



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Redress
Mechanism

11 August 2026

First Problem-Solving Monitoring Report on IRM Case C-0010-Uganda in relation to GCF Project FP034: Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda

Summary

This report provides information to the Board on the implementation of the problem-solving agreement of the Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM)'s case C-0010-Uganda in relation to GCF Project FP034: Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda, as required by paragraph 76 of the Procedures and Guidelines of the IRM (Decision B.22/22). This report discusses the processes and outcomes of the implementation of the problem-solving agreement signed by the Parties on 3 July 2025.



Executive Summary

In April 2024, the Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) [registered a complaint](#) submitted by project-affected people (complainants) from seven districts in Uganda. The complaint was filed through their representatives, the Twerwaneho Listeners' Club (TLC), a local civil society organisation. Complainants raised several concerns related to the implementation of the GCF-funded Project [FP034, "Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda"](#) (the Project), including alleged restrictions on access to wetlands, lack of compensation and inadequate consultation, increased food insecurity and impoverishment of wetland-dependent communities and increased threats to community health, security and safety.

FP034 aims to enhance Ugandan subsistence farmers' ability to address climate change impacts through wetland restoration and livelihood diversification. The Accredited Entity (AE) for this project is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Executing Entity (EE) is the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) of the Republic of Uganda. The original project completion date of 31 December 2026 was extended to 31 December 2027 following approval of the AE's [project restructuring proposal](#).

In May 2024, the IRM [determined the complaint eligible](#) and progressed it to the initial steps phase for further processing. In November 2024, the complainants and the EE (together, as parties) [agreed to resolve the matters through problem-solving](#), with the aim of reaching a mutually satisfactory outcome. Following numerous in-person and virtual dialogue sessions facilitated by the IRM, [the parties reached agreement](#) on 3 July 2025. The parties decided to keep the terms of the agreement confidential but agreed to disclose their commitments: identification of wetland users and processes for providing alternative livelihoods; organisation of study tours for community members to learn from good livelihood restoration practices; wetland boundaries and demarcation; and stakeholder engagement activities and project-level Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs). The agreement also included IRM's role in monitoring its implementation.

This is the IRM's first monitoring report for case C-0010-Uganda, covering the period from 3 July 2025 to 2 July 2026. The report presents the IRM monitoring efforts, as well as some of the outcomes of the implementation of the problem-solving agreement and pending actions. During the current monitoring period, the IRM received and reviewed relevant documents and held regular meetings with parties to gather updates and feedback. The IRM held in-person meetings with parties in Uganda in September and November 2025 and in May 2026.

Since the agreement was signed in July 2025, parties identified additional wetland users who were entitled to receive alternative livelihood support. Also, with the IRM's support, the parties organised and conducted two study tours for affected communities, one in the Southwest in September 2025 and another in the East in November 2025. Furthermore, the EE assessed the functionality of its project-level GRMs and continues to strengthen its stakeholder engagement and GRM awareness-raising activities.

The original deadline for implementing all commitments under the problem-solving agreement was 31 March 2026. Due to delays in the Project implementation and the need to restructure the Project, the parties extended the agreement implementation through 31 December 2026. The EE explained that, in the coming months, it will focus on providing alternative livelihood support to profiled wetland users and will engage with affected communities to support them in making informed decisions in managing the livelihoods provided in accordance with the Project design and scope.

This draft report was shared with the parties for their comments prior to its finalisation. The final report will be circulated to the Board and published on the IRM [case register](#). The IRM will continue its monitoring role until all commitments under the problem-solving agreement have been fulfilled and will continue reporting to the GCF Board on progress.



I. Introduction

The IRM is mandated to handle complaints received from a person, a group of two or more persons, or communities who have been or may be affected by adverse impacts of a project or programme, under paragraph 11 of its Updated Terms of Reference (TOR) (Decision B.BM-2017/10).¹ As set out in paragraph 76 of the IRM's Procedures and Guidelines (PGs) (Decision B.22/22),² when parties agree to problem-solving as a means of resolving a complaint and subsequently resolve their dispute through an agreement or a series of agreements, the IRM initiates a monitoring process to oversee the implementation of those agreements. This is the first problem-solving monitoring report under case C-0010-Uganda and covers the period 3 July 2025 to 2 July 2026.

II. Background

2.1 The Project³

GCF-funded Project FP034, "Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda" is intended to enhance Ugandan subsistence farmers' ability to deal with climate change impacts through three major components: 1) restoration and management of wetland hydrology and associated catchments; 2) improved agricultural practices and alternative livelihood options in the wetland catchment; and 3) strengthening access to climate and early warning information to farmers and other target communities to support wetland management. The Accredited Entity (AE) for this Project is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Executing Entity (EE) is the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) of the Republic of Uganda.

The Project targets 24 districts in southwestern and eastern Uganda and was approved on 15 December 2016 with an original project completion date of 31 December 2026. The completion date was subsequently extended to 31 December 2027 following a project restructuring proposal approved by the GCF Board during its forty-fifth meeting (B.45) held in June 2026.⁴

2.2 The Complaint⁵

On 8 April 2024, the IRM registered a complaint submitted by project-affected people located in southwestern and eastern Uganda through their representatives, the Twerwaneho Listeners' Club (TLC). The complaint covers seven districts in Uganda, located in the Southwest (Kabale, Kisoro, Ntungamo, Rukiga, and Rukungiri) and the East (Kibuku and Tororo).

The complainants raised several concerns related to the implementation of the Project. They alleged: 1) restrictions on access to wetlands and/or wetlands-adjacent areas, without compensation and, in some instances, without prior notice; 2) destruction of subsistence crops and confiscation of farming equipment, without compensation or prior notice; 3) confiscation of land titles, without compensation; 4) use of security forces to patrol and forcibly evict wetland dependent communities; 5) increased food insecurity and impoverishment of wetland dependent communities as a result of restrictions imposed on wetland use and lack of compensation or

¹ Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/document/irm-tor>

² Available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/document/2019-procedures-and-guidelines-irm>

³ More information about the Project is available at: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/portfolio/projects/fp034>

⁴ The project restructuring proposal approved at B.45 is available at: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/documents/2026-06/11-consideration-funding-proposals-consideration-request-changes-scope-funded-activity-fp034.pdf>

⁵ More information about the complaint is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/case/c0010-uganda>



alternate livelihoods; 6) inability to pay school fees as a result of loss of income; and 7) increase in crime rates and instances of theft, leading to increased risks to community safety and security.

2.3 The IRM Process

The IRM declared the complaint eligible on 8 May 2024 under the IRM's TOR and PGs.⁶ Following eligibility determination, the IRM began engaging with the complainants and other stakeholders in the initial steps phase to better understand the issues raised and to provide more information on the options available regarding the processing of the complaint, per paragraph 36 of the IRM's PGs. After numerous virtual meetings and two IRM site visits in Uganda in June and September 2024, the parties agreed in November 2024 to try to resolve the matters through problem-solving.⁷

III. Problem-Solving

Problem-solving is a participatory and flexible process focused on assisting the parties in finding and/or developing effective solutions to the concerns raised by complainants. A problem-solving process focuses on addressing the concerns that gave rise to a grievance or complaint in a way that meets the interests of the complainants and the other parties and is mutually satisfactory. A problem-solving process does not seek to determine culpability or assign blame, nor is it a compliance review. The entire problem-solving process is conducted in confidence to enable the complainants and other parties to engage with each other, build trust, and collectively explore solutions in a safe space. All information used in a problem-solving process by the parties is held in confidence by the IRM problem-solving team and is not used in any future IRM processes related to the project, including in a compliance review.

The IRM facilitated the problem-solving process through multiple bilateral and joint meetings with the parties, held both virtually and in person in Uganda. The main parties to the problem-solving process were the complainants and the EE. The complainants are project-affected people from seven districts of Uganda, represented by 22 elected representatives and supported by advisors from TLC. The EE is the MWE, which partners with other relevant ministries and local governments to implement the Project. Other stakeholders, including the AE, local authorities, community leaders, and the GCF Secretariat, observed and contributed to the process, as per their roles and responsibilities.

The problem-solving process began with in-person capacity-building workshops for each party in January 2025 to strengthen their communication, negotiation, and engagement skills required for meaningful dialogue. In March 2025, the IRM assisted the parties in agreeing on ground rules for the problem-solving, including topics for discussion to guide their dialogue. The six main topics identified were: profiling of wetland users; alternative livelihoods; resettlement; wetland boundaries; stakeholder engagement; and Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs).



Photo 1: Capacity building workshop conducted in southwestern Uganda in January 2025

Throughout the problem-solving process, the parties and the IRM worked collaboratively to build

⁶ The eligibility determination is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/determination-eligibility-c0010-uganda.pdf>

⁷ The initial steps report is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/initial-steps-report-c0010-uganda-final.pdf>



trust, discuss community needs and priorities, and explore options for resolution. At the beginning of the problem-solving process, the complainants wished to keep their identities confidential due to safety concerns. As the process progressed and they began to establish trust, complainants agreed to engage directly with EE representatives in joint meetings. Following a series of intensive discussions, the parties reached a full and final problem-solving agreement on 3 July 2025 during a joint meeting in Kampala, Uganda. The signed agreement outlined the commitments made by the parties and the IRM's role in monitoring the implementation of the agreement.

While the parties decided to keep the terms of the agreement confidential, they agreed that the following commitments made under the problem-solving agreement could be disclosed:

- Parties agreed on the criteria and procedures for providing alternative in-kind livelihoods to wetland users who vacated wetlands;
- Parties agreed to organise two study tours to learn about good livelihood restoration practices in Uganda;
- Parties agreed on wetland boundaries and the complainants understood the kinds of activities permitted on the wetlands; and
- Parties agreed on stakeholder engagement activities and the complainants learnt how to access project-level GRMs.⁸

IV. Problem-Solving Monitoring

As set out in paragraph 76 of the IRM's PGs, when the parties resolve their dispute through an agreement or a series of agreements, the IRM initiates a monitoring process to oversee its implementation.

4.1 Monitoring Activities

After the agreement was signed on 3 July 2025, the IRM supported the parties in agreeing on a monitoring plan that included a timeline and the parties' responsibilities under each commitment. The parties then worked together on the commitments set out in the problem-solving agreement. With the support of the IRM, the parties held regular online meetings and met in person in Uganda in September and November 2025 and May 2026. Relevant documentation was exchanged to track implementation progress and verify the status of the commitments made. Throughout the monitoring period, the AE and the GCF Secretariat played active roles by participating in meetings with the parties, supporting the organisation of joint meetings and study tours, and engaging bilaterally with the IRM and other stakeholders to identify ways to implement the commitments more efficiently and expeditiously. The following section provides a summary of the agreement implementation as of 2 July 2026.

4.2 Status of the Agreement Implementation

4.2.1. Identification of wetland users and provision of alternative livelihoods

In collaboration with the complainants' representatives, local authorities, and community leaders, the EE verified the lists of wetland users who had been omitted during the wetland users' profiling process undertaken under the Project. Now that the GCF Board has approved the project restructuring proposal, the EE explained that, in the coming months, they will focus on providing alternative livelihood support to profiled wetland users and will engage with affected

⁸ The problem-solving conclusion report is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/irm-case-c0010-problem-solving-conclusion-report.pdf>



communities to support them in making informed decisions in managing the livelihoods provided in accordance with the Project design and scope.

4.2.2. Study tours to learn about good livelihood restoration practices in Uganda

The IRM supported the AE and the EE in organising two study tours for complainants' representatives and other community members from the seven districts relevant to the IRM case. The study tours were organised for community members to learn from good livelihood restoration practices in other project areas, including the benefits and challenges of engaging in different livelihood restoration activities. The expectation was also to help community members make informed decisions about the livelihood support they wished to receive under the Project.

In September 2025, 25 community members from Kabale, Kisoro, Ntungamo, Rukiga, and Rukungiri districts participated in a study tour in the southwestern region of Uganda. They visited livelihood restoration initiatives in Bushenyi and Kisoro districts, including apiary, piggery, fisheries, goat and dairy activities, and water retention facilities. In November 2025, 15 community members from Kibuku and Tororo districts participated in a second study tour in the eastern region of Uganda. They visited farmers in Pallisa and Kaliro districts and learned about dairy and goat activities, irrigation schemes, fisheries, and water retention facilities.



Photo 2: Community members from the Southwestern region visiting a fish farm in Bushenyi district, Uganda



Photo 3: Community members from the eastern region visiting a fish farm in Pallisa district, Uganda

At the end of the study tours, participants reported that the study tours enhanced their understanding of how other farmers had successfully transitioned to alternative livelihood activities after leaving the wetlands. They also shared that the study tours helped them identify livelihood options that were both practical and sustainable in their own circumstances. Participants expressed a desire for additional opportunities to learn from the experience of other successful farmers in Uganda. Accordingly, all commitments under this item have been fulfilled, and this action is considered closed.

4.2.3. Wetland boundaries and demarcation

During the problem-solving, the parties agreed on the issue of wetland boundaries, and the complainants understood the kinds of activities permitted in the wetlands. No further action is required, and this item is considered closed.

4.2.4. Stakeholder engagement activities and project-level GRMs

After signing the problem-solving agreement, the complainants' representatives shared the outcomes of the IRM problem-solving process with other project-affected people in their respective districts during July and August 2025.

With the GCF Board's approval of the project restructuring proposal, the EE commits to



continuing its stakeholder engagement efforts outlined in the revised livelihood implementation plan to raise awareness, discuss available livelihood options and support community members in making informed decisions regarding the livelihood support provided under the Project.

In addition, the EE assessed the functionality of grievance redress committees operating at different levels and locations in Uganda and, in their assessment reports, proposed remedial actions to strengthen the operation of project-level GRMs. As part of this action, the EE also established multiple signposts to inform community members about GRMs and committed to further raising awareness in that regard. The IRM will continue to monitor implementation until all actions under this item are completed.



Photo 4: Signpost with GRM information

4.2.5. Problem-solving agreement implementation timeline

When the problem-solving agreement was signed on 3 July 2025, the parties agreed that all commitments would be implemented by 31 March 2026. Due to implementation delays and the



Photo 5: In-person meeting in MWE's office in Mbarara, Uganda, in May 2026

restructuring proposal pending the GCF Board's consideration in June-July 2026, the EE requested an extension of the agreement implementation period. In May 2026, the parties met in person in Uganda (in the Southwest and separately in the East) to review progress, exchange updates and discuss outstanding issues. Following these discussions, they agreed to extend the agreement timeline to 31 December 2026, with the possibility of further extension, if needed. The IRM will continue to monitor implementation until all commitments under the agreement have been fulfilled.

V. Lessons Learnt

Transparency is essential to building and maintaining trust: Prior to the problem-solving process, community members had limited access to project information, partly due to language barriers and limited access to communication channels. This caused misunderstandings and mistrust between the parties. Throughout the problem-solving and monitoring phases, the parties showed a high degree of openness and transparency. For example, during joint meetings, relevant district focal persons were contacted on speakerphone, allowing all participants to hear their views directly. The EE also shared available budgets for specific activities, helping complainants better understand implementation constraints and fostering greater openness to alternative proposals. Such openness helped reduce misunderstandings, strengthen trust between the parties, and support more constructive engagement throughout the process.

Capacity building supports effective implementation and monitoring: Capacity building workshops conducted at the outset of the problem-solving process helped establish a baseline understanding of negotiation, mediation, and respectful communication. During the monitoring phase, parties continued to use the skills acquired during the IRM training when addressing implementation challenges, suggesting that the learning opportunities provided by the IRM equipped them with practical tools for navigating real-world issues. This shared foundation



supported constructive engagement, informed decision-making, and collaborative implementation of the agreed actions. The IRM believes that involving a broader range of stakeholders, including local authorities and the AE, in such capacity building activities could further strengthen monitoring and implementation outcomes.

Pre-meetings improve the effectiveness of joint meetings: For all joint meetings between the parties, the IRM encouraged the complainants' representatives and their advisors to hold pre-meetings to prepare and brainstorm on different scenarios and expected outcomes. Such preparatory meetings before joint meetings proved critical to the effectiveness of the dialogue process. Given the wide geographic scope of the case, the diversity of issues across seven districts, and the use of multiple local languages, these meetings provided an opportunity to clarify issues, reformulate perspectives, and prepare questions and answers in advance. This helped ensure that joint meetings were focused on substance, leading to positive outcomes and making efficient use of parties' limited time.

Observers can make significant contributions to problem-solving monitoring processes: At the beginning of the process, the observers' (in this case, the AE and the GCF Secretariat) involvement was limited, mostly with the IRM providing them with certain updates. However, later in the process, they played much more active roles and supported parties in the agreement implementation. Their technical expertise, institutional knowledge, and existing relationships with project stakeholders supported the implementation of agreed actions.

Continued IRM engagement remains important during implementation: This case highlighted the need for sustained IRM engagement with the parties during the monitoring phase. The Project covers a large geographical area, with complainants located across seven districts in remote areas of Uganda and facing communication challenges. While the IRM encouraged direct communication between the parties, it continued to play an important facilitation role, particularly through its local team of consultants and interpreters, by supporting information exchange, addressing misunderstandings, and helping maintain momentum in implementing the agreement.

Trusted local facilitators and interpreters strengthen implementation: The support of a local facilitator and interpreters was critical throughout the process. Their involvement enabled direct communication with local parties and other project-affected community members without delay, facilitated a better understanding of local needs and priorities, and helped build trust in both the IRM process and among the parties involved. Their knowledge of the local cultural context also played an important role in de-escalating tensions and supporting constructive dialogue.

Ongoing support from local authorities is necessary for effective implementation: Successful implementation of the agreement depends not only on the parties' efforts and commitments, but also on the continued support of district-level authorities and other implementation partners. Given their central role in day-to-day project implementation and monitoring, it is important that local authorities remain informed on progress and can actively support the implementation of agreed actions as per their roles and responsibilities.

VI. Conclusion

Since the signing of the problem-solving agreement on 3 July 2025, the parties have made progress in implementing several commitments to lay the groundwork for a more comprehensive provision of alternative livelihoods and enhanced stakeholder engagement and GRM operations. The original deadline for implementing all commitments under the problem-solving agreement was 31 March 2026. Due to delays in the Project implementation and the need to restructure the



Project, the parties extended the agreement implementation through 31 December 2026. With the approval of the restructuring proposal, the parties believe that the right conditions are now in place to advance implementation of the remaining commitments.

The EE explained that, in the coming months, it will focus on providing alternative livelihood support to profiled wetland users and will engage with affected communities to support them in making informed decisions in managing the livelihoods provided in accordance with the Project design and scope.

The IRM will continue its monitoring role until all commitments under the problem-solving agreement have been fulfilled and will continue reporting to the GCF Board on progress. The IRM encourages the parties to continue working collaboratively to implement the remaining commitments in a timely manner.

This draft report was shared with the parties for their comments prior to its finalisation. The final report will be circulated to the Board and published on the IRM [case register](#).