CBIT Questionnaire for Uganda

Context

CBIT reports to the GEF Council on progress made in the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) on a regular basis. A key component of this report is to highlight CBIT projects, what they have accomplished, and lessons learned. This year, for the 59th GEF Council meeting (Dec 2020), the progress report will showcase specific CBIT projects that have been under implementation for a certain amount of time. Our aim is to highlight the impact that CBIT is having on the ground on helping countries meet their transparency requirements, and the key challenges and lessons learned. In this context, we request you to respond to the questionnaire below.

Questions on country CBIT projects for input to GEF Progress Report on the CBIT

1. With respect to your country's GHG inventory and transparency efforts to date, what historically have been the most stubborn capacity-related issues to overcome?

There are two major stubborn capacity-related issues in Uganda:

a) **Lack of formal Green House Gas (GHG) data sharing arrangements between Uganda's lead government institution governing climate change matters and key institutions in the GHG emitting sectors:** The Uganda Climate Change Department (CCD) under the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE CCD) is mandated to govern and co-ordinate national climate change actions (Mitigation and Adaptation) in different sectors. Historically, there has been lack of formal GHG data sharing arrangements between MWE CCD and emitting sectors and this impeded effective GHG reporting and tracking progress of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).

b) **Limited knowledge and skills at emitting sector level, to measure and compile GHG data is a major hindrance to effective Green House Gas Inventory (GHGI) and fulfillment of the enhanced transparency requirements.** Previously, independent consultants were hired to prepare the inventory and national GHG reports. Additionally, most GHG emitting sector teams were not fully engaged in these activities resulting in uncertainty and lack of a centralized data transmission system.

2. How has the CBIT project helped (or will help) build capacity in your country to meet the requirements of Article 13 and address any of the capacity-related issues mentioned in the first question? Please be as specific as possible using an example or two.

a) The CBIT Uganda project has formalized the process of GHG data and information sharing: Through CBIT Uganda, an Inter-ministerial Cooperation Agreement for GHG data collection, processing, and sharing is in place and operational. Four ministries have so far signed the Inter-Ministerial Cooperation Agreement. To operationalize the Inter-ministerial Cooperation Agreement, a technical guide on GHG data sharing, and five sectoral Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) on data sharing for the National GHG Inventory were signed between the MWE CCD and sector hub institutions namely: the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and

Fisheries (MAAIF), Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), Waste (National Environment Management Authority - NEMA), Forestry and other land uses (National Forestry Authority -NFA), and Transport (Ministry of Works and Transport - MoWT) and the sectors have developed sectoral GHGI and MRV which they submitted to MWE CCD. Notably, there was no formalized engagement of GHG data sharing prior to implementation of the CBIT Uganda project. The GHGI and National MRV systems were hosted at MWE CCD, but none were operational.

The objectives of the MoU are provided below:

i. to streamline the collection, processing and sharing of GHG data and information emitting sector ministries and MWE CDD for purposes of reporting to the UNFCCC.
ii. to support the development of the National GHG Inventory, for purposes of enhancing transparency and reporting under the Paris Agreement of the UNFCCC, and to guide policy decisions at national level.
iii. to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of MWE CCD and emitting sectors as relates to GHG data and information collection, processing and sharing for UNFCCC reporting.
iv. to exchange GHG data and information, and share expertise, emission factors and methodologies pertaining to the development of the National GHG Inventory

b) The CBIT Uganda project has increased intersectoral interaction and communication: The project supported the development of the Uganda MRV portal to support communication on data collection sharing and transmission to MWE CCD. The portal was handed over to the MWE CCD and it will be linked to the National Integrated MRV tool which is being established at the MWE CCD with support from UNDP-Uganda.

c) The CBIT Uganda project has strengthened technical and institutional capacity to collect, process, and feed data into the GHG inventory system. For instance:

i. A total of 62 (female 22 and male 40) National GHG experts were trained and equipped with skills in IPCC 2006 requirements and the TACC principles, inventory management, Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QA/QC), GHGI compilation and MRV processes, uncertainty assessment and improvement plans. These and many other skills will help the NDC sector teams produce better GHGI, use the inventories to track progress on the NDCS commitments, assess impacts of mitigation and adaptation actions. Prior to the CBIT Uganda project, sector teams had only received basic theoretical training on domestic MRV and IPCC guidelines, but no experience of GHG data collection or processing for GHGI and MRV systems.
ii. The CBIT project procured MRV equipment for MWE CCD and five sector hubs namely: agriculture and land use; forestry; energy; transport and waste. Prior to the CBIT Uganda project, the institutions had gaps in equipment and the procurement was demand driven.

3. How has the CBIT project helped (or will help) your country to build strong and sustainable institutional arrangements for transparency?

CBIT supported development of institutional frameworks for GHG data collection and sharing. Five institutions (National Forestry Authority (NFA), Ministry of Works and Transport (MoWT), Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) signed MoU on GHG data sharing with Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE CCD). A technical guide on GHG data sharing was developed and annexed to the MoUs. Five ministries have signed an inter-ministerial cooperation agreement on GHG data and information collection, processing and sharing. These institutional frameworks support the National Climate change Bill 2020 to mandate the institutions to collect, share and effectively report on the GHGs in fulfillment of the transparency requirements.

4. What are some key challenges and lessons learned emerging from trying to meet some of the new or more challenging aspects of the enhanced transparency framework (i.e. tracking of mitigation and adaptation action, tracking of support needed and received, projections of GHG emissions and removals, etc.)? Please be as specific as possible using an example or two.

The key challenges are provided below:

a) There are still major data gaps which limit fulfillment of the Transparency, Accuracy, Completeness, Comparability (TACC) principle.
b) A lot of activity data is unreported because it is not readily available especially data from academia and non-state actors.
c) The data collection tools previously used were not standardized so missing some key GHG indices.
d) Tracking of mitigation and adaptation action in Uganda still faces challenge of lack of established baseline. It is hoped that the CBIT supported 2016-2019 GHGI for the 6 sectors will provide key information for setting baselines in the ongoing revision of the NDC. There is also still limited capacity for measuring the GHG emissions and offsets by many data providers; and there is need for sensitization of all data providers on the importance of providing accurate information

The key lessons learnt are provided below

a) **Engaging sector teams to compile the GHG data and update the inventory is more efficient than relying on consultants.** The sector teams collect or aggregate the data from their respective data providers and can access more data and information compared to the consultants. Engagement of in-house staff is more efficient in terms of ensuring accuracy, saving time and money

b) **Uganda has previously received a series of theoretical training on IPCC guidelines and GHGI but with limited hands-on experience of the participants**. CBIT hands-on GHGI and MRV training has equipped a critical mass of national experts with the skills to compile activity data and be able to process the national and international reports. The hands-on training has guided the project on identification of the critical gaps which are mainly data gaps and the need for capacity to calculate country-specific emission factors. The teams from the different sectors were able to cooperate and obtained data from all the data providers to compile the inventory.

c) The experience gave them ownership of the inventory and they proposed practical strategies to improve subsequent inventories. **If the trained sector experts are continuously engaged in inventory compilation as one of their routine duties, the quality of the data collected, and inventory and reports will improve greatly.** This is especially because they are in the best situation to understand the strengths and weaknesses at hand from data collection to processing and reporting e.g. assumptions made and improvements needed.

d) **Learning by doing is informative, builds ownership, and can foster sustainability of the GHGI.** The sector teams were pleased to have GHGI at the end of the training session that they had produced, and which will inform the sector and national decision-making including contributing to the third national communication. All activity data collection tools previously were not standardized and the hands-on engagement with the stakeholders has made them appreciate the standardized data protocols produced with support from CBIT. The teams were eager to pretest the tools and explore how much improvement to the inventory the new tools would contribute.

e) High level engagement is key in capacity building activities and plans to support decision-making e.g. redefining roles and responsibilities of staff at the sectors and continued support for improvement of the GHGI and MRV. The high-level officers in many institutions are not much informed about GHGI, MRV, and their importance. **There is, therefore, need for capacity enhancement for the leaders, not just the technical staff. There is a need for tailor-made capacity building for institutions to complement the capacity building of individuals working in the institutions. The Uganda MRV institutional framework needs operationalizing.**

f) **Strengthening institutional arrangements through MoU and cooperation frameworks take time and conviction.** The lesson learnt therefore is do not underestimate the time needed for building or strengthening institutional frameworks across different sectors. It is better to start the process at the beginning and make it as participatory as possible.

g) **Capacity building is a process therefore at every stage of capacity building gaps or needs must be identified and possible solutions explored.** Therefore, there is need to establish a framework to assess progress in capacity building with clear targets and very specific indicators to guide capacity building support, and also reveal the significance or impact of the capacity built.

5. Based on your experience implementing the CBIT project and other related transparency initiatives in your country, are there any approaches that you would like to suggest as being particularly effective, innovative, or impactful? Examples of these could include taking a leadership role among LDCs on transparency issues, testing and piloting of inventory and MRV system, mainstreaming gender in project implementation etc. Please be specific and respond with a few key examples to the extent possible.

a) **Stakeholder engagement**. The project benefited immensely from the cooperation of all stakeholders (government and non-state actors). There was no major challenge in participation since stakeholders embraced the capacity building activities from the inception of the project. Key stakeholders were engaged in design, planning and implementation of the project. The

project brought together experts from different sectors to a family of GHG and MRV stakeholders. Close collaboration with stakeholders made identification of the needs and possible solutions to existing challenges easy. The close engagement made stakeholders appreciate the role of collaboration and sharing of GHG data. The CBIT Project Management Unit (PMU) was able to jointly develop MoU, Inter-ministerial cooperation agreements, concept notes for further capacity building support, status reports on IPCC compliance by sector, and policy briefs to guide decision-making based on the project outcomes. The high turn up for the GHGI training and commitment to developing the sector MRV and GHGI is attributed to the good relationship that the PMU established with stakeholders from onset of the project.

b) **High level engagement was key in success of the project**. Invitations to major project activities were signed by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Water and Environment or the Commissioner Climate Change Department. Cooperation from top leadership enabled successful implementation of the activities.

c) **Hands-on training on GHGI and MRV was very effective in imparting knowledge to the participants.** This was referred to as **Learning by Doing**. Participants were happy to have learned to compile GHG data and write sector inventory reports. This approach is key for ownership and sustainability of project activities. The trained teams were able to identify the gaps needed to improve their respective sector inventories.

d) **Gender mainstreaming was important in CBIT Uganda implementation.** At first few women participated in project activities. After the gender sensitization workshop many women were interested in participating in capacity building and GHGI. There were generally fewer women in high level and technical position in government than men, but women were very interested in project activities

6. Beyond fulfilling international reporting requirements, how has the CBIT project supported national priorities and decision-making?

The CBIT supported 2016-2019 GHG inventories for the six sectors will serve as benchmark for ongoing revision of the NDC. The inventory revealed key areas and gaps for government to consider in supporting. Status reports, fact sheets and policy briefs will guide decision-making for planning and budgeting for GHGI and MRV.

7. Beyond the scope of the CBIT project, what are a few examples of remaining priority gaps and needs that the country must address in the near term?

a) Massive sensitization of government, private sector and CSO on GHG inventory and the importance of collection and sharing quality data.

b) There is need to a second wave of training leading to a second iteration of the GHG Inventory. This will ensure that the skills gained through CBIT training are grounded and remain practical.