



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

GEF ID:	5674		
Country/Region:	Regional (Uganda, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Lakes Edward and Albert Integrated Fisheries and Water Resources Management Project		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,100,000
Co-financing:	\$26,885,000	Total Project Cost:	\$35,185,000
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Oladapo Olagokea

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, DRC and Uganda are eligible.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, both OFPs from DRC and Uganda have endorsed the project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, the requested funds are available with the IW focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes, - the project represents a combination of activities and achievements to further develop subsidiary institutional arrangements and actions in the Lake Edward and Albert basin which are consistent with IW-3 and IW-1.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, consistency with PRSP, Nile Basin Strategic plan (endorsed by NEL-COM), EAC as well as the AfDB 's own cooperation frameworks is described. The text could benefit from a bit cleared articulation here.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>(1/20/2014): This section requires clarification, rewriting and better outline of baseline situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline versus increment/GEF project: Please clarify AfDB funds, yet one would assume that ADB grant would be new regional money co-financing this project. The AfDB funds would then be part of the alternative/increment ("GEF project") and no need to repeat the component descriptions. Please confirm.</li> <li>- Baseline and achievements of LEAF - please clarify the baseline situation/baseline description: e.g, on</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>fisheries, pollution, environmental planning in the sub-basin countries; including on regional level.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The comments above have been addressed and the PIF been rewritten now clearly showing the GEF/AFDB co-finance as increment. Key initiatives in the baseline need to be coordinated with in project design and elaborated on by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>(1/20/2014): there seems to be confusion on the description of baseline project and increment. AfDB funds described complement and co-finance the increment. Due to this comments that will be provided here cannot be entirely complete or accurate and we would like to alert that we can only fully comment once we receive the revised PIF.</p> <p>Likely due to this confusion, table B and the text do not fully align.</p> <p>Please improve the project component description. at present the GEF components of the alternative are rather vaguely described and do not allow for a clear picture of anticipated project achievements. It is expected that the revision of the PIF to adequately describe the baseline situation versus the proposed project (GEF and Co-finance) will clarify many of these details and we would best comment in more detail on this revision. We are also always available for additional bilateral phone conversation to clarify this in detail.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Below a few comments - yet please note that there will be new/additional comments likely once we see the revised PIF for reasons described above. The current version does not enable adequate detailed review - below are just a few initial detailed comments :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table B mentions improved fish processing, which would reduce post harvest losses. This is appreciated, yet as the output goes on to mentioned information systems, it is not clear if this also refers to the processing (as in information on). Please provide clarity in this regard.</li> <li>- From description it is not clear what the vision for sustainability of the fund for MCS systems is. This appears as an interesting idea, but what is the innovativeness to make it sustainable?</li> <li>- Component 2 mentions that there is no agreement on lakes management between the two countries. what is the standing of the Integrated Sustainable Lake Management Plans that resulted from LEAF?</li> <li>- If there is nothing in place though - would it make sense to include an equivalent of a focussed TDA/SAP for this sub-basin?</li> <li>- Please include in table B a budget of allocation of at least 1 % of grant to be</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>allocated to participation in IW:Learn activities (e..g incl. regional meetings, bi-annual GEF conferences, establish functional project website, etc) but suggest to budget more than 1 % overall for KM, drawing of lessons and outreach/awareness campaign efforts to underpin sustainable lake management. This may best done within a separate component.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The PIF has been substantially rewritten taken above comments into consideration. The overall project is well thought through. At the same time it is ambitious and the comments in question 25 may aid in streamlining and focussing project activities during project design.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>(1/20/2014) The section on GEBs is missing.</p> <p>For comment on clarity of increment versus baseline, please see comment 7 above.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): yes, GEBs are described in sufficient detail in the PIF. The additional reasoning in the revised PIF is clear and well articulated.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>(1/20/2014): this will be revisited and commented on after resubmission and revision of the PIF.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): Yes, this is well described across various sections of the PIF, including specifically highlighting the role of women.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>(1/20/2014): this will be revisited and commented on after resubmission and revision of the PIF. There is some description of this in the general sections but not clear for the project components and activities.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The PIF revision provides detail in this regard , including partnership of NEL with the Nile Basin Discourse.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>(1/20/2014): The PIF includes a risk section and there are a number of significant risks to project success. Please include acknowledgement of rather fragile security situation on the ground in parts of the sub-region. in addition, the risk for being able to handle water quality related management and monitoring a likely higher than indicated. Please enhance mitigation measures on high risk items.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): Comment has been addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>(1/20/2014): There is very little mention of ongoing activities on related activities. Please strengthen.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): Comment has been overall addressed in the PIF revision and further detail to be part of project design.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> </ul>	<p>(1/20/2014): Overall - yes, as the project builds by solid TA by AFDB on the ground addressing sustainable lake management under the framework of NEL and the NELSAP. The region is not easy to access and work in and fisheries are of key importance to the population</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>around the lake while at the same time water quality in the lake is increasingly threatened by urbaization and extractive industries (incl mining and recent oil concessions that will add to threats). We will expand on this in more detail after review of the revised PIF.</p> <p>(1/24/2014): The revised PIF has includes an extensive section on this and includes the decision suport aspects that the project will provide.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>GEF co-finance needs to be enhanced e.g. please clarify government commitment in form of in-kind or cash co-finance. Please indicate the likely source of the other 10 million co-finance (besides AfDB).</p> <p>(1/24/2014): Co-finance has been enhanced and substantial AfDB co-finance, government co-finance and collaboration with Sida will provide good base for a very ambitious program. The co-finance ratio is somewhat smaller than in other IW projects yet (i) this is a very fragile and remote region with less</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		ongoing investments and (ii) there is good likelihood that for AfDB to mobilize additional bilateral funds.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	(1/20/2014): The co-finance from AfDB of around 17 million direct co-finance is adequate. There may be additional related parallel co-finance that has not been accounted for. Please also see comment under 16.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	(1/20/2014): yes, slightly above/aorund 5 % of grant sub-total.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	(1/20/2014): Yes, PPG is requested and within the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>(1/20/2014): No, the PIF is not recommended for WP inclusion yet. Please resubmit addressing comments raised.</p> <p>(1/27/2014): The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in a future workprogram.</p>	
	<b>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</b>	<p>Please address the following by CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Component 1- the overall component is ambitious, e.g. please consider if it realistic to invest very substantially in monitoring and surveillance systems, if at the same time the project is still establishing a baseline for sustainable levels of fishing.</li> <li>- Clearly established targets for sustainable fisheries - we assume - are an output of the project (incl. not only catch, but also gear restrictions and closures - as appropriate). It will be important to base this not only on science but also make sure this establishes the impacts on people and is built on consultations and campaigns to build awareness and buy-in.</li> <li>- Output 1.3 discusses control and surveillance, however, there are other aspects of enforcement, including awareness of regulations and the actual legal system. Too often the illegal fishers are identified and caught, but they aren't</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>convicted because the legal system is too weak. This aspect needs to be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Component 1.1. - the scope/nature of the 'financing mechanisms for future investments' to be explored needs clarification. Same pertains to the "sustainable fund for MSC" for operation of MSC.</li> <li>- While there is mention of monitoring and research in Outputs 1.3 and 1.4 the focus is on ecological aspects. For this project to have stakeholder buy-in, compliance and ultimately sustainability, the socioeconomic context of fisheries and water management issues and the socioeconomic impacts of proposed management strategies need to be understood. The text reflects a good sense of some of these issues (e.g. they noted barriers of low levels of education and literacy); however, it is essential to examine the socioeconomic impacts of policy decisions. We would urge to incorporate an economist and a social specialist/anthropologist into the project to address this aspect.</li> <li>- Component 1.5 - Intro of technology for food processing: The idea of reducing post catch losses is appropriate and relevant. During project design, please conduct analysis of market for processed fish (i.e. do people consume/are used to dried products). In addition, please take account of possible environment impacts of the introduction of new technologies e.g. these have a potential to lead to over-exploitation of fish by opening broader markets and therefore incentives for</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>overharvesting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Component 1.6 - Transboundary Learning: Suggest to consider in project design to split out/separate a component that combines KM and learning and related outputs across components 1 and 2 (IW:learn; outreach/public awareness, conflict resolution).</li> <li>- Component 2.2 - in nature of the content of the current ILMP (developed under LEAF) these are equivalent to a combined TDA/SAP. Please in updating, take advantage of the process and content guidance in the TDA/SAP manual on the IW:Learn website. It provides useful information e.g. on underlying participatory processes, as well as content. Please note that this manual is NOT intended to be prescriptive. The commitment for adoption on ministerial is noted. Very important and good that this is clearly indicated.</li> <li>- Also, while the consideration of increased climate variability and change are clearly indicated to be one aspect of updating the ILMPs, please consider throughout the project where those changes and impacts including increasing resilience may already need to be factored in (the recent NEL study may provide one good base for it).</li> <li>- Component 2.4 - realistic targets for enhanced pollution control need to be established. Additionally, government commitment (via co-finance ) needs to be formalized in project design to assure that investments in water quality monitoring will be sustained by government (incl.</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		O&M costs ) and hence is sustainable after project closure. - Component 2.5 - community watershed management: again, this seems somewhat oddly placed within component 2. In project design you may want to consider to have this is a separate component as both actors and institutional set-up will differ from other in component. In order to not overload one project with too many different actors and challenges, project design may want to explore if a SGP-type set-up could provide a good implementation modality for thesetype of activities. It could build on the experiences of the Nile Microgrants.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	January 20, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 27, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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