

# Rwanda Urban Development Project II

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## **Basic project information**

**GEF ID**

10530

**Countries**

Rwanda

**Project Name**

Rwanda Urban Development Project II

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

3/20/2020

**Review completed by PM**

7/14/2020

**Program Manager**

Aloke Barnwal

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

AB, May 28, 2020:

Regarding Table A, please note that GEFSEC is working on adjusting the outcome text to better reflect the GEF-7 SC-IP outcome. No action is needed from the GEF Agency for the time being.

GEFSEC June 29 2020

Thanks for revising the outcome text. Comments cleared.

### Agency Response

Response 6/17:

Table A outcome selection has been changed to *“Transforming cities through integrated urban planning and investments in innovative sustainability solutions.”* as per email communication 6/10 from Fareeha Iqbal.

**2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

FI & AB, May 28, 2020:

Not yet. Adjustments and/or clarifications are requested:

a) PDO in the PID (p.9): The project should be explicit in its indicators on integrated and sustainable urban planning. The indicators currently articulated do not reflect GEF objectives.

While the context has been improved to consider GEF’s integration approach, it is essential that GEF’s program objectives are reflected in project development objective and indicators. e.g. "institutional capacity for integrated urban planning and management strengthened".

b) Clarifications are requested to text in para 17 of the PID:

(i) Please clarify what is meant by 'low-impact infrastructure'.

(ii) It is not clear which infrastructure or site is being referred to here. If it is for community centers and other public buildings, then in addition to energy efficiency, the project could also facilitate solar power installations which can directly reduce GHG emissions. The project could demonstrate good pilots of low-carbon buildings for wider scaling up.

c) Regarding para 20 of PID (see page 10): Capacity building is a critical element of GEF’s support to facilitate integrated planning and making sustainability-linked investments. Will sustainability and integration principles be part of ICD? It is not very apparent from the scope.

d) Description of sub-Component 2a needs adjustment (see p.11 of PID): This component (and both the sub-components) does not indicate if integration and sustainability principles will be adopted. As discussed in previous consultation meeting, we would like the GEF SCIP principles and objectives considered across all the components of the project even if GEF funds are not appropriated for them.

GEFSEC 29 June:

Thanks for revising the project objective and the indicator which is fine. The changes are reflected in the PAD however the objective in PID is different. Please revise the objective in PID to make it consistent.

Thanks for clarifying on low-impact infrastructure which essentially is low environmental impact infrastructure/investment. A foot note or supportive text will be useful for better clarification.

The sites are noted and infrastructure focus is also clear now in paragraph 20. Low carbon benefits will be achieved through energy efficiency in operations, sustainable building materials with low embedded carbon and waste management infrastructure (in addition to natural infrastructure). It is understood that the project will not focus explicitly on renewable energy solutions e.g. solar based LED street lights. This is however a clear opportunity which the project may like to consider.

c) Thanks for adding more explicit reference of sustainability and integration in ICD. Comment cleared.

d) Thanks for the clarification. However, we will appreciate this detail to be included in the project document's sub component 2 (a).

July 7, 2020

Please respond to the following comment made above. This is a useful opportunity to enhance climate mitigation aspects of the project.

It is understood that the project will not focus explicitly on renewable energy solutions e.g. solar based LED street lights. This is however a clear opportunity which the project may like to consider.

July 14, 2020

Thanks. Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

Response 7/9:

Although the project does not have an explicit renewable energy focus, the menu of urban upgrades will include low carbon infrastructure investments such as efficient street lighting and efficient building design. The project implementation manual will provide further detail on required specifications, including those for

energy efficient street lighting. Specific urban upgrading investments will be selected by the communities through a participatory planning process. Therefore it is not possible to quantify at this time how much money will be invested in low carbon energy solutions.

Response 7/6:

Thank you, requested changes are made in the PID and PAD (objectives)

A footnote has been added in the PAD and the PID (low-impact infrastructure)

Some lines have been added into paragraphs 36 and 38, describing how these principles are integrated in component 2a.

“36. Investments in secondary cities will incorporate the principles of sustainability and integration, which are embedded in national policies. The Law Governing Urban Planning and Building in Rwanda (2012) regulates local development based on clear procedures to support sustainable, integral and inclusive development, institutional strengthening and development, decentralization, local economic development, citizen participation and accountability mechanisms.”

“In the detailed area plans, opportunities will be sought to integrate sustainability principles such as the provision of green space, the integration of non-motorized transport and the development of mixed-use communities. The establishment of CMOs is an important step towards cities becoming self-administered autonomous entities, capable of developing and implementing integrated plans.”

Response 6/17:

a) The PDO is revised to “*to improve access to basic services, enhance resilience and strengthen integrated urban planning and management in the City of Kigali and the six secondary cities of Rwanda*”.

In the previous version of the PAD, the PDO indicator was grouped under the phrase “institutional capacity for integrated urban planning and management strengthened”, but it is quantified through the indicator “Cities with detailed area plans prepared and adopted (Number)”. This will be rephrased to “Cities with detailed area plans, incorporating principles of sustainability, prepared and adopted (number)”.

This indicator refers to the development of local development or detailed area plans for unplanned settlements in Kigali and in the six secondary cities. The area plans developed in this project will be aligned with Rwanda's policies and strategies which already emphasise the importance of sustainability and integrated urban planning. Indeed, Rwanda's Urbanization Policy (2015) is explicitly founded on a number of core principles, of which the first two are "Sustainability and resilience" and "integrated urban planning". Sustainable Urbanization is also a core element of Rwanda's overarching national medium-term development strategy, its National Strategy for Transformation (2018-2024).

Detailed area plans are used to coordinate all development activities and infrastructure and control the use and development of land. They provide specific land use regulations, building height restrictions and allowable densities, among others, applicable to a smaller geographic area (compared to the master plan). The plans should be approved by the district council and align with the overall district development strategy.

b) (i) Low-impact infrastructure describes infrastructure that reduces the impact on the environment. This incorporates infrastructure that uses efficient energy in its operation (e.g. LED street lighting), that has lower amounts of embedded carbon in the materials (e.g. minimising the use of concrete), and reduces pollution loads. Examples of the latter include green infrastructure and sustainable urban drainage systems that seek to replicate the natural hydrological cycle where possible (e.g. increasing infiltration and using biological treatment of waste waters).

(ii) The site refers to the four unplanned settlements (Mpazi, Gatenga, Nyagatovu and Nyabisundu). New infrastructure will seek to use efficient energy in its operation and reduce the embedded carbon in construction.

c) Yes, these principles underlie Rwanda's policies on Urbanization (see National Urbanization Policy (2015), the National Housing Policy (2015), the National Informal Settlement Upgrading Strategy (2015), and crucially, Priority Area 2 of the National Strategy for Transformation (NST) which states focuses on "Accelerate Sustainable Urbanization from 18.4% (2016/17) to 35% by 2024". As a result, any training and capacity development efforts will incorporate sustainability and integration principles, and these will be explicitly described in TORs presented to any consultancies. A sentence has been added to this paragraph (now 23 in the revised PID and 28 in the PAD) to read, "In alignment with the Government's long-term vision, all ICD activities will incorporate sustainability and integration principles."

d) Yes, investments in secondary cities (in sub-component 2a) will also incorporate the principles of sustainability and integration, which are embedded in national policies. The Law Governing Urban Planning and Building in Rwanda (2012) regulates local development based on clear procedures to support sustainable, integral and inclusive development, institutional strengthening and development, decentralization, local economic development, citizen participation and accountability mechanisms. In the development of detailed area plans, opportunities will be sought to integrate sustainability principles such as the provision of green space, the integration of non-motorized transport and the development of mixed-use communities. Component 2 supports the establishment of City Management Offices. CMOs are expected to be responsible for integrated urban planning, and urban infrastructure and service delivery. CMOs will also develop

and implement their own urban institutional development strategies. The establishment of CMOs is an important step towards cities becoming self-administered autonomous entities, capable of developing and implementing integrated plans.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

**4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** 5/20/20:

Yes. The draft PAD has been provided, which seeks WBG Board approval of a loan of USD150 million equivalent for the RUDP II.

**Agency Response**

**5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

STAR allocation?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Focal Area allocation?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

Focal Area Set Aside?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes.

29 June 2020

As communicated by email to GEF coordinator, please revise the Rio Marker of the project to reflect CCM as principal (Rio Marker 2) given that the project will contribute to significant amount of GHG reduction.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** Response 7/6: This is done in the GEF data sheet. Rio Marker for Mitigation and Adaptation set at 2.

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes. Context has been provided in the PAD. Financing from the GEF will enable: (i) the integration of the value of natural capital conservation into a multi-sectoral planning process; (ii) the strengthened integration of planning processes across key ministries and sectors; and (iii) the uptake of innovative approaches in urban development, including developing new financing instruments and business models.

#### **Agency Response**

**2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes, the baseline scenario has been well-described in Section 1 of the PAD. The baseline project, RUDP II, has also been well described.

#### **Agency Response**

**3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes, Section 2 of the PAD describes the proposed impacts of the blended GEF grant.

#### **Agency Response**

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

#### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

FI, 5/28/20:

Adjustments/clarifications have been requested in review item 2 of Part I of the review sheet, above.

GEFSEC June 29, 2020

Please refer to additional comments on item 2 part 1.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Response 7/6:

see response above

Response 6/17:

Please refer to our responses under Part I #2 above.

**5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes, this is provided in Annex 4 of the PAD.

### **Agency Response**

**7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5/20/20:

Not yet.

Please further elaborate on innovation and sustainability aspects and indicate where these have been included in the documents.

GEFSEC June 29, 2020

Thanks for adding the Sustainability section in the PAD. It's fine.

The elaboration on innovation in the response below is fine. As noted in the document, the project also aims to support innovation in financing including by engaging private sector in wetland restoration and SWM. Similar to sustainability, please add a paragraph in the project document on innovation and include this and the details provided in the response below. Innovation along with integration is fundamental to SCIP and therefore a specific reference to it in the project document is requested.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

Response 7/6:

A few sentences have been added in paragraph 57, rather than add a whole new paragraph. It states that “The project aims to support innovation in financing, including by engaging the private sector in wetland restoration and solid waste management. Innovation is a key part of the GEF financing”.

Response 6/17:

One of the GEF review comments elsewhere in the review document is the recognition that the project will support “the uptake of innovative approaches in urban development, including developing new financing instruments and business models.” The PAD explains the political leadership in these investments, and demonstrates, for example, their role in supporting Rwanda’s National Strategy for Transformation (NST). The ICD / CMOs and institutional reform in the CoK make the project sustainable. The NST describes key strategic interventions, which include:

- Developing Flagship projects in secondary cities and other key urban areas to support thriving and sustainable urban economies (with employment and incomes),

- Update Master plans of secondary cities and other key towns to reflect the ambition to become modern cities and towns. Master plans will be implemented and monitored to ensure sustainable development of cities and towns, and
- Promote and develop local construction materials in collaboration with the private sector in line with the ‘Made in Rwanda’ policy to support the growth of the construction sector and the affordable and low-cost housing programme.

In addition, paragraph 70 of the PAD specifically addresses how sustainability of the project will be promoted.

**8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

June 29, 2020

GEFSEC wasn't able to provide comments on this section in the first round due to some portal issue. Please add a geo-referenced map illustrating the project's entire focus area, not just the wetland.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** Response 7/6: In the GEF Data sheet, a map has been showing the locations of the six secondary cities.

**9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

AB, May 28, 2020:

This is a child project. For better reflection of this project's contribution to the overall impact of the Sustainable Cities IP, the agency is requested to address the technical comments related to integrated planning and sustainability in project components made earlier in the review sheet.

June 29, 2020

Please refer to additional comments in Part 1 #2.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Response 7/6:

see response above in the relevant section

Response 6/17:

Please refer to our responses under Part I #2 above.

**10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes. Stakeholders and their roles have been identified. In addition, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been submitted.

### **Agency Response**

**11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** 5/20/20:

Yes. In addition to the information provided in the online CER template, gender considerations have been discussed in Section D (p.21) of the PAD and a gender mainstreaming analysis has been presented in Annex 3 of the PAD.

### **Agency Response**

**12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes. Information has been provided in the online CER template. The project will support innovative financing to enhance public-private sector engagement in promoting ecosystem values in urban planning.

### **Agency Response**

**13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes. Various potential risks, including environmental and social, have been discussed in Section V of the PAD, along with mitigation measures.

June 29, 2020

Thanks for adding COVID-19 perspective in the project risk and design. Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Response 6/17:

Please note that the PAD has been revised to incorporate project responsiveness to Covid-19. RUDP II will provide short-term employment opportunities and support essential economic activity. In the long term, RUDP II infrastructure investments will address the outbreak of pandemics by reducing crowding, and providing water and sanitation infrastructure and solid waste collection in the upgraded settlements. Other small-scale infrastructure and maintenance works will also be supported by the project. Early actions to ensure that civil works can commence at the time of project effectiveness is underway. In addition, Community Upgrading Committees will be established in each settlement. Each committee will work with city officials at critical review and decision-making points to provide project oversight. Dedicated focus group discussions with women and other minority groups will be facilitated to ensure that selected investments are gender-inclusive and equitable. The committees will also serve as institutional mechanisms through which community needs are reflected in the investments and social safety net responses are better coordinated. Response measures are also incorporated into the ICD support under subcomponent 1a in Kigali. Given the anticipated effects of COVID-19, detailed area plans supported under this component will develop and leverage place-based approaches, including: (i) highlighting the importance of sustainable medium to long term planning; (ii) exploring options to convert critical public spaces into centers for collection and distribution of basic needs such as food and water during emergencies; (iii) improved neighborhood planning with well-networked and resilient infrastructure; and (iv) managed

urban density and appropriate land use mixes that support improved mobility and access to services. Similar measures are also incorporated into technical assistance for master plan implementation delivered under subcomponent 2b in the secondary cities.

**14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5/20/20:

Further information is requested.

Institutional arrangements have been adequately discussed. However, regarding relevant initiatives: Table 5 on p. 25 of the PAD lists various relevant initiatives in the country but does not provide any details on how the proposed SC-IP project will coordinate with them. Please provide this information.

June 29, 2020

Thanks. Comments cleared.

### **Agency Response**

response 6/17:

Please note that in the editing process of the PAD, as required by the Bank to reduce its length, Table 5 was removed, although the text on different initiatives remains in paragraph 55 of the PAD. The World Bank and MININFRA are co-chairs of the Urbanization and Rural Sector Working Group, an existing body through which the Government of Rwanda and stakeholders meet to discuss sector and cross-sector planning and prioritization according to strategic plans and development programs. This sector working group conducts biennial Joint Sector Reviews, a monitoring framework that supports a coordinated approach to implementation of strategic plans through performance reviews of the projects including RUDP II. In addition, the national planning and implementation oversight involves development partners (bilateral/multi-lateral) through the Development Partners Coordination Group (DPCG) that will support coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area. This is explained in paragraph 54 of the PAD. In addition, the National Steering Committee (presented in Figure 3 and described in paragraph 65) consists of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), MININFRA, Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC), Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Emergency Management (MINEMA), Local Administrative Entities Development Agency (LODA), Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA), and the City of Kigali. Together, these two bodies will serve to ensure that activities are coordinated to as to maximise the efficient use of resources.

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

The project is consistent with the Government of Rwanda's National Urbanization Policy. The country is placing the principle of sustainability at the heart of its Vision 2050. These various policies acknowledge that cities are integrated systems of systems, and that a comprehensive approach is needed for managing risks across the natural and built environment.

### **Agency Response**

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5/22/20:

Further information is requested.

Some information on knowledge management is provided in the description of sub-Component 1b. However, please provide more detail on the knowledge sharing and exchange, target beneficiaries of the knowledge products, and sustainability/updating of the knowledge products. How will these feed into, benefit and benefit from program-wide knowledge exchange via common/shared platforms?

June 29, 2020

We noted that in Paragraph 31 (not in 32) the PAD indicates the project will be linked with the global child project of SCIP to exchange knowledge and experience with other global partners and cities. However, the above comment is related to knowledge management within this child project. We referred to Annex 5, but could not find anything significant in this regard. Please note that knowledge management is critical for the impact program to ensure that knowledge generated in the project is documented, products are created and shared to benefit cities across the country and also to support sustainability of outcomes. The Agency is requested to propose how this will be overall managed within the proposed implementation mechanism. The Global project's support to Kigali city in capacity building and knowledge generation will complement project specific knowledge management. This can be included as part of knowledge management plan/strategy.

July 7, 2020

The Agency is requested to respond to the above comment and factor it in the project document.

July 14, 2020

Thanks. Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

Response 7/9:

The PAD has been updated to provide additional information on knowledge management activities to be carried out under the project. Specifically, Annex 4, para 11 now reads:

***Advocacy, knowledge exchange and partnerships.** The Government, spearheaded by MoE, is taking the lead on sustainable development in Africa. Kigali is already a member of several networks such as the 100 Resilient Cities and ICLEI (also known as Local Governments for Sustainability). These platforms will enable Rwanda to scale-up engagement regionally and internationally. The Government and CoK are committed to using this project to promote its sustainable urbanization agenda across Rwanda. Kigali will both learn from SCIP and create knowledge that will be shared through the platform. In the project design and implementation, Kigali will benefit from GPSC knowledge resources which will be tailored to Rwanda's situation. Project resources will be specifically allocated to allow urban policy experts to participate in global activities and forums. Using its experience in hosting the Africa Green Growth Forum, Kigali will seek to host international meetings to demonstrate best practices and promote knowledge exchange. Knowledge generated by the project will be managed to be a resource for public and private sector partners working on sustainable urbanization. Specific knowledge projects that include the detailed topographic survey and the framework for greenhouse gas accounting and reporting will be made available, to inform additional interventions in other sectors, and to develop skills and development beyond the lifetime of the project. The PIU will be responsible for overall knowledge management, but knowledge will be disseminated through the National Steering Committee. Activities that include study tours will ensure knowledge is shared between the City of Kigali and stakeholders in the secondary cities. Therefore, as Rwanda has embarked upon a drive towards integrated, sustainable and resilient urbanization, knowledge generated from the project will ensure the sustainability of the project's outcomes.*

Response 6/17:

Paragraph 32 in the PAD describes at a high level how the project will “support advocacy, knowledge exchange and partnerships on sustainable urbanization, building upon the global Sustainable Cities Impact Program”. Further information is provided in Annex 1, and more detail is provided in Annex 5. Nationally, the target beneficiaries of activities to enhance knowledge on sustainable urbanization will be government, city, and district officials, professionals working in the private sector on sustainable urbanization, and students and academics in the education sector. Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), the GEF

focal institution is responsible for organizing the International Environment Day events that feature themed areas of focus and will purposely feature SCIP as a theme as part of knowledge sharing and exchange as part of Rwanda's experience on Urban sustainability. Internationally, Kigali would seek to host practitioners from other countries participating in the SCIP, and its extensive network of partner cities (e.g. World Smart Sustainable Cities Organization, 100 Resilient Cities). The PAD document is limited for space and therefore it is difficult to significantly add more detail. However, more detail will be provided in the Project Implementation Manual.

relevant changes made in PID

**17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

#### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5/20/20:

An M&E Plan has been submitted.

June 29, 2020

Thanks. Comments cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

Response 6/17:

As per email from Fareeha Iqbal dated 5/29, a budget description for M&E has been included in the updated project budget.

**18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/20/20:**

Yes. The PAD lays out the socio-economic as well as environmental benefits that will ensue from this integrated, cross-cutting project to support urban development in Kigali and secondary cities in Rwanda.

**Agency Response**

**19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes**

**Agency Response**

**20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

Yes.

July 22, 2020

Please complete section on ESS in the portal. Basically, it requires just ticking the box indicating the overall project risk rating (Environmental and Social Risk Classification (ESRC)) and then referencing the attached ESRS in the ESS portal section.

July 24, 2020

Thanks. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** Response 7/22: This section has been completed in the portal.

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.**

**Agency Response**

GEF Secretariat comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

Council comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response**

STAP comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

5/20/20:

Yes; STAP had provided general comments on the PFD which have been taken into account in design of the child project.

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A -- PPG was not requested.

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** N/A

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

June 29, 2020

GEFSEC wasn't able to provide comments on this section in the first round due to some portal issue. Please add a geo-referenced map illustrating the entire project's focus area including the six secondary cities. The map provided in Annex E only shows the wetland.

July 7, 2020

Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

Response 7/6:

In the GEF Data sheet, a map has been showing the locations of the six secondary cities.

### **Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements**

**1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes. An LoE from the OFP was submitted at the time of PFD approval.

## **Agency Response**

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

N/A

## **Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

FI, May 28, 2020:

Not yet. The agency is requested to please address the following:

Part I of review sheet: item 2, and

Part II of review sheet: items 4, 7, 9, 14, 16

June 29, 2020

The agency is requested to address additional comments in the review sheet. Please note new comments related to Project Map and Rio Marker which were not made in the first review cycle due to portal issue and oversight respectively.

July 7, 2020

Please address an outstanding comment under Part I (2) and respond to the comment made in Part II 16 previously.

July 14, 2020

All comments are cleared and the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

July 22, 2020

Please complete section on ESS in the portal. Basically, it requires just ticking the box indicating the overall project risk rating (Environmental and Social Risk Classification (ESRC)) and then referencing the attached ESRS in the ESS portal section.

July 24, 2020

All comments are cleared and the project is recommended for endorsement.

**Review Dates**

**1SMSP CEO Approval**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**1SMSP CEO Approval****Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation****Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The Rwanda Urban Development Project is a child project under the GEF 7 Sustainable Cities Impact Program which aims to strengthen integrated urban planning and management in Kigali to support sustainable and resilient urban growth. The \$8.8 million GEF grant funding, along with \$150 million WB co-financed loan will support Kigali and six other cities in Rwanda in strengthening systemic urban planning and institutional capacity to implement integrated, inclusive and gender sensitive projects and policies. The project will engage with national and city leadership in raising their sustainability ambitions and fostering cross sectoral institutional coordination for sustainable urban development.

The project will target systemic drivers of environmental degradation including urban sprawl and unplanned settlements through (i) improved processes to integrate ecosystem values into urban planning; (ii) physical investments in integrated “gray” and “green” infrastructure; (iii) innovative approaches to financing and scaling investments. The project will strengthen technical capacity and knowledge base and influence national and global urban agenda by demonstrating sustainable approaches. More specifically, the project will catalyze investments in solid waste management, flood risk management, nature-based solutions and wetland rehabilitation and other sustainable and low carbon urban upgrading infrastructure . Project activities such as establishment of urban upgrading unit to adopt integrated approaches; creation of high resolution LiDAR data sets for evidence based planning; national integrated waste management strategy; storm-water master plans; and wetland restoration investments will support sustainable urban regeneration in Kigali and other cities. The project proposes to effectively engage with the private sector in waste management and wetland restoration management to leverage their investments.

The project is expected to reduce 2.9 million tons of GHG emissions, restore 163.5 hectares of land and improve resilience of 251,000 people. The Government of Rwanda and City of Kigali have demonstrated strong commitment towards urban sustainability with a number of baseline initiatives. Kigali is a strategic city in Africa and has the potential to serve as a beacon for and exemplar of sustainable urbanization for Africa.

Overall, the project builds on a strong foundation to provide value added support which will deliver transformational change and global environmental benefits in line with the SCIP program framework.