



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

GEF ID:	5495		
Country/Region:	Rwanda		
Project Title:	Increasing the Capacity of Vulnerable Rwandan Communities to Adapt to Adverse Effects of Climate Change: Livelihood Diversification and Investment in Rural Infrastructures		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	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-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,824,749
Co-financing:	\$45,386,000	Total Project Cost:	\$54,410,749
PIF Approval:	January 08, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Alemayehu WUBESHET-ZEGEYE

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Not at this time. This funding request would exceed the ceiling currently	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>available to Rwanda under the Equitable Access principle. This funding request can be considered once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>Update 8/30/2013: Yes, the amount requested has been revised and can be considered under the Equitable Access principle.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Not clear. The strategic objectives have been identified, and they are in line with the LDCF results framework. However, please see comments on the design of the project.</p> <p>Update 10/1/2013: This issue has been resolved.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project appears to be consistent with Rwanda's national strategies and plans.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and</p>	<p>The baseline project and problems are adequately described and appear to be based on sound data and assumptions.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Not yet. The components, outcomes and outputs are clear and appropriately detailed, please see the comments concerning the project design.</p> <p>Update 10/1/2013: This issue has been resolved.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>Not entirely. It appears that the additional reasoning is based on an assumption that the baseline project, energy access, is in of itself resilient to climate change. This is not substantiated in the proposal. Hence, the adaptation benefits identified in the proposal are not fully justified.</p> <p>Update 10/1/2013: The responses to comments provided are acceptable for the PIF stage. By CEO endorsement, please ensure that baseline and additional projects combined fully consider the resilience of the energy infrastructure and fully reflect it in the project design, following the referenced "Guidelines to Mainstream climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Energy and Infrastructure Sector."</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. This is adequately covered in the proposal.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>No. Please see further the comments concerning the design of the project. Namely, the risk of the baseline intervention's vulnerability to climate change is not discussed.</p> <p>Update 10/1/2013: This is acceptable for PIF stage. Please see comment related to the review question on additional reasoning.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, it appears that the project is consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments on project design: concerning Component 1, the underlying assumption is that livelihoods' diversification based on the expected increase in electrification would increase the population's resilience to climate change. The proposal does not describe how the impacts of climate change on the functionality of the availability and reliability of electric power have been considered in the design of the concept, particularly in the event of extreme weather-related phenomena mentioned specifically, such as floods.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revisit the concept in light of the comment made above. Upon adequate revision, the project will be reassessed for innovativeness, sustainability, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>potential for scaling up.</p> <p>Update 10/1/2013: For the PIF stage, the project can be considered innovative, sustainable, and with potential for scaling up, assuming that, by CEO endorsement, baseline and additional projects combined fully consider the resilience of the energy infrastructure and fully reflect it in the project design. (Please see comment related to the review question on additional reasoning.)</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Not clear. The project financing is appropriate, however please see the comment concerning project design, and make adjustments as necessary.</p> <p>Update 10/10/2013: For PIF stage, this issue has been resolved.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>Not clear. The indicated amount and composition of cofinancing is appropriate, however please see the comment concerning project design, and make adjustments as necessary.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Update 10/10/2013: For PIF stage, this issue has been resolved.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes, at under 5% the requested amount is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, the requested amount does not deviate from the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time. This funding request can be considered once adequate,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>Update 8/30/2013: Not at this time. Please see comments under 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, and 17.</p> <p>Update 10/3/2013: The PIF can be recommended for technical clearance. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>01/13/2014 -- An revised PIF was received on December 19, 2013, with a adjusted title and grant request. The revised proposal is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Primarily #8 and #13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 05, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 03, 2013	

\* **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.**