included the Nile Basin Initiative Secretariat, and the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program.

The consultation process produced socio economic profiles of the communities and documented critical areas of concern from both governments, development partners involved in the sector and the fisher communities (refer to consultation report). The issues of concern expressed by stakeholders representing government institutions as well as fisher communities during the LEAF Pilot Project are still valid today. In essence, the erosion of the natural resource base due to growing population in the fishing villages, over-fishing, and point- and non-point pollution, have caused ecological imbalances which are impacting on the ecosystems of the lakes, consequently posing a threat to lake fisheries, and therefore to the livelihoods of the fisher communities, as well as to other potential sources of income, such as tourism. The use of existing National agencies, for coordination of national level activities and consultations was stressed.

LEAF II builds on and adds to the level of public involvement. It will do this through the involvement of communities and through the recruitment of stakeholder participation from the NGO, fishers, herders, representatives from the agricultural sector, and representation from the private sector, most particularly the petroleum (Oil and gas) industry in the Albertine rift. Stakeholder participation will also be sought during the full life of the project in the development and implementation of all project elements, with particular emphasis on the various catchment management projects, alternative livelihoods and during the updating of the Lakes Edward and Albert Integrated Basin Management Plan. It is already recognized by the countries in the agreed ILMP that genuine commitment to stakeholder involvement is imperative as the only way of ensuring co-operation at all significant levels, promoting sustainable and productive engagement with local environments and involving the private sector (mining and petroleum industry) and locally elected organizations in seeking negotiated solutions to environmental degradation.

The project implementation will build on the capacities of existing institutions at both National and regional level. Mechanisms have been established at national level for the loan components of the project financed through ADF. Given the nature of the regional components, the project intends to draw on the expertise of other institutions and structures responsible for park management, like ICCN—the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (Virunga) who are responsible for managing Lake Edward as it is situated within the Park in DRC, and the Uganda Wild Life Authority (UWA) responsible for management of Lake Edward in the Park in Uganda. The two are explicitly included in the project design. Virunga (COOPEVI). The ICCN enters into agreement periodically with them to manage fisheries on Lake Edward.

During project implementation, it will be important for the stakeholders to understand the close connection between the condition of the basin's resources and their quality of life, including economic opportunities, health, heritage, and aesthetics, and for them to be involved from the beginning of the planning process so that they may have a greater acceptance of the policies and actions developed, and a greater willingness to form partnerships to work toward implementation. Being involved from the outset will allow the setting of common priorities, mutual understanding in the approaches to be applied, and prevention of duplication and overlapping of activities. Actions at the onset of implementation will include: (i) A stakeholder analysis that should map out stakeholders based on interest in, influence over and importance to the project, identification of potential risks and conflicts that may jeopardize the project, possible relationships that can be built on during implementation and design an appropriate stakeholder consultation/participation strategy and plan (ii) Development of criteria for selecting target area and beneficiary communities taking into consideration objectives of the project, need, location as well as taking into account vulnerable and disadvantaged groups (iii) Adoption of participatory processes in the planning and execution of specific project components. These processes should be as inclusive as is applicable to the outputs by embracing civil society, community based organizations, women and youth organizations, self-help enterprises/cooperatives, local interest groups and consultation and involvement of both men

and women in the decision making processes.

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

The Lakes Edward and Albert are dynamic ecosystems, and in addition to their storage function they are the source of food and recreation for the population in the basin, support a large range of biodiversity goods and services and provide the foundation for people's livelihoods. Inland fisheries, and related export and regional trade, play a significant role in the economy of LEA basin and the partner states of Uganda and DRC. The two lakes support a wide diversity of flora and fauna. They play a major economic role in the riparian countries, of Uganda and DRC, including supporting fishing industry for export and local consumption, lake transportation, and irrigation development.

The estimated number of direct beneficiaries is about 400,000 people consisting mainly of the members of BMU/UGREP in the two countries who are active stakeholders along the value chains. They include about 35% fishermen who actually do fishing on the lakes, 10% crew members of the fishing boats/vessels while the rest is made of 55% who are involved in the various value addition processes of where the women predominate. The income generated from the fishery provides food security, and supports the livelihoods in the basin. By promoting the development, conservation and sustainable management of transboundary fisheries and water resources of LEA basin, which is of significant socioeconomic importance to both DRC and Uganda, the project will generate a positive impact on the quality of life of about 2 million people living in the Lakes Edward and Albert basins.

The lakes are also an important source of domestic and industrial water supply, and repository of wastewaters. The oil and gas industry water requirements in the Lake Albert basin have for instance been estimated to increase from the present day 7MCM annually to 36.5 MCM annually by 2040. The Lakes are a repository of the urban, domestic and industrial wastewaters, including urban runoff, as well as the sediment loads and nutrients from the agricultural and livestock areas, which enter the Lakes through the numerous river systems. The discharge of these effluents into the Lakes causes pollution, by increasing the concentration of Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), total Phosphorus (TP), total Nitrogen (TN), and Chlorophyll-a, resulting into eutrophication. The lakes also moderate the local climate by reducing the range of atmospheric temperatures fluctuations.

The water and fisheries resources of the two lakes sector are a key entry point for poverty alleviation and gender empowerment. While professional fish capture (harvesting) is dominated by men, post-harvest activities (fish processing, fish retailing, and trading) are often done by women [well established]. Uneducated and poor women are often involved in post-harvest activities, which do not require large capital investments or high technical skills. A large proportion of small-scale (household) fishers are women and children. For thousands of other women, however, fish processing

and trade are more about economic survival. They often operate in an informal environment, making their contributions less visible than those of the rest of the sector. For these women, the income generated by post-harvest activities is often their only source of cash income, in particular in societies where men control a large part of the household's main cash-generating activities [established but incomplete]. Improved management of the lakes natural resources will therefore be particularly beneficial to women, and the GEF activities will follow gender-sensitive approaches developed under the main project. The project is designed to pursue a deliberate gender-sensitive approach whereby women's participation in training workshops, on-the-ground interventions, multi-stakeholder forums and LEA basin user groups will be strongly promoted. The strategy for gender mainstreaming under LEAF II aims at: (i) contributing as much as possible, to the reduction of gender based inequalities that may exist in the project area within the context of the LEAF II, (ii) Encouraging both men and women to participate in project activities; ensure that their specific needs are taken into account, that they benefit from the project and that the project impacts positively on their lives; (iii) Creation of conditions for equitable access by men and women to project resources and benefits; and, (iv) Creation of conditions for equitable participation in project implementation and decision making processes, with special focus on co-management (see PPR for details). The implementation of the project's gender mainstreaming strategy will ensure that the various socioeconomic benefits, including improved income level from fisheries related activities, market access, water quality and quantity, health quality, alternative livelihood opportunities among others, are felt by both women and men.

Investments in improvement of navigation and maritime safety in the basin, will likely promote a cheap, energy efficient, relatively safe, and environmentally friendly transport mode. Navigation is broadly limited to fishing activities and informal small-scale transportation of passengers. The Lake Albert has also historically provided communication, between Mahagi port in DRC and Butiaba in Uganda. The emerging oil activity around the lake will most probably resuscitate the port in the near future to play a role in the transportation of equipment, manpower and petroleum products.

Strengthening transboundary management of LEA basin will lead to improved benefit-sharing of water-related goods and services in both DRC and Uganda. This will serve as a means to enhance regional development and economic integration. Improved and integrated management of surface water resources will also contribute to local and regional sustainable development, improve natural risk prevention and reduce vulnerability to climate change. At national level, improved institutional frameworks and capacities for cooperation will be of great benefit to the operation of ILMP for the LEA basin. National benefits will be realized from improved surface water and fisheries resources management, increased capacities of local/regional authorities and stakeholders to sustainably manage and use fisheries and water resources, and improved coordination. Locally, the capacities will be enhanced to sustainably manage fisheries and water resources of LEA basin, with increased community and ecosystem resilience to climate change.

The above defined socioeconomic activities within the project will contribute to the overall global benefits through directly impacting on the food security, safeguarding ecosystem services, improving water quality and supporting long term adaptation measures of LEA basin. Global environmental benefits will result from improved fish production, integrated ecosystem, water management and catchment protection that will lead to improvement in the resource base of the LEA basin population as a whole, and respond to the global emerging challenge of climate change

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

Project alternatives considered and reasons for rejection:

A systematic review of Project alternatives evaluated the priority concerns and issues in the Lakes Edward and Albert basin. The alternatives, and the justification for their dismissal, are shown in the table below.

Options Considered	Description	Reason for Rejection
Large scale project	A project focused on large-scale, integrated basin management as proposed in the LEAF 1 (pilot phase) , estimated at US\$ 170 million was considered, in order to support a national network of such areas.	There is no agreed legal and institutional framework for the management of the Lake Edward and Albert basin, which would permit the project to finance implementation of such a large scale project directly. A scaled down project (US\$ 25 million) was considered that will strengthen fisheries and water institutions, work towards a bilateral agreement and creation of a basin agency, as well as implement some community driven type projects. If this is successful, the project can be scaled up in line with the updated integrated lake basin Management Plan.
Parallel individual national programs.	Two Different Projects in each of the member states for the Lakes Edward and Albert basin.	Individual national programs would not address the transboundary issues or the need for a systematic and coordinated data and knowledge exchange for Basin land and water management. Preparation of two separate national programs would be costly and result in duplication and inconsistencies. As a result, the option of developing LEAF II as a regional program was chosen mainly because it provides a platform for dialogue and harmonization of policy, legislations, and regulatory frameworks for transboundary natural resources. In addition, a regional project provides opportunities for adopting cooperative management frameworks for the shared transboundary natural resources (water and fisheries), and equitable benefit sharing..
Scaling up co-management and community driven type activities	In terms of replicating the experiences of co-management under the LEAF 1, the project considered scaling up the area of intervention to try to demonstrate interventions along both lakes in the two	Given the limited amount of funds available and the benefits of scale from concentrating in one area, the project will focus geographically in selected UGREPS or Beach management Units. This will allow neighboring communities to collaborate and reinforce their efforts, as well as human and financial resources to be economized. Expansion can be done within the framework of subsequent programs

Options Considered	Description	Reason for Rejection
	countries	
Blended versus stand-alone project	As a stand-alone GEF project, the project would have had a much more limited impact and geographic scope due to resource constraints and higher risks	As a blended operation, the project will benefit from a strengthened NELSAP CU, targeted capacity-building activities, and additional funding from the ADF (Loan components) to manage longer-term local, national and global environmental issues that contribute to the perpetuation of rural poverty in the Lakes Edward and Albert basin .It is unlikely that without the structure and resources lent through a blended operation, that subprojects supported through the ADF, would be able to generate in the aggregate the same degree of broad, multiple benefits to diverse stakeholders.

Cost Effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness of project investments is presented in the project Economic and Financial Analysis (Annex 1). Cost-effectiveness is given by the fully-blended design approach of the project. This allows use of GEF resources exclusively for value-added investments and TA which generate global environmental benefits related to the management and utilization of the shared international waters of the Lakes Edward and Albert. The global environmental benefits are manifest in (i) Multi-state cooperation to reduce threats to international waters —formulating legal and institutional structures and capacity to facilitate these actions; (ii) Reduced pollution load in international waters from nutrient enrichment and land-based activities—through catchment based management (iii) Restored and sustained freshwater, ecosystems goods and services (through fisheries information systems, bilateral MCS etc.), including globally significant biodiversity, as well as maintained capacity of natural systems to sequester carbon; and (iv) Reduced vulnerability to climate variability and related risks, and increased ecosystem resilience, through improved water resources information systems.

The project will promote catalytic and transformational investments in Sustainable Land management, as well as co-management measures at strategic locations with a view to achieving the greatest on-site and off-site impacts (both social and environmental), whilst using the least inputs possible. The Project will conduct a rigorous monetary and non-monetary cost-benefit analysis of different catchment management measures and will undertake proper mapping of impacts on land quality and water resources, to ensure that outcomes are achieved in the most efficient way. Planning will be financed using GEF funds, while implementation of interventions will be undertaken, through the ADF financed loans at National level.

An estimated 7% of the GEF IW allocation will be used to promote strengthening the integrative, technical and administrative capacity of institutions across the water resources and fisheries management spectrum, to ensure that their capacity and effectiveness is optimized. This will

contribute to maximizing the impact of other aspects of the project as the resources will be more effectively deployed as institutional capacity deficits are reduced

The project will work through partnerships that recognize different skills and comparative advantages and promote dialogue around common interests. This will make it possible to capitalize on the synergistic benefits that can be realized by pooling resources and working towards transnational wetlands management, reducing land degradation on a catchment-wide scale, and sustainable fisheries management. Building on the back of stronger stakeholder linkages, the project will invest in activities that incrementally improve the living conditions of communities, and develop their understanding of the rationale underlying basin regulations. This should contribute to improved compliance, which, in turn, will reduce the recurrent costs of monitoring and managing illegal fishing and other illegal natural resource use.

Wherever possible, the project will use the competencies and technical skills within the mandated government institutions, and research institutions like the National Fisheries Research Institute in Uganda, and the ICCN in DRC, to implement project activities and provide information needed for the specialist studies. Wherever possible, project resources will be used to strengthen existing SLM- and water-related programmes, like the Uganda initiated Semuliki CMP, in order to avoid duplication and redundancy. The project will build social capital by working, wherever possible through existing local structures that have established norms and procedures for cooperation, and through local champions who can serve as ‘multipliers’ in the community.

The PCU will be supported throughout the life of the project by technical experts from the NELSAP CU and key implementing partners in the Ministries responsible for Agriculture, Fisheries, Water Resources and Environment and some associated institutions – this Team participated actively in the project formulation stage and will remain actively engaged in the project, providing overall technical guidance to the Project as part of leveraged co-finance. Throughout the lifespan of the project the PCU will work to target increased co-finance commitments.

The choice of a binational harmonized approach to address the threats to Lakes Edward and Albert basins is more cost effective and sustainable than the exclusive implementation of individual actions by each of the countries. By developing a harmonized updated regional integrated lake basin Management Plan, priority actions to reduce the most pressing transboundary problems that would otherwise compromise LEA fisheries productivity, water quality and quantity will be identified. Formation of a binational LEA management organization will facilitate the implementation of harmonized approaches and reduce duplication of efforts, thus maximizing the impact of the resources invested. The project will address the identified barriers in regional, national and local capacities for sustainable natural resource management and planning, primarily through the delivery of TA. This financial modality is considered the most appropriate and cost effective means by which

to strengthen the systemic planning and institutional capacities for binational management of LEA basin fisheries and water resources.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The aim of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is to assist the NELSAP and agencies in the partner states to assess project performance based on the indicators outlined in the Results Framework of the project (Appendix 1 of the PPR). Monitoring will consist of continuous and/or periodic review and surveillance of activities with respect to management, and the implementation of the work plans. The project's M&E will focus on three aspects: (i) project implementation; (ii) project performance; and (iii) project impact and sustainability.

The project will establish an appropriate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system (building on the NBI Result based policy, Strategy and toolbox for Work planning, Reporting and M & E) to track progress against these core indicators as well as against a larger set of component-wise indicators that will paint a broader picture of overall project performance. The Regional Project Coordinator, supported by the NELSAP Senior Economist will on behalf of the implementing agencies, be responsible for the overall LEAF II M&E.

A web-based Management project-wide Information System (MIS) will be established to serve as a tool for enhancing transparency, rigorous standards, supervision, and auditing to ensure accountability. It will mainly address input-output monitoring related to the various activities proposed under the three components and sub-components as a means of tracking implementation progress. Given the time lag between Phase 1 project conclusion (2009) and commencement of Phase II (2016), a baseline survey will be prepared during the first year, against the project indicators. The MIS will be developed for monitoring the progress in implementation of various project components. The main modules of the MIS will be installed at the NELSAP CU offices, with sub-modules at the National Offices in the National Focal Point Ministries of Uganda and DR Congo. At the national level, each National office will ensure that each implementing agency is linked to its sub-modules. The MIS will be designed based on the project's results framework. It will also provide a systematic link between the PDO/Global Environmental Objective, the outcomes under various components, outputs, activities, and inputs. The development of the MIS will be coordinated by the NELSAP CU, with substantial involvement of the Partner States.

Community-based M&E will regularly track the performance and impact of the CDD type catchment and fisheries management sub projects. The community-based M&E will be enhanced through integration of social accountability mechanisms, such as the community scorecard and report card systems, social audits, participatory budgeting and expenditure reviews, as well as conducting participatory poverty assessments.

A major effort will be dedicated to improving, updating and modernizing M&E systems at different levels and for different purposes, such as for instance: (a) water and climate monitoring systems; (b) vegetative cover and land-use monitoring systems; (c) capacity of community groups in terms of sustainable land and water management; (d) Environmental and Social Management Plans; and (f) vulnerability levels of target populations. Some of these have a much wider reach than the overall project input-output monitoring framework, for instance by providing data and analysis on the Lakes Edward and Albert basin as a whole. The M&E would involve a combination of field-based data collection and remote sensing/ GIS.

The total budget for the M&E component of the project is of \$ 300,000 primarily supported by co-financing. Out of this amount, GEF support is estimated at US\$ 160,000, and is directed towards (i) Developing an internal/project communication system and link it to the M&E system, (ii) Harmonizing data gathering and analyses procedures, methods, standards, tools and protocols among countries (iii) Developing a regional M&E system and information sharing protocols, linked to the web-based Management Information System (MIS) (iv) external audits (v) project launch workshop and (vi) semiannual M & E missions to the project area by the NELSAP CU.

M & E Activity	Timing/Frequency	Responsibility	Budget, US\$
Inception /Induction workshop	Within first two month of the project startup	NELSAP CU and PCU	40,000
Harmonizing data gathering and analyses procedures, methods, standards, tools and protocols among countries	Within first two month of the project startup	NELSAP CU	20,000
Developing a regional M&E system and information sharing protocols, linked to the web-based Management Information System (MIS)	Within first two month of project startup	NELSAP CU	20,000
Technical Reports	Semi-Annually, Annually	NELSAP CU, PCU	20,000
External Audit Reports	Annually	NELSAP, External Consultant	60,000
Periodic Monitoring and Evaluation Visits to project area	Semi annually	NELSAP CU	60,000
Mid Term Review	End of Year 3	Independent consultants contracted by NEL-PCU	40,000
Project Completion Review (PCR)	End of Year 5	NELSAP CU, PCU	40,000


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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Patrick Ocailap	Deputy Secretary to the Treasury/GEF Focal Point	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda	January 27, 2014
Vincent Kasulu Seya Makonga	Secretariat general A L'Environnement Et Conservation De La Nature	Ministere de l'Environnement, Conservation de la Nature et Tourisme	December 19, 2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

--

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mahamat ASSOUYOUTI		03/03/2016	Oladapo OLAGOKE	+225 20263494	o.oladapo@afdb.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Countries and Project Name: DR CONGO & REPUBLIC OF UGANDA: Multinational- Lakes Edward & Albert Integrated Fisheries & Water Resources Mgt. Project

Project Purpose: To sustainably utilize the fisheries and allied natural resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin through harmonized legal framework and policies.

IMPACT	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
		Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
	Poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods for local communities and global environmental benefit	National Poverty Rate Food Security Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 71% & 19.5% respectively for DRC & Uganda below USD 1.25 purchasing power parity/day – 75% and 65% food insecure person in DRC and Uganda respectively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – By Year 2019, 60% & 15% respectively below USD 1.25 PPP/day – 50% & 45% of population food insecure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Poverty Assessment Reports; UNDP HDI 	<p>Assumptions: Governments of Uganda and DRC commitment to declared project objectives and peace initiative sustained.</p> <p>Risks: Political instability This is mitigated through strengthening of NBI.</p>
OUTCOMES	Sustainable utilization of fisheries and allied natural resources of the Lakes Edward and Albert Basin through harmonized legal framework and policies.	Improved fisheries resources management through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Average Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE); – % reduction in the use of illegal fishing system; – % Catch of other fish species 	Baseline study to be conducted (2016);	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 50% increase in yield of CPUE of baseline figure – 50% reduction in illegal fishing practices by 2019 – 25% increase in catches for under-exploited pelagic species 		
	Enhanced women's access to resource	Percentage of increased of allocated resources to women	Baseline study to be conducted (2016);	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 70% of women benefitting from the alternative livelihood options 		

CT	IMPA	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
			Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
OUTPUTS	A) Fisheries Resources Development and Management Component cost: UA 9.368 million						
		A.1 Monitoring and Surveillance Activities of the Lake improved and harmonized;	A.1) Increased patrol for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) and Information Management	Zero (2014)	Total of 48 patrols conducted by 2019 (including 8 joint bilateral patrols)	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR	
		A.2 Harmonized Policy Framework developed	A.2) Improved compliance with fishing regulations	Current level of infractions to be determine through baseline survey	50% Reduction in Number of infractions recorded	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR	<u>Risk:</u> The vagaries of the weather can lead to the degradation of ecosystems and biodiversity <u>Mitigation Measure:</u> Financing of resilience actions, fight against fragilities,
OUTPUTS	A.3 Capacity building on best fishing practices and training in biodiversity protection	A.3) Number of Beach Management Units (BMUs) capacitated through trainings	10 BMU as at 2014	60 BMU at 2019 with at least 50% women	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR		
	A.4 Data gathering (Catches Assessment: Frame survey, Fish stock and catch assessment) for operation of Regional Information system established	A.4) Status of fish stock & CPUE established .through improved data collection on fish stock for effective management of fisheries resources;	Nil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 standardized Catch Assessment Survey designed and implemented on each lake - 1 Regional information system established for each of the lakes 	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR		
	A.5 Conservation of	A.5) Knowledge base on LEA	Nil	- Over 90% of the fish	Project reports ,		

CT	IMPA	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
			Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
		aquatic biodiversity	aquatic biodiversity improved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected area established and demarcated Conservation and environmental education conducted Number of fisheries research station established 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> breeding ground identified are protected and demarcated All the fishers communities within the project area trained on conservation and environmental education Two fisheries research sub –stations established and equipped 	M&E reports; PCR	
		A.6 Fish quality and value addition	A.6) Reduction in post-harvest losses and improved fish quality and basic infrastructure provided <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Fish landing sites constructed with market stalls Number of fish drying facilities and smoking kilns provided Feeder Roads rehabilitated 	Baseline survey Zero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 % increase in total volume of Fish traded by women fish marketers 4 fish landing sites with marketing stalls constructed (80% allocated to women) 50 fish sun dry facilities and 50 smoking kilns provided 150 km of Feeder roads rehabilitated 	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR	
		A7 Alternative livelihood development	A.7) Number of people trained and gainfully employed in alternative sources of income of 50% of which were women	Zero Zero	15,000 trained at least 50% women	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR	
		A.8 Aquaculture Development	A.8.1) Estimate of Aquaculture potentials (carrying capacity) for each Lake	Baseline survey Zero	1 survey conducted 10 pilot fish cage farming established		

CT	IMPA	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
			Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
			A8. 2) Pilot Tilapia Cage farming				
		A. 9. Navigational and maritime safety strategy established	Navigation and Maritime safety strategy and action Plan	Zero	Navigation and Maritime safety strategy and action Plan	Project reports , M&E reports; PCR	
		B. Integrated Water Resources Management, Component cost: UA 4.290 Million					
		B.1) Lake Edward Institutional Arrangements for collaborative management and development of the fisheries and water resources developed;	Coordination capacities of NELSAP and the participating agencies in Uganda and DRC are strengthened and formalized.	Zero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal and institutional Instruments for the joint management of LEA fisheries and water resources developed, agreed and ratified by Uganda and DRC; - Sustainable financing mechanisms developed, agreed and operationalized; 		
		B2) Existing Integrated Lake Management Plans (ILMP) updated and adopted at ministerial level by Uganda and DRC	Basin hydrological and natural resources database	NBI Regional Knowledge base Nile Information system	- LEA Basin natural resources database in place		
			Knowledge products (hardcopy/ electronic)	Zero	- At Least 10 knowledge products on the state of the basin (2 annually)		
			Water resources management and planning model ¹³	NEL basin planning model; Nile Basin DSS	Water resources management and planning model developed		
			Updated Integrated Lakes	Integrated Lakes	Updated Integrated		

¹³ Knowledge products (hardcopy/ electronic) and decision support systems/ web based tools developed with appropriate integration of new ecological information
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

CT	IMPA	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
			Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
			Management Plan	Management Plan (Phase I) Baseline survey (2016)	Management Plan Incl. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fisheries Management Plan - Biodiversity Conservation Plan - Water resource assessment, Disaster Management Plan - Watershed Management Plans - Water Quality Management Plan - Pollution control plan - Environmental Flow Assessment - Stakeholder Engagement Plan - Water-related Health Management Plan - Investment Plan etc. 		
		B.3) Water quality/quantity assessment	Hydro & meteorological stations to collect water and climate data	Zero	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hydromet design report - 4 Hydro-meteorological stations - 2 Water quality laboratories established (-Uganda and DRC) 		
			Bathymetric/hydrographical surveys	Zero	Two Bathymetric surveys developed (one for each Lake)		
			Riparian staff trained	Zero	20 staff trained		
		B.4) Establish catchment based water	Number of Catchment Based water resources management	Zero	3 catchment based water plans developed		

CT	IMPA	RESULTS CHAIN	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS/ MITIGATION MEASURES
			Indicators (including CSI)	Baseline	Targets		
		resources management (incl. wetlands)	plans developed (number of gender action plans)				
			Number of Catchment Management Organization established	Zero	3 catchment based organization established (60% of members being women		
			Vegetation cover change as a % of baseline in selected catchments ¹⁴	Zero	2% (Yr 3); 5% Yr 4; 8% (Yr 5)	Satellite imagery, vegetation index	
			Number of trees planted as Improvement in basin vegetation cover	Zero (ha)	1,940,000 agro forestry and fruit trees with 150,000 local trees planted by PY 3		
			Annual average sediment load from selected sub catchments compared to control catchments reduced Number of gender Community based	Zero Zero	320 ha of wetland and river bank areas resorted by project completion		
			Direct project beneficiaries, of which female (%) ¹⁵	Zero			
		B5) Integrated Control of aquatic invasive weeds	Regional integrated aquatic weed management plan developed	Zero	Regional Integrated aquatic weed management plan produced	Project reports Satellite imagery, vegetation index	
			Number of Basin User community trained on weed control and utilization	Zero	5,000 of Basin User community trained on weed control and utilization		
			P% reduction with weed coverage areas in LEA using biological, manual and mechanical method	Zero	60% reduction in weed coverage area		

¹⁴ Indicator captures changes in agricultural land (currently x ha) as well as forest land1 (currently y ha) and protected areas (currently z ha) in targeted areas.

¹⁵ Number of beneficiaries targeted under components 1 and 2 catchment management and alternative livelihoods under component 1 fisheries management.

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).

COMMENTS FROM STAP	RESPONSES
<p>1. The initial implementation phase that was carried out demonstrated the possibility to cooperate but also the inherent challenges in the region related to poverty and civil strife. Some of these challenges are identified in the PIF under the heading "barriers" [to cooperation]. The approach to build on analysis and results in the first phase, update the Integrated Lake Management Plans including broader NELSAP SEAs carried out substituting traditional TDA/SAP approaches is welcomed and should possibly fast track the establishment of sustainable institutional frameworks at the bilateral level including a focus on investments that should have been identified in the originally produced ILMPs. During project preparation the results of the first cooperative phase should be clearly spelled out to support the detailed design of the proposed GEF/AfDB project.</p>	<p>Comment noted—Project preparation has taken recognition of the results of the pre-investment phase as well as the broader diagnostic work undertaken by the NELSAP. The results of the first cooperative phase have been included in the project preparation report. They have also informed actions or interventions to be implemented under the LEAF Phase II. Key result areas included (i) Creation of a platform for sustainable use of natural resources through an integrated lakes management plan (ii) Promotion of the co-management of Fisheries Resources as part of measures to improve the governance of the fisheries in the two lakes for a more sustained use of the resources and (iii) Promotion of Community Development Activities for fishing communities—through pilot community development activities. Other work that has informed project design includes the NELSAP Multi Sector Investment Opportunity Analysis.</p>
<p>2. The proposed work to implement action programs, build capacity and put into place integrated transboundary water resource and catchment management is generally well-targeted, and builds on many foundational data sets and situation reports. Nevertheless, STAP cautions, regarding project design, that some of the proposed project components are over-ambitious, particularly for example Output 2.4 on water resources etc., including some un-clarity regarding aspects of regional governance (NELSAP) and country participating agency roles (see further below).</p>	<p>Comment Noted—The project design has been revisited to take into consideration the comments made by STAP. Component 2.4, will now only address improved water resources and water quality monitoring. The project design team notes that the elements related to <i>enhanced pollution control achieved at project closing, cannot be achieved within the framework of this project</i>. They are also dependent on improved enforcement of regulation for point source pollution into the lakes. However, part of the updates to the Integrated Lakes management Plan, will include establishing a baseline on water quality management as part of a regional knowledge base and put in place a pollution control plan, which clearly spells out regional and national obligations, and that in future forms a basis for pollution control investments</p>
<p>3. The project has the potential to establish or to consolidate baseline data and management best practice for major</p>	<p>Comment Noted, and guidance reflected in the PPR—Component 2 of the project addresses this comment. As part of updating the integrated lakes management plan, a</p>

COMMENTS FROM STAP	RESPONSES
<p>ecosystem components and to build a reservoir of expertise to sustain, at least in the medium term, the natural resource potential of the lake basins. A coordinated ICT strategy for all data and information produced in the proposed project should be explored in the project preparation phase possibly at NELSAP or linked to another institutional framework that is robust. Much data has been generated in the first AfDB financed project and more will be created. Accessibility and transparency in data protocols is critical for trust building and future investment project</p>	<p>regional knowledge base, will be put in place following procedures, agreed within the framework of the NBI. The LEA knowledge base, will be linked to the NBI Regional Knowledge base and information system (IS), which is hosted at the NBI Secretariat as part of the Nile DSS program. The LEA Regional knowledge base shall provide mechanisms to facilitate synchronization of approved and quality assured data with the National Data Management systems. The knowledge base would be strengthened through collation of existing data and information products, as well as through support for new surveys and mapping (e.g. of Fisheries resources, water resources, natural habitats, biodiversity, satellite imagery acquisition and analysis, etc.). The NBI Interim Data and information sharing and exchange procedures (2009), and the Operational Guideline for Implementation of the Nile Basin Interim Procedures for Data and Information Sharing and Exchange, will guide the access of information from the Regional Knowledge base.</p>
<p>4. The project benefits from Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP) advice and support in project preparation and implementation where NELSAP operates as a de facto joint institution in the absence of robust bilateral agreements. The role of NELSAP vis-à-vis the participating institutions in the two countries towards the end of the project should be defined and clarified during project designed.</p>	<p>Comment Noted, and guidance reflected in the PPR. A Regional Project Coordination Unit is provided for in the project design. NELSAP as a regional mechanism is needed to coordinate the participation of the two countries of Uganda and DRC and donor partners in the planning of regional programs within the LEA basin and to coordinate national and regional-level activities during program implementation. It will play important roles in such upstream activities as: (i) Producing analytical work to identify problems that would benefit from a regional approach and facilitating cross-country dialogue (ii) convening national stakeholders and international partners to agree on development of specific programs and managing, the programs' designs and (iii) assessing with countries the costs and benefits of their participation and facilitating agreement on how costs are to be shared and (iv) mobilizing donor support and establishing monitoring and reporting processes for agreed programs (v) gathering data, sharing information on good practices, and organizing training and (vi) Coordinating country-level operational activities and harmonizing policies, laws, and procedures. NELSAP will facilitate the formation and operationalisation of LEA basin management organisation between the two countries under a sustainable financing mechanism. This institution should be in place and operationalised before the end of the project (by the fourth year of the project)</p>

COMMENTS FROM STAP	RESPONSES
<p>5. Regarding diagnostic analysis, the foundation for the project concept. The PIF states that the Lakes Edward and Albert Fisheries pilot Project (LEAF) diagnostic analysis forms the basis for identifying the challenges to be addressed. In addition STAP advises the proponents to consider the findings of related studies e.g. on Lake George fisheries, mining activities and pollution and to review FAO reports on postharvest fish technology in Uganda, which may usefully complement the existing knowledge base including from the oil exploration sector</p>	<p>These studies have been considered and guide in the line of actions proposed for similar activities under this project. Some documentation referred to includes: (i) The Environmental Monitoring Plan for the Albertine Graben 2012-2017 and (ii) Strategic Environmental Assessment (Sea) of Oil And Gas Activities In The Albertine Graben, Uganda. Other studies considered as part of the foundations include, study reports from the NELSAP Multi Sector Investment Opportunity Analysis¹⁶.</p>
<p>6. Regarding fisheries, the PIF may underestimate the species diversity in the lakes, for example recent IUCN estimates cite about 80 taxa of fish in Lake Edward but does not mention the very different mix of commercially exploited species in Lake Albert. The PIF confusingly refers to 24 species in the two basins yet cites 60 endemic cichlid species; therefore the full project brief should revisit this issue. Deforestation is a well-known consequence of poorly managed post-harvest fish processing, cited under Barrier #2, which will be addressed by the project. However, while the PIF describes (under Output 1.5) introducing modern fish drying techniques and smoking methods, there is no mention of complementary actions to monitor and to reduce informal/inefficient fish processing, without which overall deforestation pressure may not reduce, especially if the export market is further developed.</p>	<p>Comment noted, and guidance integrated into project design. Provision of modern fish solar dryers and fish smoking kilns) aim at improving household and enterprise climate adaptive capacity and resilience. Investment in these fish processing equipment will help in reducing community vulnerability to climate change. The PPR also recognises the need to integrate National Biomass strategies, as well as rural electrification programs, which could further reduce the stress on deforestation in the lakes Edward and Albert watersheds</p>
<p>7. The experience of invasive species control, especially for Eichhornia crassipes in Lake Victoria will be valuable in assessing the sustainable methods to be applied to the lakes; Output 1.7 makes an assumption that</p>	<p>As described in the project PPR, The weed control will involve an integrated approach with more focus in community participation. It is proposed that combination of manual, mechanical and biological approach should be used in weed control. These are hinged around building the</p>

¹⁶ NELSAP / NBI, December 2012. Nile Equatorial Lakes Multi Sector Investment Opportunity Analysis (NEL MSIOA). NEL indicative Investment strategy and action plan. Draft version. Report prepared by BRL Ingénierie. 111 pages
 GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

COMMENTS FROM STAP	RESPONSES
<p>only mechanical means are to be considered, this assumption should be tested, given that weevils have previously been used on Lake Edward.</p>	<p>capacity of the basin communities in LEA in weed control and management; and development of LEA weed management plan</p>
<p>8. The Expected Outcome 2.2 specifies capacity built but this is not clearly delivered by any specific action within the PIF which in several places mentions strengthening capacities and training but not how or by whom this is to be achieved. This is a vital component of the entire project, the sustainable outcomes of which fundamentally depend on strategic and local capacity built to integrate scientific, technical and traditional knowledge sectors. The full project brief should clearly present, preferably through a separate Component, a framework for capacity building and knowledge management.</p>	<p>The capacity building aspects through training in alternative livelihood opportunity, environmental and conservation training, improved post-harvest techniques, climate smart technologies in catchment basin management, aquaculture development, frame survey, fish catch data etc. at community, national and binational level have the approaches in achieving these clearly stated in PPR.</p>
<p>9. During the project preparation phase these broader region based institutional frameworks needs to be considered especially since the NBI is not a Regional Economic Commission as stated in the PIF. What would the role be of the EAC in the context of cooperation with a non-EAC member (DRC)?</p>	<p>The regional integration, as demonstrated in EAC, can strengthen the political negotiating power. Joint representation of interests by EAC (in the context of harmonised natural resources use rights as relates to LEA basin) could be advantageous in dealings with non EAC member like DRC, by bringing together the common interests of member states.</p>
<p>10. There is no mention in the PIF of the use of overall indicators for monitoring and evaluation of the project, this should be addressed during project preparation and possible links to an overall ICT strategy (at NELSAP and the relevant agencies) be clarified</p>	<p>This has been addressed in PPR. Program, project and intermediate level performance indicators and targets are included in Appendix 1 of the PPR. The project will establish a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system (building on the NBI Result based Work planning, Reporting and M & E) to track progress against these core indicators as well as against a larger set of component-wise indicators that will paint a broader picture of overall project performance</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁷

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/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Inception / Stakeholder Workshop and Beneficiary Consultation Meetings	30,000	30,000	30,000
Consultancy preparation contract	100,000	80,000	100,000
Site visit and stakeholders consultations	30,000	25,000	30,000
Validation workshop	25,000	25,000	25,000
Contingency	15,000	2,000	5,000
Total	200,000	162,000	190,000

¹⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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