



GREEN  
CLIMATE  
FUND

Independent  
Redress  
Mechanism

19 March 2026

---

# Problem Solving Monitoring Report on IRM Case C-0012-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 in the Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM)'s case C-0012-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 processes and outcomes of the implementation of the problem solving agreement signed by the parties on 6 November 2025. The parties were provided with a draft report for comments prior to its submission to the Board.



## Executive Summary

On 11 January 2025, the Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) received a [complaint](#) from the parents of an eight-year-old child (complainants) who, in March 2023, drowned in a water retention facility or ‘pond’ in southwestern Uganda as part of the GCF-funded project [FP034, “Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda”](#) (the Project). The Project aims to enhance Ugandan subsistence farmers’ ability to address climate change impacts through wetland restoration and livelihood diversification. The Accredited Entity for this project is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Executing Entity is the Ministry of Water and Environment of the Republic of Uganda.

In February 2025, the IRM determined the complaint [eligible](#) and progressed to the initial steps phase. In June 2025, the complainants and the Executing Entity (together as parties) agreed to resolve the matters through problem solving, with an aim to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome. Following a series of in-person and virtual engagements facilitated by the IRM and the UNDP’s Stakeholder Response Mechanism, which had received the same complaint, [the parties reached an agreement](#) on 6 November 2025. The UNDP Uganda Country Office observed and supported the process in its capacity as the Accredited Entity. While the parties decided to keep the terms of the agreement confidential, they acknowledged that the agreement does not constitute a resolution of the child’s death but focuses instead on providing livelihood support to the affected family members.

Following the signing of the problem solving agreement, which included a four-month implementation timeline as well as a monitoring role for the IRM, the IRM engaged regularly with the Accredited Entity, Executing Entity and the complainants to discuss implementation progress and any issues arising. This problem solving monitoring report summarises the outcomes of the implementation of the agreement reached on 6 November 2025 between the affected family and the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda. All commitments under the agreement have been implemented within the envisaged timeline and to the satisfaction of both parties.

Considering the fact that during the last two years, the IRM has handled two cases regarding drowning incidents (IRM Case C-0011-Uganda and IRM Case C-0012-Uganda) and has been made aware of a third one, the IRM will continue engaging with relevant stakeholders, including the GCF Secretariat and UNDP, in relation to health and safety measures under this Project. Also, if deemed necessary, the IRM reserves the right to self-initiate a compliance review process as per its mandate to assess potential non-compliance with GCF environmental and social policies and to ensure that the project continues in a sustainable manner.

This problem solving monitoring report was shared with the parties for comments prior to its finalisation and is being submitted to the GCF Board for information. The report will be disclosed on the [IRM case register](#), and the case will be closed.



## 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 (Decision B.BM-2017/10).<sup>1</sup> In handling the complaint, the IRM is required to offer problem solving to the parties as a means of resolving it, under the IRM's Procedures and Guidelines (PGs) (Decision B.22/22).<sup>2</sup> As set out in paragraph 76 of the IRM's PGs, when the parties agree to problem solving, and they 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 problem solving monitoring report under case C-0012-Uganda and summarises the implementation of the agreement reached by the parties on 6 November 2025.

## II. Background

### 2.1 The Complaint

On 11 January 2025, the IRM registered a [complaint](#) submitted by the parents of an eight-year-old child (complainants) who drowned in a water retention facility or 'pond' in southwestern Uganda in March 2023. At the time of the incident, the facility was under construction as part of the GCF-funded project FP034, "Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Uganda." According to eyewitnesses, the deceased was looking after goats grazing in the area and is said to have entered the pond, lacking a fence at that time, to retrieve a goat that had strayed into it. The complainants requested and were granted confidentiality in accordance with the IRM's TOR and PGs.

### 2.2 The Project

FP034 is intended to enhance Ugandan subsistence farmers' ability to deal with climate 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 project targets 24 districts in the southwestern and eastern regions of Uganda. FP034 was approved on 15 December 2016, with an estimated completion date of 31 December 2026, pending any official extensions. 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.<sup>3</sup>

### 2.3 The IRM Process

The complaint was declared [eligible](#) on 10 February 2025 under the IRM's TOR and PGs.<sup>4</sup> Following eligibility determination, the IRM started engaging with the complainants and other stakeholders in the initial steps phase to further evaluate the issues raised and to provide more

---

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

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

<sup>3</sup> More information about the project is available at: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/project/fp034>

<sup>4</sup> The eligibility determination is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/determination-eligibility-c0012-uganda.pdf>



information on the options available with regard to the processing of the complaint, as indicated in paragraph 36 of the IRM's PGs.

During the initial steps, the complainants shared additional details regarding the drowning incident. They indicated that on the day of the incident, they were working as day labourers outside of the village. They claimed they needed to engage in this work to compensate for lost income and increased food insecurity due to restricted access to wetlands. The mother of the deceased reported that in the past, she would usually practice subsistence cultivation in wetland areas near the village while taking care of her children. The family further mentioned that they had been promised alternative livelihoods but had not received them at that time. As a result, parents explained that they sought employment away from home and could not provide the necessary oversight to their minor children.



*Photo 1: Wetland at the location of the drowning incident*

Following numerous engagements with the IRM, both in person and virtually, the parties agreed to attempt to resolve the matter through problem solving, which commenced on 19 June 2025.<sup>5</sup>

In June 2025, the IRM was informed by the Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM), a UNDP accountability mechanism, that they received the same complaint.<sup>6</sup> In accordance with the Principles for Cooperation among Independent Accountability Mechanisms,<sup>7</sup> the IRM and the SRM jointly processed the case for greater efficiency and consistency.

### III. Problem Solving

Problem solving is a participatory and flexible process focused on assisting the parties in finding and/or developing an effective solution 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 focused on a respective project, including a compliance review. The problem solving was conducted by staff from the IRM and UNDP SRM, supported by a local interpreter.

The IRM and SRM facilitated the problem solving process through multiple bilateral meetings held both online and in-person with each of the parties to build trust, discuss needs and priorities and explore options for a mutually satisfactory resolution. The IRM visited the complainants in Uganda in June, September and November 2025 and engaged separately with representatives from the Executing Entity and the Accredited Entity. In addition, the IRM's local interpreter

<sup>5</sup> The initial steps report is available at: <https://irm.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/case/initial-steps-report-c-0012-19jun.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> The UNDP's Stakeholder Response Mechanism's case page on this complaint is available at: <https://srm.info.undp.org/case/srm013>

<sup>7</sup> Available at: <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/3043c724b44d475060e19be691c1a0ae-0490092016/original/IAMnet-Criteria-for-Participation-and-Principles-for-Cooperation-september-2016-ENGLISH.pdf>



provided on-the-ground support by visiting the family’s home, making phone calls and delivering translation and interpretation services as needed.

After four months of intensive engagement, on 6 November 2025, the complainants and the Executing Entity, the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda, reached agreement. Parties decided to keep the agreement confidential but are comfortable disclosing that the agreement reached is not a resolution to the loss of the child’s life but rather focuses on providing livelihood support to the affected family members to promote “reconciliation and peaceful coexistence.” The parties agreed on an implementation timeline and understood that the IRM and UNDP SRM would play a monitoring role to ensure its full implementation.

Regarding the health and safety aspect, during case processing, the IRM was able to confirm that the pond near the complainants’ house was fenced with a clear warning sign indicating drowning hazards and grievance channels.



Photo 2: Drowning hazard warning sign (left) and information on grievance redress mechanisms (right) on the fence enclosing the wetland

#### 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.

After the agreement was signed on 6 November 2025, the IRM maintained regular communication with the parties in line with the signed agreement. The IRM held online and in-person meetings with UNDP and the Ministry of Water and Environment, and engaged with the complainants with the help of a local interpreter. Consistent with the agreement, the parties fulfilled their commitments within the set timeline. The affected family received the livelihood support that was promised by the Executing Entity and expressed satisfaction with the outcomes of the problem solving process and the agreement reached.

#### V. Lessons Learnt

**Limits of remedy in cases involving loss of life:** The parties entered the problem solving process with a shared understanding that a loss of life cannot be remedied through the IRM problem solving. At the same time, complainants indicated that they are in deep emotional pain and wish the IRM process to be expedited with the aim of reaching agreement. While the issues raised in the complaint could not be fully resolved, the complainants reported a degree of relief resulting from the commitment and delivery of livelihood support by the Executing Entity. The complainants also understand that participation in the IRM process does not preclude their ability to pursue other avenues to address the matter of the loss of their child.

**Value of local support and language skills:** The IRM initially faced challenges in effectively engaging with the complainants due to their residence in a remote area of southwestern Uganda and considering language barriers. The involvement of a local interpreter was critical to facilitating communication, sharing updates, and staying in contact with the complainants. The local interpreter was also essential in understanding parties’ needs and priorities, and helping build trust in the IRM process and between themselves.

**Role of local-level grievance mechanisms in early resolution:** Depending on the context, local-level grievance mechanisms can offer more accessible and timely avenues for addressing



community-level concerns. While the IRM remains available to people adversely affected by GCF-funded projects, the case highlights the importance of communicating the availability of local grievance mechanisms to project-affected people. Clear procedures and effective outreach at the local level can facilitate earlier engagement and, where appropriate, support the resolution of issues faced by the affected communities.

## VI. Conclusion

Although the parties acknowledge that the loss of life cannot be remedied and thus the complaint received by the IRM could not be fully resolved, the parties reached agreement only on the livelihood component of the case. After reaching the agreement on 6 November 2025, the parties successfully implemented their commitments within the agreed timeline and have indicated satisfaction with the outcome of the problem solving process and the agreement reached.

Considering the fact that during the last two years, the IRM has handled two cases regarding drowning incidents (IRM Case C-0011-Uganda and IRM Case C-0012-Uganda) and has been made aware of a third one, the IRM will continue engaging with relevant stakeholders, including the GCF Secretariat and UNDP, in relation to health and safety measures under this Project. Also, if deemed necessary, the IRM reserves the right to self-initiate a compliance review process as per its mandate, to ascertain that potential non-compliance with GCF environmental and social policies is addressed.

The IRM shared this monitoring report with the parties for comments prior to its finalisation and submission to the GCF Board for information. The report will be disclosed on the [IRM case register](#), and the case will be closed.