



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

GEF ID:	<b>6986</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Rwanda</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Building the Capacity of Rwanda's Government to advance the National Adaptation Planning process</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$27,898,600</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$34,048,600</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Knut Sundstrom</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ermira Fida</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. Rwanda is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated September 19, 2014, has been attached to the submission.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	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	YES. The proposed grant (\$6.73 million,	

\*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)
	equitable access	including Agency fee and PPG) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<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>?</p> <p><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>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-2 and CCA-3.</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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is consistent with Rwanda's Vision 2020; the Second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013-18); and the Environment and Climate Change Sub-Sector Strategic Plan (2013-18); as well as the findings of the country's Second National Communication.</p> <p>Please refer to sections 6 and 8 below, however. It is not clear whether the proposed project aims to contribute towards the further implementation of Rwanda's NAPA, in which case the alignment with relevant NAPA priorities should be described in Section B of the PIF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit Section B of the PIF and clarify whether the proposed project would also contribute towards the implementation of Rwanda's NAPA priorities.</p> <p>01/06/2015 –“ YES. The proposed project would contribute towards the implementation of Rwanda's NAPA priorities in the areas of climate information services and early-warning systems.</p>	
Project Design	<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 assumptions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF describes the baseline scenario in relation to the proposed four components, including several baseline initiatives and indicative sources of co-financing.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the PIF refers to the climate information services required to inform medium- to long-term adaptation, but also to early-warning systems. To the extent that the project seeks to address Rwanda's NAPA priorities pertaining to climate-related early-warning systems, the description of the current state of those systems, as well as the baseline investments by FONERWA and UNESCO, may be relevant. In contrast, with regard to medium- and long-term adaptation, the relevance of these systems and associated baseline projects is less clear.</p> <p>In addition, with regard to the capacities of relevant institutions to advance</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Rwanda's NAP process, the PIF could provide further information regarding the key, national institutions that would be targeted. It is unclear to what extent the project could meaningfully address these needs at the national, sub-national and local levels simultaneously, including across the private sector and civil society.</p> <p>As for Component 2, Section A.1.2 of the PIF appears to identify as the principal gap the absence of an explicit focus on climate change adaptation within FONERWA. At the same time, however, the PIF cites three FONERWA-financed projects that clearly address resilience and adaptation, with associated grants amounting to nearly \$10 million. The relevance of these projects for the baseline scenario is also unclear. It would seem useful to view the baseline situation with respect to finance more broadly, including domestic and international sources of finance other than FONERWA, and to identify any associated shortfalls in institutional frameworks, capacities and mechanisms that may prevent a more effective mobilization and channeling of resources to advance the NAP process.</p> <p>Finally, with respect to Component 3, the PIF provides little information regarding the environmental and socio-economic monitoring systems that are already in place and on which the project could build, i.e. what data is already being collected that could inform the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>monitoring of Rwanda's NAP process?</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please revisit Section A.1.2 of the PIF and focus the description of the baseline scenario on matters of direct relevance to the proposed project. These could include, inter alia, climate information services required to inform medium- to long-term adaptation; existing capacities of relevant national institutions to advance Rwanda's NAP process; institutional frameworks to mobilize and channel domestic and international finance; and environmental and socio-economic monitoring systems.</p> <p>Following the above, please narrow down the baseline initiatives, projects, programs and investments that the proposed project would directly build on and enhance; describe their duration and any associated, indicative amounts and types of co-financing.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. The baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives have been clarified as recommended. The revised PIF provides a more comprehensive description of the institutions, policy and planning processes, as well as the associated M&amp;E systems and sources of funding that would be enhanced in the context of Rwanda's NAP process.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, it is critical that the proposed project identifies very specific gaps and needs associated with</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		each component as a basis for clearly targeted interventions that are commensurate with the ambitious scope yet limited size of the project.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>01/06/2015 – YES. The project framework has been revised and streamlined, and it is now sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>Overall, the PIF uses the notion of medium- and long-term adaptation somewhat loosely, arguing that current responses to climate change have a "short-term" focus. This generalization does not seem to be consistent with previous efforts to implement Rwanda's NAPA, including those financed through the LDCF, which have sought to address urgent and immediate needs while building resilience to climate change impacts beyond the near term. The PIF could further explore how the proposed project departs from and adds value to past and present approaches.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Under Component 1, the proposed project would allocate \$2.24 million to expand and strengthen Rwanda's climate information system and address the associated issues of long-term sustainability. It would also integrate medium- to long-term adaptation into existing policies and development planning; and train stakeholders in the national and local governments, CSOs, local communities and the private sector. The scope of the Component seems unrealistic and should be narrowed down significantly. What meaningful improvements can be achieved in terms of climate information with the level of resources proposed? What policies and plans would be targeted? What key, national institutions would be prioritized for training?</p> <p>As for Component 2, as noted in Section 6 above, the baseline scenario and associated gaps seem insufficiently understood. While LDCF support towards the NAP process may be well placed to enhance institutional frameworks, capacities and mechanisms to mobilize and channel resources for adaptation -- in line with the policies and plans that would be strengthened under Component 1; the proposal to channel project funds through FONERWA seems to add transaction costs while contributing little in terms of more sustainable and more adequate financing. Moreover, if concrete measures are to be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>financed in the context of the proposed project, it would be important to understand how those would relate to or depart from Rwanda's existing NAPA priorities.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed project seems very focused on institutions and processes in the environment and natural resources management sectors. It is unclear what role other line ministries in vulnerable sectors would play in components 1 and 2, and how ministries of finance and planning or their equivalents would be engaged.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6 above, please revisit thoroughly the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits in sections A.1.3, A.1.4 and A.1.5 of the PIF. The scope, focus and resource allocations between the proposed components should be reconsidered.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been clarified as recommended. The revised PIF clarifies the proposed, LDCF-financed interventions and their added value vis-à-vis the baseline scenario and on-going NAPA implementation projects.</p>	
	<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</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. The role of other line ministries in vulnerable sectors is unclear; whereas the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) could potentially have a more prominent role in coordinating or executing activities associated with integrating medium- to long-term adaptation into existing policies and development planning; and in developing institutional frameworks, capacities and mechanisms to mobilize and channel resources for adaptation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the role of line ministries and relevant agencies in climate-sensitive sectors other than environment and natural resources management; and (ii) consider enhancing the role of MINECOFIN particularly in relation to components 1 and 2.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. Public participation and the role of relevant stakeholders has been adequately clarified for this stage of project development.</p>	
	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	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. In absence of further clarity regarding the scope and focus of the proposed project, the risks and associated mitigation measures cannot be adequately assessed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please revisit the description of major risks and associated mitigation measures.</p> <p>01/06/2015 – YES. Relevant risks and associated mitigation measures have been adequately identified in the revised PIF.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Some of the projects and programs described as baseline initiatives in Section A.1.2 may not be relevant as such, but should rather be described among other relevant initiatives, with which coordination will be sought. These include in particular the FONERWA projects that are not clearly impacted by the proposed LDCF project.</p> <p>In addition to the LDCF-financed projects already identified, coordination and coherence should be ensured with the AfDB project – 'Increasing the Capacity of Vulnerable Rwandan communities to adapt to adverse effects of Climate change: Livelihood diversification and investment in rural infrastructures'.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please ensure that Section A.5 of the PIF provides a complete list of relevant initiatives with which coordination and coherence will be sought.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		01/06/2015 “ YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately described in the revised PIF.	
	<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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit Section A.1.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. The proposed project shows clear potential for innovation on several fronts, from the systematic and iterative integration on climate change risks and adaptation measures across key policies and plans, to the thorough analysis and strengthening of the financial architecture for effective adaptation at the national level. The project, albeit a first step in several respects, is designed to have an impact at the national level and in the medium- to long term. Thanks to a clear and strong commitment by the national government, as well as promising momentum in the implementation of national adaptation strategies and measures, the project presents a viable strategy to reach its ambitious goals in terms of scale and sustainability.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component seem appropriate and adequate.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please revise the indicative sources, amounts and types of co-financing in Table C accordingly.</p> <p>01/06/2015 “ YES. The sources and amounts of co-financing are adequately substantiated for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further evidence that the proposed project would indeed impact and strengthen all FONERWA programming.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	YES. At \$285,000, or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed funding level for project management 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. A PPG of \$150,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to \$6 million.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
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 PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17.  01/06/2015 – YES. The proposed	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 6 and 17.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	October 16, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 06, 2015	
	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.**