



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5194		
Country/Region:	Rwanda		
Project Title:	Building resilience of communities living in degraded forests, savannahs and wetlands of Rwanda through an ecosystem management approach.		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; Others; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,500,000
Co-financing:	\$10,744,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,244,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Rwanda is a LDC and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An endorsement letter signed by the GEF OFP Dr. Rose Mukankomeje and dated October 19 2012 is included.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP has a comparative advantage in providing proof of concept and the best available science and knowledge upon which investments can be based. The proposed project focuses on optimizing ecosystem management to support climate change adaptation in Rwanda. UNEP's expertise lies in providing technical advice on ecosystem management and therefore it has a comparative advantage for this	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. UNEP has been active in the country since 1994 and has worked closely with the governmental and non-governmental partners in Rwanda. UNEP has either worked in the past or has active ongoing projects with the proposed executing agencies in the country.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. The current funding request of \$5.5 million is within the resources available in the LDCF based on the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is aligned with the LDCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute to all three LDCF objectives.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPEF	No. The project description only lists the national strategies and plans that the proposed project is consistent with and does not provide information on the specifics within the strategies and plans	

		<p>address.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please discuss the items under each national strategy and plan that the project will respond to.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Requested information has been provided.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes. Loss of forests due to unmanaged firewood collection, overstocking of livestock and land clearance of agriculture, draining of marshes for agricultural purposes, and soil erosion are the stated as the problems that are affecting agriculture, energy, transport and health sectors of the country.</p> <p>The baseline projects that are addressing these issues are as follows:</p> <p>Land Husbandry, Water Catchment and Hillside Irrigation Rural Sector Support Project Project d' Appui a la Reforestation au Rwanda (PAREF)</p> <p>The baseline projects are sufficiently described for the PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		

	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Not Clear. The proposal describes climate risks in the country, and presents ecosystem management and restoration as a viable solution. However, effects of climate change on the baseline projects and on the goals they intend to achieve have not been discussed. Also, the proposal does not describe the inadequacy of the baseline projects in dealing with such risks.</p> <p>As described, adaptation interventions and benefits have focus on ecosystems and their well-being. Communities and their risks appear to be secondary.</p> <p>It is also unclear how ecosystem management alone will be able to tackle the cited problems of drought, famine, flooding, and climate related disasters.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please describe how baseline projects and their intended goals will be affected by climate change and please explain how the baseline projects in their current form are not adequate to respond to these risks.</p> <p>Please review section B.2 keeping vulnerable communities in focus, the array of climate risks they face, and the role ecosystems may play in reducing their vulnerability. Please follow the GEF Operational Guidelines GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06 sequentially to establish the additional cost reasoning for the project.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>in addition to ecosystem management would make the proposed project more suited to address the climate risks and provide more viable reasoning for additional costs.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Not entirely clear. The clarifications given on the climate change risks to the baseline projects and the details on the geographic locations of the project intervention provide necessary information on the additional cost reasoning. However, the section B.2.4 on "Adaptation interventions and benefits" provides only general information.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: It would be appropriate to replace B.2.4 with section B.2.5. Per the suggestions made during the bilateral meeting with the agency, please remove references to ecosystem engineering and hyperbeneficial systems.</p> <p>3/20/2013 Yes. Requested changes have been made.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not clear. The proposed project comprises of three components geared towards providing technical assistance and also undertaking investment activities to provide adaptation benefits through ecosystem management.</p> <p>Overall for all components the primary focus seems to be ecosystem management and restoration with the expectation and assumption that such</p>	

adaptation. The components need to be adjusted to establish the focus on populations that are vulnerable to climate change, determining ecosystem services that are/will be critical for their well-being and developing feasible ways to manage ecosystems to ensure delivery of such services.

Recommended Actions:

For component 1, please explain how support towards PhD and MSc theses will directly aid the project goals of reducing vulnerability of target populations in Rwanda. It is suggested that such research be built to aid and develop suitable ecosystem management plans for the targeted areas.

The component sets out to develop management plans for wide-range of ecosystems. Please adjust the focus on communities and the types of ecosystems that are identified to be critical for their livelihoods especially under the climate change.

For component 2, please clarify whether the first three expected outputs are geared towards national level or district level.

For component 3, it is vital that climate risks that target communities face are clearly identified. Through analysis and consultation please identify specific ecosystem services that are vital for the communities' well-being under the changing climate and finally establish

		<p>provision of the services and reduce climate change vulnerability.</p> <p>Instead of hyper-beneficial biodiversity rich ecosystems, the component should focus on ecosystem services that are vital for the communities and devise ways to generate those services and products. The concepts of hyper-beneficial ecosystems and ecosystem engineering should be replaced with species that are known to be adaptive and important to continue generation of ecosystem services necessary for vulnerable communities.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Not entirely clear. The requested changes have been made in components 1 and 2. However, the expected output (3.1) of component 3 still focuses on biodiversity, though the response sheet states otherwise.</p> <p>Recommended Actions Please revise the output according to the previous comments provided for component 3.</p> <p>3/20/2013 Yes. Requested changes have been made to focus on climate resiliency.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not entirely. Please see comments for sections 13 and 14.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Yes. Though some clarifications are still pending on the additional cost reasoning, the overall methodology and assumptions are sound.</p>	

	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>Not clear. The project will strengthen the technical capacity of governmental and academic institutions in Rwanda regarding ecosystem management approach to climate change adaptation. However, actual tangible benefits to the communities at risk are not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Following comments from previous sections please establish a clear linkage between reduction in climate change vulnerability of communities with restoration activities proposed in the project.</p> <p>3/7/2013 Yes. Socio-economic benefits that the local communities will achieve through the project activities have been clearly described.</p> <p>Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement: Please devise mechanisms that will facilitate involvement of women in the project and also please highlight the additional measures that the project will take to generate adaptation benefits for women.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage: Please identify NGOs and local level organizations that could contribute towards and benefit from the project.</p>	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes for PIF stage.  Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage: Please determine how and at which stage the proposed project will coordinate and work with other related initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes for PIF stage.  Recommended Actions for CEO Endorsement Stage: Please describe by CEO endorsement stage roles of each of the executing agencies in implementing each of the project components.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The requested PMC is 4% of the total grant requested.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	Indicative co-financing for the project is \$9.2 million. The national government will be providing the entire co-financing	

	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	No. UNEP is not bringing any co-financing towards the project.  Recommended Action: Please indicate whether UNEP will be able to provide co-financing for the proposed project.  3/7/2013 Yes. UNEP has added \$1.5 million as co-financing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Please see comments for sections 9, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 26.  3/7/2013 Not yet. Please see comments for sections 13, and 14.  3/20/2013 Yes. All pending issues have been addressed.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG		

	commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	No PPG submission was received (not recorded in the internal system). 3/7/2013 Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	3/7/2013 Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	3/7/2013 Not yet. PPG approval is contingent upon the PIF approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 18, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.