



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9997		
Country/Region:	Rwanda		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Rwanda to implement the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,600,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	DS, February 15, 2018: Yes. Project aligns with CBIT objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, February 15, 2018: Yes. Project clearly aligns with Rwanda's capacity needs as per its National Communications, and would be an important step in further improving its national MRV systems to meet the enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	DS, February 15, 2018:	CI-GEF Agency March 5, 2018:

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Partly unclear. The project overall clearly indicates drivers of global environmental degradation, scaling and innovation, however, the role of Vital Signs as an executing partner remains unclear as it pertains to building long-term national capacities, which is related to sustainability of project outcomes. Please provide an explanation of how the project will ensure that capacities are built in the government and at the national level, and how the systems that will be put in place will be sustainable beyond project completion, by ensuring country ownership. Please also consider including a stronger link with national academic institutions when it comes to carrying out research and field work for establishing national emissions factors. It seems that this kind of work could be carried out by national institutions/academics, which would help retain the capacity in the country.</p> <p>DS, March 8, 2018: Comment cleared. REMA will lead and coordinate the implementation of this project, as per paragraph 34 of the</p>	<p>During interactions with REMA and partners in Rwanda, they indicated that there are limited skills and technological capacities within the country to develop data integrating tools. Recognizing that Vital Signs has experience and expertise in providing data science decision support in Africa, training of focal points from key sectors (agriculture, forestry, land use, waste, and infrastructure) and the hub from REMA will be conducted. Training will be conducted by Vital Signs but will enhance country ownership and strengthen capacity by increasing the number of people with knowledge to manage the inventories and MRV system. This will be accomplished by carrying out extensive engagements with key national/local institutions, including academia in the process of development to ensure the transfer of these skill sets and technology to different institutions for sustainability. Since, Vital Signs has presence in Rwanda and is hosted by the Wildlife Conservation Society, it will be available to provide technical backstopping and capacity support for an extended period to ensure continuity.</p> <p>Para 34 has been updated to include this information.</p>

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		PIF, and will be supported by Vital Signs.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>DS, February 15, 2018: Partly unclear. The project is designed in a sound incremental fashion when it comes to addressing the already identified capacity needs in the country. However, please provide an overview of whether any other supporters of climate transparency are active in the country (ICAT, PATPA, bilaterals, other multilaterals etc) in terms of addressing some of these capacity constrains.</p> <p>DS, March 8, 2018: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>CI-GEF Agency March 5, 2018: Paragraphs 11-13 have been added to address bilateral and multilateral funding. Links to ICAT have been incorporated but PATPA is not active in Rwanda and therefore has not been included.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>DS, February 15, 2018: Partly unclear. The project is overall designed in a sound and clear fashion. However, please consider:</p> <p>(1) carrying out Output 2.1.1 (capacity needs assessment) during PPG phase, given that capacity needs are already clear enough as described in the National Communications, and the project should help alleviate these identified needs. Please completely remove this output from Table B, accordingly.</p> <p>(2) linking up with national academic institutions (universities) for Output</p>	<p>CI-GEF Agency March 5, 2018:</p> <p>(1) Output 2.1.1 has been removed</p> <p>(2) Vital Signs has been providing decision support tools in Africa including Rwanda, by collecting and integrating data from different sources. Partners in Rwanda have indicated that this particular task might be difficult to achieve without external expertise, but Vital Signs will work closely with local research institutions to impart these skills and ensure that there be no increased reliance on international NGOs.</p> <p>A new risk category and risk mitigation</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2.1.2 and generally speaking ensure that national capacity is being built in a way that will be retained after project completion. Please ensure that no dependency on any international NGOs or other actors will be created when it comes to accurate climate action tracking and reporting under the Paris Agreement. Please also include a new risk category and associated risk mitigation measures in the table on risks, to address (potential lack of) long-term domestic capacity.</p> <p>DS, March 8, 2018: Comments cleared for PIF stage. At CEO approval stage, the agency is requested to provide an elaborate, sound and clear description of the project's approach to galvanizing domestic, in-house capacity and in particular academic institutions, beyond vital signs, for instance through pairing programs, to support the government in the medium to long-term in a sustainable fashion.</p>	<p>measure has been included in Section 4 (last row of the table).</p>
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>DS, February 15, 2018: Partly unclear. Please reference GEF Gender Equality Action Plan in section on gender.</p> <p>DS, March 8, 2018:</p>	<p>CI-GEF Agency March 5, 2018: Reference to the GEF Equality Action Plan has been included in Para 32.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Comment cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	DS, February 15, 2018: Project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>DS, February 15, 2018: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 3, 4, 5 and 6 and submit revised version along with response sheet.</p> <p>DS, March 8, 2018: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF clearance and PPG. At CEO approval stage, the agency is requested to address the comment under Question 5.</p>	
Review Date	Review	February 15, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.