**UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019**

1. July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification**
 | GEF ID.: 5194 | Umoja no.:  |
| Project Number + Project Title | Building resilience of communities living in degraded forests, savannahs and wetlands of Rwanda through an Ecosystem based Adaptation Approach(Rwanda LDCF) |
| Duration months | *Planned* | 48 months |
| *Extension(s)* | . The original project completion date is June 2020, but a one year extension is expected, proposing June 2021 as a completion date. The Project has a valid legal instrument until December 31, 2020 and extension will be pursued 6 months prior to expiry. |  |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | Climate Change Adaptation Unit Freshwater, Land and Climate BranchEcosystems Division |
| Executing Agency(ies) | Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) |
| Names of Other Project Partners | Musanze district, Rwanda |
| Kayonza district, Rwanda |
| Kirehe district, Rwanda |
| Ngororero district, Rwanda |
| Bugesera district, Rwanda |
| Gasabo district, Rwanda |
| Project Type | Full-sized Project  |
| Project Scope | National  |
| Region *(delete as appropriate)* | Africa |
| Names of Beneficiary Countries | Rwanda |
| Programme of Work | Programme of Work biennia 2018 - 2019 Climate change |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | Climate Change Adaptation |
| UNDAF linkages  | United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2018 – 2023 (UNDAP II)Results Area 1: Inclusive Economic Transformation Outcome 1.3 Sustainable management of environment, natural resources & renewable energy, climate change resilience |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | Goal 6 Clean Water and SanitationIndicator 6.6.1 Change in the extent of water-related ecosystems over timeGoal 13 Climate ActionIndicator 13.3.2 Capacity Building for Climate Change Indicator 13.B.1 Support for Planning and Management in Least Developed CountriesGoal 15 Life on Land Indicator 15.2.1 Progress towards sustainable forest management |
| GEF financing amount | $ 5,500,000 |
| Co-financing amount | $ 9,244,000 (estimated as at CEO endorsement)$ 62,387,905 |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | 10 November 2015 |
| Start of Implementation | 3 June 2016 |
| Date of first disbursement | 15 September 2016 |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June | USD 2,292,166.33 |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June | USD 1,819,946.33 |
| Expected Mid-Term Date | June 201824 August 2019(Actual mid-term date) |
| Completion Date | *Planned* | 31 December 2020 |
| *Revised* | June 2021 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | June 2021 |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | December 2021 |

1. **OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UN Environment Subprogramme(s)** Climate change | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)**a) Countries increasingly advancetheir national adaptation planswhich integrate ecosystem-basedadaptation(ii) Increase in the number of countries that have technical capacity to integrate ecosystem-based management into national adaptation plans |
| The project directly contributes to the advancement of ecosystem-based adaptation pilot activities in the country. The national adaptation plan project for the country financed through GEF is about to start this year and this project will maximize linkages with that, including linkages in project site interventions (e.g. Ibanda Makera forest), to allow for scaling up. In addition, national wetland management framework, a national catchment management framework and water quality monitoring systems will be developed in this project that contribute to broader adaptation planning in the country. |

**For all GEF 6 and later projects: NA as this is a GEF-5 project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GEF Core Indicators** | **Indicative expected Results** |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned linkages with UNDAF**  | Results Area 1: Inclusive Economic Transformation Outcome 1.3 Sustainable management of environment, natural resources & renewable energy, climate change resilienceThis LDCF project contributes to this outcome by implementing the following interventions: i) strengthening the technical capacity of Rwanda to plan and implement EbA; ii) strengthening the policy and strategy framework in Rwanda to promote ecosystem restoration and management; iii) restoring ecosystems to increase their resilience to the effects of climate change; and iv) promoting sustainable and climate-resilient livelihoods. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)** | The project contributes to SDG 6 by restoring lakes, wetlands and riverbanks that contribute to increased water quality, improved livelihoods such as fishing and improved ecosystem health and hydrological regulation services. Thus far, 159 ha have been restored with a further 130 ha planned. The project also contributes to SDG 15 by undertaking restoration of forests and savannah regions in the country. More than 500 ha has been replanted with trees so far. Goal 13 is supported through capacity building and policy development activities in the project. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Status** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| 1st PIR | 2nd PIR |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development Objective Rating FY** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| MS | S |  |  |  |
| Since the previous reporting period, progress of activities on the ground under Outcome 3 have sped up and results are already evident. For example, the removal of invasive species in Lake Cyohoha North has resulted in increased transport, higher fish catch, and overall improvements in the Lake Cyohoha North ecosystem. Forest restoration with indigenous species has also been successful and anecdotal reports of increasing species diversity in the area are observed. Radical terracing in Ngororero District has been successful in soil conservation and preventing landslides. Restoration of dry savannah areas are proving more challenging due to prolonged droughts that are compromising the survival rates of seedlings. While the targeted hectares are being achieved and even exceeded, the quality of restoration across sites differ due to survival rates.Activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 continue to lag behind, as delays in the procurement of consultants have delayed the conduct of training activities and development of policy recommendations. Training activities are planned in Q3 2019.Overall, the project is on track to meet the project objectives. Adaptive management during the project implementation phase has led to more comprehensive approaches to land and water management to address the barriers of degradation in the project sites. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Progress Rating** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| MS  | S |  |  |  |
| Delays in the project largely resulted from the transition of the Rwandan government to a new procurement system, which has posed difficulties in recruiting qualified consultants in a timely way. One of the key procurements that lagged behind (after 2 failed recruitment processes) is the baseline survey study necessary for proper monitoring and assessment of project impact. A first draft of the baseline study has been developed, but this process has overlapped with the mid-term review. Most of the delivery in the project has focused on site-level interventions, through arrangements with the Districts. This has proven useful in increasing delivery rates for on-ground interventions from 30% in the last reporting period to 70-90% in this reporting period with some sites already showing promising results.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Rating** | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ | FY 20\_\_ |
| L | M |  |  |  |
| Overall risk for the project is rated as modest. The prolonged drought this year is impacting on trees’ survival rates. Currently the average survival rate is 65% but fruit trees suffer poorer outcomes at 3%. Contracts with nurseries include maintenance and replacement of dead seedlings. The Rwanda Water and Forest Authority is engaged at the district levels to work with the field officers and teams to find solutions on increasing survival rates. Opportunities for assisted natural regeneration in lieu of restoration will be also be explored. There are also emergent environmental and social risks identified in the project such as potential for economic displacement of livelihoods (grazing and farming) with the delineation and enforcement of wetland and lake buffer zones. Transportation of water through small-scale irrigation and construction of water points are promoted to offset impacts of loss of direct access to water in buffer zones. Management measures will be put in place to ensure sustainable extraction from wetlands and lakes. An Environmental and Social Audit is planned to assess any present and foreseen impacts and propose mitigation and management measures. More detailed risk assessment and measures are in the relevant section below. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | A strong and participative process of collaboration between REMA and the District-level institutions is observed. There is strong ownership of the project activities and results by the district and communities, which are a result of direct alignment with district priorities and performance frameworks. Project steering committee members are show strong engagement in the project with the request to visit project sites to monitor progress. The project has a “National Technical Committee” comprised of all relevant stakeholders who provide technical assistance on specific issues, upon request. As a result of strong alignment with district priorities and activities, the project has also likely leveraged more co-finance than planned in the CEO endorsement but the detailed calculation will be reported in the next PIR. Districts have provided cash and in-kind and staff time. As planned, MOUs have been signed with Districts to facilitate local implementation, with the exception of Gasabo District, which is yet to sign the MOU. Community involvement on the execution of activities have been generally good, particularly on clearing of invasive species in wetlands, planting of agroforestry trees, and establishment of radical terraces. Further community engagement is needed on livelihood activities within wetland buffers, such as grazing and planting of vegetable crops. Engagement of banana growers on terracing their lands needs to continue in order to maximize benefits on soil conservation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | During project implementation, gender parity among beneficiaries is sought as much as possible. Training activities or restoration activities have included women as much possible. Around 40% of people benefitting from project activities are women.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | The project has produced the Rwanda Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Index and EbA Restoration Guidelines. Lessons learned from the project and other knowledge-sharing products will be developed at a later stage. An MOU has been signed with the University of Rwanda on project-specific EbA topics. The evaluation of proposals for master’s research projects are planned in July. During Q4Y2019 – Q1Y2020, a documentary film on the project progress will be conducted. Also, a two-page lessons learned document will be produced and uploaded on the REMA adaptation portal. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | **Building climate resilience though ecosystem-based adaptation in Rwanda: The IDP model green village[[1]](#footnote-2)**The LDCF II project has successfully supported the resettlement of vulnerable households from Ruhodo island. Climate change is threatening the livelihoods and quality of life of poor and vulnerable communities in the island of Ruhondo in Musanze District in Rwanda. Climate trends in the area show increasing amounts of rainfall and flooding and increased sedimentation owing to hilly terrains in the country. Such harsh conditions, combined with the lack of access to transportation, education, and social services in the small island make the settlements untenable. The GEF-funded project LDCF II executed by Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) and implemented by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in partnership with the Musanze district, has contributed funds to through climate change resilient amenities in the Gakoro IDP model village. The green village is equipped with biogas facilities for cooking, solar panels for lighting, and rainwater harvesting for domestic use vegetable gardens. Each household is provided with a cow for milk and to provide biogas in addition to human waste.  All relocation is voluntary and community members are better off in the Gakoro village with better to safe housing and better access to social services especially health and education, electricity, clean water, and transportation. The houses are well built, adequately sized and have disability access (ramps). There is no apparent conflict between the relocated Gakoro village settlers and the surrounding communities. The “host community” views the village as a potential market. A small market was established after the establishment of the village, which has around 700 people. People from the host community also go to the Gakoro village to observe the facilities that can be adopted such as biogas, rainwater harvesting, and solar energy. Some outstanding issues need to be solved such as providing the new resettled community with land for farming or alternative livelihood opportunities. Currently, Gakoro residents still go back to the island to farm. Careful planning is need so as the new resettlement, including land for farming, do no encroach of nearby wetlands.  There are also 49 households remaining in Ruhondo island that need urgent relocation. As many members of their community have been given access to better housing, services, and more opportunities in the future, they feel left behind. |
|  |

1. **RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[2]](#footnote-3) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. **3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s**)[[3]](#footnote-4)

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Description of indicator[[4]](#footnote-5)** | **Baseline level[[5]](#footnote-6)** | **Mid-term target[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **End-of-project target** | **Level at 30 June 2019** | **Progress rating [[7]](#footnote-8)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[8]](#footnote-9)**Increased capacity of Rwandan authorities and local communities to adapt to climate change by implementing Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) interventions in forests, savannas and wetlands  | 1. Degree to which capacity of targeted government institutions is strengthened at national and sub-national levels to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and assess effectiveness of EbA interventions. | 1. Current estimated level of capacity to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and assess effectiveness of EbA interventions is 3. Institutions have increasing capacity to monitor and identify climate risks. They are also able to design, budget and implement restoration interventions but not EbA interventions. Ecosystem restoration is prioritized by national institutions but not EbA. Therefore, EbA interventions are not currently implemented.A ”Gap analysis study on EbA” is currently being conducted by EbA consultant to determine the baseline each institution[[9]](#footnote-10). | NA | 1. Increase of at least 4 points in the capacity score of each institution. (Max 10, Min 0)  | 1. Capacity has not been measured at the mid-term as only end-of-project targets are included in the Project Document. Implementation progress and output-level detail are indicated in respective sections below. Outcome 1 activities have been delayed. Although some initial training activities have started, more training events are expected to take place later in 2019, responding to needs to be identified in the gap analysis study.  | MS |
| 2. Number of individuals benefitting directly from project interventions disaggregated by gender.  | 2. Zero  | NA | 2. At least 2,800 including 40% of which are to be women.  | 2. 1,481 people have been employed for average 4.5 months, with 51% women (750) and 49% men (731).1,399 participants benefited from training; 819 men and 580 women. 1054 households benefited from project ground activities (average 5 members per house), which is a total of 5,270 people.The beneficiaries are not added together as there are people that have benefitted both from training, employment, and directly from project interventions. | S |
| **Outcome 1:****National and local authorities have increased capacity to plan and implement EbA interventions.**  | 1.1. A National Steering Committee (NSC) mobilised as a platform to promote large-scale EbA programmes in Rwanda and capacitated to plan large-scale EbA interventions (disaggregated by gender).  | * 1. TOR for the National Steering Committee (NSC) has been developed but no trainings of NSC have been held.
 | * 1. NA
 | * 1. At least 90% of the participants to the NSC members have been trained on EbA.
 | 1.1 By end of the project the National Project Steering Committee is expecting to become the National Steering Committee on Rio Convention Committee and to be able to act as a platform to mobilize large-scale EBA programmes. Development of TORs to progress in this role is under way. Introductory training for PSC/NSC members were conducted. | MS |
| 1.2 Number of localgovernment officials,environmental committeemembers and local communityrepresentatives trained to plan,budget and implement EbAinterventions (disaggregatedby gender). | 1.2. Rwanda has recently implemented a number of national strategies, policies and plans for ecosystem restoration but no local government officials, environmental committee members or local community representatives have the capacity yet to plan, budget and implement EbA interventions.  | * 1. NA
 | 1.2. By project end point, at least: i) 80 local government officials; ii) 110 environmental committee members including 15 members at the provincial level, 25 members at the district level, 30 members at the sectoral level and 40 members at the cell level; and iii) 80 local community representatives have capacity to plan, budget and implement EbA interventions (of which 40% of women).  | 1.2. 26 representatives of government institutions have been trained on EBA including 6 women and 20 men. Training activities planned for Q3 and Q4 2019 are expected to reach more trainees. | S |
| 1.3. Number of documents and technical EbA guidelines developed and disseminated to environmental committees and local authorities through the climate change adaptation portal.  | 1.3. CC portal has already been created. A webpage is currently being developed on the portal for the LDCF1 project. This project will extend the role of this website through compiling the information of the project as well as other adaptation projects on a national scale.  | 1.3. NA | 1.3. By project end-point, at least 3 technical EbA guidelines developed.  | 1.3 Draft EBA restoration guidelines have been developed for: i) wetlands; ii) savannah and iii) forests Reports have been produced and are currently under review and for validation on July 17, 2019. The following technical documents are expected to be completed:- National Wetland Management Framework; National catchment management framework; and Water Quality Management Framework | S |
| 1.4. Number of educational resources on EbA developed by the project for communities living near project sites to increase awareness on EbA and support new competence based curriculum at primary ,secondary and university levels to address adaptation to climate change using EbA  | 1.4. Zero  | 1.4. NA | 1.4. By end point at least one training manual to support new competence based curriculum at primary and secondary levels developed and one green campus guidelines to integrate EbA Developed, 4 awareness campaigns on EbA targeting local communities and National Curriculum development center staff.  | 1.4Recruitments are pending for the consultant to produce training manual to support new competence based curriculum at primary and secondary levels and to develop the green campus guidelines, for awareness campaigns on EBA targeting local communities and National development center | MS |
| 1.5. Number of master‘s theses on EbA in Rwanda produced and validated at research forum and university level  |  1.5. No scientific studies on EbA in Rwanda published.  | 1.5.NA | 1.5. At least 6 theses on EbA produced and validated at university level | 14 masters’ theses submitted for funding pending evaluation  | S |
| **Outcome 2:****Sectoral and local policies, strategies and plans strengthened to promote the restoration and management of degraded ecosystems for EbA.**  | 2.1. Number of policy revisions proposed for cross-sectoral, sectoral and local policies, strategies and plans to incorporate EbA, and validated by the government.  | 2.1. The majority of cross-sectoral, sectoral and local policies, strategies and plans promote ecosystem restoration. However, they do not promote EbA.  | 2.1. NA | 2.1. At least 6 policy recommendations proposed and validated for cross-sectoral[[10]](#footnote-11), sectoral[[11]](#footnote-12) and local[[12]](#footnote-13) policies, strategies or plans to incorporate EbA.  | 2.1 Currently the draft report titled “**Entry points for mainstreaming EBA in Rwanda: A review of key existing regulatory instruments”** proposing policy recommendations such as integration with District Development Plans, environmental assessment processes, award systems for private sector, and synergies with Rio conventionshas been developed and will be validated on July 16, 2019. | S |
|  | 2.2. Number of upscaling strategies developed to promote EbA based on project interventions.  | 2.2. No upscaling strategy for best adaptation practices in Rwanda developed to date.  | 2.2.NA | 2.2. National up scaling strategy developed.  | 2.2 The National Upscaling strategy on EBA will be produced by end June 2020. This is because the strategy needs to include/capture all lessons learned from this project. | S |
| **Outcome 3:****EbA implemented by local communities to restore degraded ecosystems in forest, wetland and savannah ecosystems and establish climate resilient livelihoods.**  | 3.1. Number of households implementing climate-resilient agriculture practices including agroforestry in the project intervention sites. | 3.1 Households have on average between 12 and 22 trees on farm in project intervention sites. | 3.1 NA | 3.1.1 At least 500 individuals implementing climate-resilient agriculture practices including agroforestry in the project intervention sites. Beneficiary households have on average 30 trees on farm | 3.1 912 households are implementing soil conservation practices through radical terraces and agroforestry. | HS |
| 3.2. Number of hectares of wetlands/Lakes restored with climate-resilient species in Bugesera, Gasabo, Kayonza and Ngororero.  | 3.2. Zero | 3.2. NA | 3.2. At least 190 ha of wetlands/Lakes restored with climate-resilient species  | - Murago wetland - 34 ha 1. - Lake Cyohoha North - 115 Ha

- Kibare Lakeshores (80 Ha) -Nyiramuhondi riverbanks - 10Ha**-** Nyandungu Wetland – 0 ha- Construction of biogas technologies for 46 households under way in Musanze. Avoided deforestation in ha from renewable energy technologies in IDP houses will be measured after construction of biogas and clean cooking systems. While the coverage of hectares has exceeded the target, the quality of restoration across sites differ across sites and particularly lower in Murago wetland and Lake Kibare that are under drought conditions. Nyandungu wetland restoration has not commenced yet.**Total 239 ha** | S |
| 3.3. Number of hectares of forest restored with climate-resilient species  | 3.3. Zero | 3.3 NA | 3.3. 20 hectares restored with climate-resilient species At least 4 households have access to biogas technologies.  | - Sanza Natural Forest - 22 ha - Gihe forest - 7 ha- **Total 29 ha** | HS |
| 3.4 Number of hectares of savannah restored with climate-resilient species. | zero | 3.4 NA | 300 hectares restored usingclimate-resilient species | * Rwinkavu hill - 200ha
* Ibanda -Makera – 88 ha
* Kirehe District - 250 ha

**Total 538 ha[[13]](#footnote-14)** | HS |
| 3.5 Number of individuals receiving training, equipment and technical support to adopt climate-resilient livelihoods inthe project intervention sites. | 3.5.1 zero | 3.5.1 NA | 3.5.1. At least 120 individuals,of which at least 40% women,have received training,equipment and technicalsupport to adopt climate resilientlivelihoods in theproject intervention sites | * Bugesera - 68 people (40 men and 28 women)
* Ngororero District - 912 people

**Total 980 people[[14]](#footnote-15)** | HS |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s):

| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MS | S | Since the previous reporting period, progress of activities on the ground under Outcome 3 have sped up and some results are already evident. For example, the removal of invasive species in Lake Cyohoha North has resulted in increased transport, higher fish catch, and overall improvements in the Lake Cyohoha North ecosystem. Forest restoration with indigenous species has also been successful and anecdotal reports of increasing species diversity in the area are observed. Restoration of dry savannah areas are proving more challenging due to prolonged droughts that are compromising the survival rates of seedlings. While the targeted hectares are being achieved and even exceeded, the quality of restoration across sites differ due to survival rates.Key challenges lie in addressing the drivers of degradation across ecosystems, which are both climate and human activities such as farming and grazing near wetland ecosystems. For example, while the relocation of 46 families in Musanze District is expected to support improved resilience of settlements and avoided deforestation by providing for their energy needs, households continue to farm on the island in the absence of land for cultivation on the mainland. Farming activities continue to contribute to the degradation of Lake Ruhondo. Another example is in Lake Cyohoha North and Murago wetland complex. While the buffer zone delineation and restoration have been done, livestock continue to drink from the lake and encroach on the buffer zone. Murago wetland also still has a lot of farming activities in the wetland buffer zone. These challenges are being addressed through continued community engagement and searching for alternative sources of land and water resources, including through small scale irrigation.Activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 continue to lag behind, as delays in the procurement of consultants have hindered the timely conduct of training activities and development of policy recommendations. Training activities are planned in Q3 2019.Overall, the project is on track to meet the project objectives. Adaptive management during the project implementation phase has led to more comprehensive activities to address the barriers of degradation in the project sites. |

**Risks to the delivery of results**

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified**  | **Description of the problem/risk** | **Agreed recommended actions**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| on achieving targets | Drought conditions compromising seedling survival | Engagement of Rwanda Water and Forest Authority, increasing proportion of drought-resistant species such as grevillea robustaConsideration of suitability of sites for assisted natural regeneration instead of restoration |
| on stakeholder engagement |  |  |
| on gender actions |  |  |
| on safeguards | Potential risks on displacement of economic activities and livelihoods as a result of wetland buffer demarcation and enforcement of land use | Alternative land and water resources to be sought.Environmental and social audit to take place and deliver recommendations |
| on delivering GEF Core Indicators |  |  |
| on delivering of PoW EA |  |  |
| on sustainability of results | Continued encroachment of wetland and lake buffer zones | Engagement of community on alternative resource provision (e.g. small-scale solar irrigation). |
| Others |  |  |

**3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs**

| **Outputs[[15]](#footnote-16)** | **Expected completion date[[16]](#footnote-17)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)[[17]](#footnote-18)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)** | **Progress rating justification****Describe any problems in delivering outputs**  | **Progress rating[[18]](#footnote-19)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1: National and local institutional capacity development for the use of an EbA approach** |
| Output 1.1: A National Steering /technical Committee (NSC) mobilized as a platform to promote large-scale EbA programmes in Rwanda. | December 2019 | 20% | 50% | The project NSC was established in 2016. Meetings are held twice per year to provide guidance and support on project Implementation and for approval of project annual work plan and budget. The Project NSC is expecting to become at the project ending the National Steering Committee on Rio Convention Committee and able to act as a platform to mobilize large-scale EBA programs.The project has hired a national EBA expert to update and review the existing ToRs of the Rio Convention Committee. A roadmap and training need is under development that will allow the project NSC to be converted into the National Steering Committee on Rio Convention.11 NSC members, together with other relevant government institutions representatives and local level authorities, have received an introductory training on EBA concepts conducted by the EBA international expert. The training was conducted from 12-14 December 2018. 29 participants attended the training; 25 males and 6 females. The EBA consultants have produced the draft report on EBA guidelines and Gap analysis report. Those reports have been circulated among the NSC members in June. The validation workshop has been planned to take place on July 16, 2019. In-depth EBA training sessions will be provided in Q4Y2019 after validation of EBA gap analysis.The target completion of December 2019 would likely not be met as TORs, roadmaps, and training still need to be conducted. | **MS** |
| Output 1.2: Training events organized for local authorities, environmental committees and other target groups – with an emphasis on women and youth – to plan, budget and implement EbA interventions. | March 2020 | 10% | 40% | The capacitation on EBA of local authorities, environmental committees and other target groups is undergoing.**Period 19 - 22 December 2017:** REMA held a series of initial workshops with the District Development Strategy Committee. The aim of the workshops was to introduce the concept of EbA and integration of Environment and climate change in Development Sectors’ Plans and District Development Strategy. As the result of these trainings, the District Development Strategy 2018 – 2024 for the project sites have included environment and climate change and EBA concepts. **Period: 12-14 December 2018**Once the hiring process of EBA consultants (National and international) was completed in October 2018, a national training on introductory EBA was conducted. Districts authorities (5 representatives) participated as well (see above output 1.1)**Period January – June 2019:** The international EBA expert has produced the draft EBA Gap analysis report, which will be validated on July 16, 2019. Based on the identified gaps, the EBA expert is producing EBA training materials as well a training plan (identified targets groups and expected timeline for training sessions). It is expected that local levels training will be conducted in Q4Y2019.**EBA training on project team and REMA staff**REMA staff have been identified as well as a target group for capacitation in EBA. From July 2018 to June 2019, 8 staff including Four project staff and 4 supporting staff have received training on EBA, DRR and SPSS software application in EBA at the African School of Project Management and at International management training consortium in Nairobi, Kenya. Further capacities needs have been identified in: 1) GIS application for EBA monitoring. | S |
| Output 1.3: Technical EbA guidelines developed and distributed to environmental committees and local authorities. | September 2020 | 10% | 50% | The EBA restoration guidelines consultant has been hired in November 2018. The consultant has produced the inception report in the same month.Rural surveys, stakeholder workshops and fields visit for the data collection phase have been undertaken between January and April 2019.Three final draft EBA restoration guidelines: i) wetlands; ii) savannah and iii) forests reports have been produced and are currently under review. The reports include: i) identification suitable climate resilient indigenous species; review of past and current restorations activities and iii) EBA guidelines and restoration plans.A validation workshop for these three reports is scheduled to take place in 17 July 2019.During Q4 Y2019 the consultant will provide the trainings to trainers from Farmer Field Schools on the benefits of planting climate resilient species. | S |
| Output 1.4: Educational resources on EbA developed for communities living near project sites, and school and university students. | September 2020 | 15% | 25% | 1. **For communities**

As a preparatory phase to design details project activities on the ground and the buy-in of the communities, sensitization/mobilization meetings were conducted twice a month per site period July 2017 – December 2017. During period January to June 2018, across the project areas, 20 meetings to help setting up the Community Driven Development (CDD)[[19]](#footnote-20) groups in each project areas: 3 have been set up of 5 planned.Additionally, nine (9) awareness meetings were organized during the period November 2018 – June 2019 in five districts (Bugesera, Ngororero, Kayonza, Kirehe and Musanze). The themes discussed during these informational meetings for communities are: i) brief on the new environmental law, ii) induction on EBA with special focus on EBA restoration of wetlands, forests and savannas as well as on the importance of conserving indigenous tree species. In total 937 people participated including 501 men and 436 women.A detailed public awareness campaign plan will be developed in Q4 2019 and delivered during the period Q1 and Q2 2020. The awareness meetings will be on EBA benefits based on project deliverables and lessons learned (see activity 1.3.3).1. **Schools and universities students**

Preliminary discussions have been engaged on procedural process with the relevant departments: i) Rwanda Education Board and ii) The Department of Education and Environmental Mainstreaming (DEEM) in REMA.In collaboration with Rwanda Education Board, competence-based curriculum modules have been developed for integration of Environment and Climate Change in Secondary National Curriculum. The chapter of Environment and Climate will be the entry point of EbA in curriculum. A focal person in the DEEM has been designated. Two staff from DEEM are received training on EBA (June to 05 July 2019) in order to support the development of training manual to support new competence-based curriculum at primary and secondary levels. Additionally, an education specialist expert will be recruited to support the overall process. The ToRs are under development.There has been delays in the execution of this activity, which was put on hold while EBA consultants were been hired. The EBA consultants are expected to provide EBA / training to the NCDC, and all relevant stakeholders.The education specialist is expected to be hired by February 2020. Once hired, a catch-up strategy will be developed so as to produce the required project outputs before the end of the project: i) green campus guidelines; ii) detailed education programmes on EBA. | MS |
| Output 1.5: Scientific studies prepared and forum for dissemination of knowledge on EbA effects created. | September 2020 | 10% | 35% | From July 2018 up to June 2019, the following activities/ deliverables were completed:1**.** The signing of the MOUs between Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) and University of Rwanda, to support research to enhance the knowledge on ecosystem-based adaptation. This research is a joint project between University of Rwanda represented by the Center of Excellence in Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management (CoEB) and Rwanda Environment management Authority (REMA). The following topics have been identified: 1. Forest-friendly and climate-resilient restoration in Kayonza, Kirehe, Bugesera, Gasabo and Ngororero District; 2. Forest restoration and land husbandry in Ngororero District 3. Sustainable removal of water hyacinth in Cyohoha North Lake (Bugesera District) 4. Regeneration of ecosystem Kayonza (Rwinkwavu and Kibare), Kirehe (Ibanda Makera), Ngororero (Sanza) 5. Sustainable agriculture and ecosystem-based adaptation 6. Rural resettlement and ecosystem-based adaptation **2.** The creation of an oversight board in June 2019to ensure the quality of the research outputs under the MOUs signed. A Call for proposal to support 10 EBA master’s researches was advertised during the period Q1 and Q2 Y2019 (link to the call <https://ur.ac.rw/IMG/pdf/eba_lcdfii_rema_coeb_call_for_proposals.pdf>.Fourteen (14) proposals were submitted by MSc students. The submitted proposals will be evaluated by oversight board on a workshop 16 -19 July 2019 to select 10 laureates. | S |
| **Component 2: Policies, strategies and plans for adaptation to climate change.** |
| Output 2.1: Revisions to national ecosystem management and development policies and strategies to promote EbA proposed, validated, and submitted for adoption by government of Rwanda.  | June 2020 | 10% | 30% | Currently the final draft report titled “**Entry points for mainstreaming EBA in Rwanda: A review of key existing regulatory instruments”** has been developed. A validation workshop of the findings is scheduled for 16 July 2019. Once validated the policy briefs will be developed accordingly. | S |
| Output 2.2: A national upscaling strategy developed to promote EbA. | September 2020 | 15% | 70% | Two reports are expected from this output. 1. **Rwanda Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Index** (final report available. Report will be soon on REMA online Portal). This product identifies vulnerable regions in the country where EbA activities can potentially be upscaled.
2. **The National Upscaling strategy on EBA** will be produced by end June 2020. This is because the strategy needs to include/capture all lessons learned from this project.
 | S |
| Output 2.3: Policy-makers and decision-makers trained to integrate and promote upscaling of EbA interventions. | September 2020 | 10% | 25% | EBA experts were recruited. An introductory training on EBA was conducted from 12-14 December 2018 with the participation of the relevant policy-makers and decision makers (see above output 1.1), including at the local level. Training of Trainers (ToTs) was conducted in September 2019. The Trainees in collaboration with LDCF II staff will conduct further training of Environmental committees at provincial, District, Sector and Cell levels; NGOs; Private Sectors actors and Agricultural cooperatives. Trainees will work with District officials and technicians to develop the EbA upscaling strategies at those levels. A review and assessment of the national assessment tools (SEAs, EIAs, EAs) have been done. The consultants will be preparing Policy recommendations (see above output 2.1 and 2.2). Further training is scheduled for Q4Y2019. | MS |
| Output 2.4: District Development Plans (DDPs) of pilot sites revised to promote the use of EbA. | September 2020 | 60% | 100% | The LDCF II project team have held a series of workshops with the District Development Strategy Committee on the concept of EBA and in integration of Environment and climate change in Development Sectors’ Plans and District Development Strategy during the period 19 - 22 December 2017. As part of the project, All 6 project districts have now developed their District Development Strategy (DDS) 2018 – 2024 with project support. Environment, Natural Resources, Biodiversity and Climate change have been recognized in the DDS (2018 -2019) as areas for sustainable development due to the project. Most districts DDS now consider ways to effectively manage the natural resources (e.g. water, land and biomass) required for transforming agriculture and increasing access to modern energy services. Further trainings on EBA planning will be provided to representatives of the 6 Districts in Q4 2019 (see above output 1.2). | S |
|  **Component 3: EbA interventions that reduce vulnerability and restore natural capital** |
| Output 3.1: EbA implemented to restore wetland ecosystems to increase resilience of local communities to floods and droughts | June 2020 | 25% | 70% | In the previous reporting period (June 2018), the creation of nurseries for plantations was undertaken. During June 2018 and June 2019, many of the planting activities have been completed. The following results achieved with collaboration with the Districts in the project sites: 1. 4,000 bamboo seedlings on 10ha were planted along the Nyiramuhondi riverbank.
2. The target of 26 Km of demarcation line/trench excavated along Murago wetland has been completed;
3. 5,200 bamboo seedlings have now been planted on 52 km along the Murago wetland.
4. 34 ha of agricultural land around Murago wetland was restored by plantation agroforestry trees (Grevelia robusta, calliandra, Moesopsis, jacaranda).

An assessment of the survival rate of the trees in June 2019, was rated between 65 - 60%. This survival rate is expected to decrease as the region is facing prolonged drought.With the technical support of the Forestry Department, a higher proportion of grevillea robusta trees which is more resistant to drought will be planted in the next raining season. The Forest Department at the district level will provide further technical support on this issue of decreasing survival rate. Another important result is the clearing of the 115 ha/ out of 115 ha from water hyacinth of the Lake Cyohoha North (which is an additional 40 ha from previous reporting). The project is already showing benefits and communities are engaged. The removal of water hyacinth in Lake Cyohoha has reportedly increased fishing by 40% by communities[[20]](#footnote-21). Transportation across the lake is now possible again without the blockage from the water hyacinth. Communities reported that earned from income received from the cleaning activity, was used to buy cattle for families. Around the Lake, a demarcation line was also done by digging trenches to catch sediment and prevent nutrient runoff, and bamboo seedlings have been planted. Because water hyacinths are recurring, the project has secured from the contractor to maintain a clear area for 2 years after the end of his contract. Further to this, a more sustainable approach is the recruitment of an organic compost expert to train fishermen and farmers on the production, use and marketing of organic compost using water hyacinth and other invasive species[[21]](#footnote-22). However, the project still looking to find the organic compost expert. The ToRs have already been advertised twice.During restoration activities around the wetlands and lakes, the project encounters a major challenge of community heavy encroachment in the buffer zones (farming activities; direct withdrawal of water for human and cattle consumption, presence of a market in buffer zone)[[22]](#footnote-23). 46 relocated households in Musanze are expected to benefit from biogas technology to avoid deforestation and degradation of surrounding wetland environments. Fodder trees were additionally planted in the buffer zone of Ruhondo Island and Gakoro. | S |
| Output 3.2: EbA implemented to restore forest ecosystems in Sanza to increase resilience of local communities to floods and landslides. | September 2020 | 20% | 75% | 1. The 22 ha target for Sanza forest and 7 ha target of Gihe forest has been fully restored with the planting of indigenous trees[[23]](#footnote-24) which has improved the biodiversity in the forests. Tree survival rate was estimated at 80% in June 2019. It has been reported that illegal mining has ceased in the forests. Before illegal mining felled trees and extracted soils in the forest which resulted in sedimentation in the river. There are reports that some species of animals have returned as well as the return of 7 new species of plants[[24]](#footnote-25). The restoration of Sanza forest is fully funded by the LDCF and the Gihe forest fully by the District funds.2. It is critical that conservation approaches enable local people to develop more economically and ecologically sustainable livelihoods. Radical terraces to protect the agricultural fields upstream of the Nyiramuhondi river and between Gihe and Sanza forests have been constructed. As of June 2018, radical terraces were built only on 37 ha of out of 100 ha target. By June 2019, all 100 ha of radical terraces were completed and valorized. Agroforestry seedlings including; 5,000 grevillea; 10,000 calliandra; 5,000 avocadoes, and 1,067,000 pennicetum seedlings have been planted on the 100Ha of radical terraces. Further cows were distributed to 45 households. 212 (95 men and 117 women) received training on climate change awareness and forests restoration In addition, the Ngororero District contributed in co-financing by providing farmers with cassava and sweet potatoes seeds/seedlings for their production. The 100 ha of radical terraces benefitted a total of 912 households. Farmers have reported[[25]](#footnote-26) an increase in yield for e.g before project production of 10kg beans to 60kg of beans and maize from 10kg to 17 kg. The productivity has increased because topsoil has been maintained with compost manure receive from cows and the terraces and waterways built. Also, terraces have reduced landslides according to the communities[[26]](#footnote-27). | HS |
| Output 3.3: EbA implemented to restore savanna ecosystems in Kayonza District to increase resilience of local communities to droughts. | December 2020 | 30% | 85% | During last reporting in June 2018, nursery beds were prepared and on-going achievement rates were between 59% - 70% depending on the sites. As of June 2019, all nursery activities have been completed. Furthermore, plantations of seedlings have been completed in all sites. Total land planted is estimated approximately to 538ha[[27]](#footnote-28) (exceeding target by 150 ha), with a survival rate ranging from a high 82% in Kirehe with Grevillea Robusta to a very low 3% with fruit trees (avocado and mangoes) in Kibare Lakeshores[[28]](#footnote-29). There are serious concerns, with the prolonged droughts in the project sites, that the survival rates will be further reduced.Additional to planting activities of restoration, other activities are performed that contributed to the overall progress of 85% of this output.**Relocation of the selling Point in Kibare Lake[[29]](#footnote-30):** The selling point has been successfully relocated away from the buffer zone of Kibare Lake. Now the buffer zone of the Lake has seen a natural regeneration of fodder as human activity has been reduced. | HS |
| Output 3.4: Training events, equipment and technical support for the establishment of climate-resilient livelihoods in wetlands, forests and savannas to enhance local communities’ resilience to the effects of climate change (Note: Trainings under component 1 above)  | Mar 2020 | 0% | 15% | ToRs for an Expert on Ecotourism, Private sector financing mobilization is under preparation. A major outcome is the hiring of the Fishing and aquaculture expert/consultant. He has developed Business plan which is under review. Construction of solar powered irrigation systems on 10 ha in Murago has already started and achievement rate is at 45%[[30]](#footnote-31). The irrigation system is expected to be handed over to farmers by Q1 2020 after a sustainable operation plan is developed considering water extraction rates. 68 farmers (40 men and 28 women) are involved in the construction. Those farmers are the farmers economically displaced due to the enforcement of the wetland buffer zone (20 m). | MS |

Overall project implementation progress[[31]](#footnote-32)*:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| MS | S | The implementation progress has improved from the previous reporting period. The recruitment of consultants has supported important work such as the development of EbA guidelines, development of training products, and others that pave the way for other activities in the project. Capacity building and policy activities under Outcomes 1 and 2 are expected to accelerate in the coming months, also as catch-up plans are developed for delayed activities. Delays on Outcome 3 activities result from the long start-up phase and redesign of activities according to priorities on the ground and practical considerations. Different rounds of changes present challenges to translating these to the results framework, budget structures, and reporting arrangements. New activities also require assessment for feasibility and environmental and social safeguards. Despite these challenges, work on EbA interventions on the ground in the Districts are advanced and done in an integrated manner addressing both restoration on the ground, implementation of buffer zones, and addressing drivers of degradation, with some sites such as Lake Cyohoha, Sanza forest, and radical terracing already generating results. The challenge in the next two years would be to continue engaging communities in preventing encroachment of buffer zones to make the interventions sustainable, and in some cases supporting provisions for water and other resource needs for livelihoods.  |

**Risks in implementation**

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc).

The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Agreed recommended actions** | **By whom** | **When** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delays in recruiting consultants | Finalizing the ToRs of the remaining consultancies by end SeptemberShare the ToRs proactively on other platform and link it to the Rwanda Government online systemProvide short guidelines application to prospective applicants | REMA Project team | By end September 2019 |
| Drought conditions | The Rwanda Water and Forest Authority is engaged at the district levels to work with the field officers and teams to find solutions on increasing survival rates. Opportunities for assisted natural regeneration will be also be explored | REMA Project teamDistricts | By End September 2019 |

**3.3. Risk Rating**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation at CEO approval** | **Mitigation at implementation** | **Rank** |
| Current climate and seasonal variability and/or hazard events prevent implementation of planned activities. | Consider current climatic variability during the restoration process.Focus on climate-resilient species and techniques to: i) assist plant growth particularly in the seedling/sapling phase; and ii) reduce risk of damage from hazard events.Take meteorological predictions and seasonal variability into account to reduce the risk of damage to plants. | Climate resilient Grevillea will be planted on the next season.Replanting to be performed during raining season.Options for assisted natural regeneration are to be scoped.Rwanda Water and Forest Authority will be engaged at the district level. | CEO: M |
| TM: S |
| PM:M |
| Communities do not support interventions and do not adopt ecosystem management activities for adaptation during or after the term of the proposed project because of limited immediate benefits of EbA. | Institutionalise the pilot programmes within MINIRENA/MINAGRI to promote sustainable, long-term delivery.Implement alternative livelihoods that have been deemed financially, technically and socially viable/feasible to reduce reliance on intensive land use.Engage with community stakeholders during the PPG phase to strengthen their buy-in into the proposed project.Actively involve local communities in project implementation.Raise public awareness on the capacity of the restored ecosystems to increase community resilience to climate change. Foster a bottom-up, grassroots approach throughout the project’s development and implementation phases.Improve capacity building and training of the communities to improve their understanding of the adaptation benefits of the EbA activities.Implement activities that have direct benefits to local communities. | Intensive awareness campaigns and stakeholder consultations were done before the start of the project and at the early stages of implementation. Further engagement of communities at risk of economic displacement due to wetland and riparian buffer implementation is required. Continued engagement of banana growers that have not allowed radical terracing on their property on the benefits to soil conservation should also take place | CEO: M |
| TM: M |
| PM: L |
| Institutional capacity and relationships between line ministries are not sufficient to provide effective solutions to climate problems that are complex and multi-sectoral. | Promote the development of institutional capacity throughout the project design. This will ultimately lead to the development of an appropriate institutional framework for analysing climate change impacts, amending policy and implementing EbA interventions for climate change adaptation. | Districts and government institutions have received training on EBA. REMA and the District authorities have very good working relationships that allow technical support to the District level and allow for political will to execute and sustain activities in the Districts.  | CEO: M |
| TM: L |
| PM: L  |
|  |
| Limited technical capacity to conduct preliminary studies and design the implementation of activities | Identify and develop human resource capacity as required.Identify whether staff trained by the LDCF1 project is available to carry out certain tasks in order to increase technical capacity in-country.Include funds in the project budget for preliminary studies to hire international consultants to complement the research team. Engage field officers to work closely with the project manager of the proposed project to ensure timely delivery of project outputs. | Field officers have been engagedInternational consultants: CTA, EBA, Vulnerability assessment expert have been hired.Previous LDCFI project manager has been engaged as a national technical advisor on the project.Hiring process took long not only because of the introduction of the new system but also the unavailability of required skills.Further capacity building through training in the project and working alongside international consultants is envisioned. | CEO: MTM: MPM:M |
| Uncontrolled settlements into the natural ecosystems. | Raise awareness of the national and local government on this potential risk.Raise communities’ awareness on the benefits of restored natural ecosystems for their livelihoods.Maximise the economic benefits from sustainable natural resource management. Increase the capacity of district authorities to enforce policies for natural resource protection. | Still encounter heavy encroachment along the 20m and 50 m buffer zone for wetlands and lakes respectively.The project has engaged with communities and they requested irrigation and water supply for their livestock. These options are pursued with due consideration to potential environmental risks to water extraction from wetlands and lakes. | CEO: MTM: MPM: M |
| **Overall Risk Rating****Project Manager** | M |
| Overall Risk RatingTask Manager | M |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating**[previous] | **FY2019 rating**[current] | **Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| L | M | The main project risks are changes in the country’s procurement system, resulting in procurement delays, drought conditions that compromise seedling survival rates, and delays caused by changes to project activities and screening for feasibility and safeguard risks. These are described in sections above and risk tables below in greater detail. |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Optional Annexes and/or Links:**

* **Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported**
* **Half yearly Report**
* **Quarterly Reports**
* **Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)**

**Risks Factor Table**

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated* ***Substantial*** *or* ***High*** *and who is responsible to for it.*

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK FACTOR TABLE** |
| ***Project Managers*** *will use this table to summarize risks identified in the* ***Project Document*** *and reflect also* ***any new risks*** *identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project,* ***as relevant****. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (****PM)*** *and one for the UNEP Task Manager (****TM)****. If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The* ***UNEP Task Manager*** *should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.* |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | **Substantial** | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **INTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project management** |
| Management structure[Roles and responsibilities] | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM : low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The project team in REMA together with the field officers have established roles and responsibilities. |
| Governance structure[oversight] | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM : low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The steering committee members are active in bringing up and debating issues and project details. Meetings are conducted efficiently with clear resolutions. |
| Internal com­munications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good  | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Good communication channels are in place. |
| Work flowBudget | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: medium, due to restructuration of activities (new activities added), two budget revisions were needed this year. First in January 2019 and then now June 2019. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The result of adaptive management in the project is that changes the budget and workplans occur. At the mid-term, the current set of activities were confirmed. Guidance on budget revisions was also provided to the team (e.g. proposals for new budget lines, etc.). |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: While the project is leveraging co-financing, documenting how the results relate to the project and how the project is supporting other activities to be more climate-resilient can be improved. |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: Medium |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: As a result of changes to project activities, reallocations across budget lines are necessary. The initial approach of the country was to use existing budget lines for new activities. The TM has advised to break down budget lines according to purposes (e.g. separate budget lines for restoration and irrigation). Project management costs are efficient. |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: Medium. A second budget revision in 2019 is being finalized which include new budget lines |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Some expenditures were previously recorded under the incorrect budget lines. Expenditures are however clarified in the notes. Since the 2nd 2019 budget revision, new budget lines have been created allowing for more transparent reporting. |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: With restructuring of projects activities the production of some of the reporting are delayed financial reports and the current PIR |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: In agreement with PM comments. |
| Stakeholder engagement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: LowSo far a total of 112 HHs have been resettled from Ruhondo islands, including 62 resettled to Gakoro/Gacaca green village, whereas 46 were resettled by LDCF II Project. Musanze District Authorities is still looking for the means to resettle the remaining families. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Stakeholder engagement with communities and districts have generally been very good. However, there are gaps in having formal engagement processes for communities that potentially experience economic displacement from the delineation and implementation of wetland and riparian buffer zones. Communities in Lake Ruhondo and in Musanze District have been left behind (49 families) and a plan and financing for their relocation should be realized. |
| External com­munications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand­ings concerning objectives and activities evident | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: There is high awareness of the project among project beneficiaries and very strong engagement with district leaderships. |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM:Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: The project activities focus on long-term benefits and ensuring activities are sustainable through engagement of communities and districts. |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: MediumDelay in procurement of consultancies were due to an introduction of online procurement system, which was new and difficult to use by most of the consultants in the beginning.Some consultancies were removed in order to avoid duplications of tasks or deemed no longer relevant. |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Procurement of consultancies have been delayed, including experts on EbA. Many consultancies have been removed in the project in order to allocate more funding to field interventions, increasing this risk. Restoration protocols and the recommendations of experts are similar, so the impacts in this case are not high. |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Although there were changes in project activities, the decisions appear to be motivated by a desire to have stronger alignment with priorities and to have more on the ground relevance, not political ambitions or individual or elite interests. |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **EXTERNAL RISK** |
| **Project context** |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: High political stability at national and district levels are observed |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: There are concerns with prolonged droughts in Kayonza and Bugesera districts, that survival rate at currently 65% drop even further. Fruit trees survival rate is low as 3% |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| TM: This risk is rated as substantial instead of medium as these conditions put in danger the success of EbA in particular areas especially the sites in the east and south which experience drier conditions. The quality of restoration efforts in forest and savannah, and also riparian zones would be compromised. |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Low | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: No significant economic and social issues external to the project are observed. |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners  | Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: Medium |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: There are some challenges to capacity, particularly financial management and in monitoring and reporting of impact indicators. Capacity building activities have been conducted. Further training in finance is planned in Q4 2019. |
| Others, please specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN** |
| Rank – importance of riskRisk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the riskWho – person(s) responsible for the actionDate – date by which action needs to be or was completed  |

| **Rank** | **Risk Statement[[32]](#footnote-33)** | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
| 1 | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions | Low survival rates of seedlings, poor restoration outcomes | Consult RWFA at the district level on alternatives to current restoration protocols (e.g. increase of proportion of grevillea, acacia and other species that are more drought resistant)Consider opportunities for assisted natural regenerationConsider cost and opportunities for irrigation | REMA, RWFA, contractors | ASAP |
| 2 | Environmental and social risks from delineation of wetland buffers and restriction of land use within these areas. Alternative water sources to be provided such as irrigation may also have some environmental risk, particularly for Murago wetland. Relocation of the market along Kibare lakeshores need to be checked for safety and waste disposal plan. | Displacement of economic activities such as riparian farming and grazing; cumulative impacts of potential unsustainable water extraction from Murago wetland if the small-scale irrigation of 10 ha is further upscaled | Develop Environmental and Social Audit for activities that have transpired, propose mitigation and management measures. Conduct desktop impact scoping for irrigation activities under preparation. | REMA, RAB, Districts, under the supervision of the TM | ASAP |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** | **FY2019 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
| L | M | The project faces increased risk owing to the drought conditions that is having an impact on the success of restoration activities. Some environmental and social risks related to new activities have also been identified as mentioned above.  |
|  | **If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation** |
|  |

Annex 1. Photos to illustrate Gakoro village improvements in settlements and facilities

****

****

1. See Annex 1 for photos. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. As per latest from baseline study July 2019 yet to be validated. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Add rows if your project has more that 3 key indicators per objective or outcome. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Adapted from TAMD (2013) and PPCR (2014) scorecard indicators.

management or development policies or strategies [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. For example, revisions could be proposed for the national forestry policy and the water resources master plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. For example, revisions could be proposed for the DDPs of Bugesera, Kayonza and Ngororero. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. **Rwinkavu Hill, Kayonza district:** Plantations also completed on 200 ha instead of 100 ha but survival rate is estimated at 70% and with the current prolonged droughts, there would be a likely decrease for this rate. **Ibanda-Makera savanna natural forest:** As of June 2019, nursery seedbeds were prepared and seedlings were planted and completion is estimated at 100% with: i) markamia rutea (5,550 seedlings); ii) Acacia polyacantha (5,590 seedlings); iii) ficus vallis (only 56 seedlings). Overall tree survival rate is estimated at 75%. **Kirehe**: plantations even exceed the original target with 250 ha planted instead of 200 ha. Three species were planted: i) Grevillea robusta on 200 Ha with 82% survival rate in May 2019; ii) calliandra calothyrus on 5 Ha with 85% of survival rate in May 2019 and iii) Sena spectabillis on 45 Ha with 74 % of success rate. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Construction of irrigation and water points for livestock in Lake Kibare, Murago wetland, and Rwakigeli Lake are in the scoping and construction phases. Upon completion, the results against the indicator is expected to increase. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. . Expecting completion is as described in the latest workplan January 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Community Driven Development (CDD) is a development initiative that provides control of the development process, resources and decision-making authority directly to community groups. The underlying assumption of CDD projects are that communities are the best judges of how their lives and livelihoods can be improved and, if provided with adequate resources and information, they can organize themselves to provide for their immediate needs. It is in this context that communities within the project areas living around degraded wetlands, savannas, forests and lakes are been supported to develop and implement environmental-friendly natural resources conservation and livelihood improvement subprojects such as irrigation, horticulture, aquaculture, agro-forestry, alternative sources of energy, among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. The reporting of an increase of 40% in fishing around the Lake Cyohoha is based on communities anecdotal reporting and still need to be validated. However field visits conducted by project PM, M&E, CTA observed a general satisfaction by communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Because of the economic benefits fishermen may gain from the selling of organic compost to farmers, this may be an incentive for fishermen to continue the cleaning of the Lake. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. After several consultations with communities and districts officials, it was proposed for the project to provide water extraction for farmers to ensure sustainability of the restoration of the buffer zone around wetlands. Districts of Kayonza and Bugesera suffer from recurrent prolonged droughts that forced communities to move further close to the lakes for farming for human and livestock consumption. During project 2017 budget revisions, it was proposed to construct solar irrigation systems around the Murago wetland. The Project NSC further convened 26th July 2018 proposed further to the team to undertake the following activities: i) install solar powered irrigation system and water supply to cattle’s around Kibare lake in Kayonza District, Ndego Sector, Isangano and Byimana cell**s** ii) Construction of the selling point to relocate market activities conducted within 50 meters of Kibare Lake to ensure total protection of the ecosystems and iii) small scale irrigation Rwakigeli Lake to increase farmers climate change resilience from recurrent prolonged droughts. While the selling point construction have started (see Output 3.3 for progress), the other activities of irrigation and water supply are at various stages of discussion for the feasibility and environmental safeguards. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. The following trees have been planted: 1.Erythrina abyssinica: 29,986 seedlings; 2.Ficus cycomorus spp gnaphalocarpa: 27,830 seedlings; 3.Ficus thonninghii: 27,830 seedlings; 4.Accacia siberiana: 27,830 seedlings; 5.Cartrus: 7,562 seedlings; 6.Carapa grandiflora: 45 seedlings; 7.Syzygium parvifolium: 338 seedlings; 8.Arundinaria alpine: 147 seedlings; 9.Syzygium parvifolium: 206 seedlings, 10.Polystichum setiferum/ Ptreridium aquilinum: 101,063 seedlings; 11. Polyscias fulva: 16,170 seedlings and 12. Myrianthus holstii: 990 seedlings. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. These observations were made by the District Director of Agriculture, Mr. Rongin Ntarinda during interview held on 20 May 2019 by the Midterm review consultant (see CTA mission report). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. During midterm review May 2019, farmers reported these increases in yield productivity during focus group discussions. Farmers reported even surplus production that allowed them to sell in the market in Ngororero. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. According to communities and district officials (during midterm review focus groups), terraces have reduced the occurrence of landslide during 2018 – 2019 rain season. For example, they recalled that in 1993 people died from the landslide with houses and crops damage. This year landslide was minimal and no incurrence of death. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. **Kirehe**: plantations even exceed the original target with 250 ha planted instead of 200 ha. Three species were planted: i) Grevillea robusta on 200 Ha with 82% survival rate in May 2019; ii) calliandra calothyrus on 5 Ha with 85% of survival rate in May 2019 and iii) Sena spectabillis on 45 Ha with 74 % of success rate.

 **Kayonza:** Plantations also completed on 200 ha instead of 100 ha but survival rate is estimated at 70% and with the current prolonged droughts, there would be a likely decrease for this rate.

**Kibare Lake:** The trenches of 16 km were completed with the planting of seedlings on 80 Ha. This area has one of the lowest survival rates due to the severe drought. While bamboos recorded a survival rate of 40% and grevillea has a 70%, fruits trees (mango and avocados) have a survival of only 3%.

**Ibanda-Makera savanna natural forest:** As of June 2019, nursery seedbeds were prepared and seedlings were planted on 88 ha and completion is estimated at 100% on 88 ha with: i) markamia rutea (5,550 seedlings); ii) Acacia polyacantha (5,590 seedlings); iii) ficus vallis (only 56 seedlings). Overall tree survival rate is estimated at 75%. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Because of this extreme survival rate, the Department of Forestry will undertake a field visit and proposed a remedial action plan. At present it was suggest to increase the planting of grevillea. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. The Organic Environmental law imposes a 50m buffer around Lakes. As the result, to enforce the law, the existing market had to be relocated outsize the buffer zone. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. The project intends first to construct solar-powered irrigation system on 10ha/ out of 34 ha of restoration as a pilot. The irrigation is intended to be managed by the community. A community management plan will be developed to ensure that water is extracted in a more sustainable way: e.g. irrigation is combined with rainwater harvesting; community trained in water harvesting and other soils water retention techniques. Further environment assessments will be performed to assess the environmental risks before any extension of the system. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)