Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Project aligns with CCA-1 and CCA-2 of the GEF Programming Strategy for the LDCF/SCCF (2018-2022). However, the distribution between CCA-1 and CCA-2 in Table A should be
adjusted to reflect the significance of CCA-2 in this project, with at least $1.5 million to $1.6 million from the LDCF requested for CCA-2.

DS, October 29, 2018:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response
The distribution between CCA-1 and CCA-2 has been adjusted, raising CCA-2 to $1,555,638, reflecting its significance.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Partly unclear. The components are overall clear and sound, however, some issues remain as follows:

(i) Please clarify how Output 1.2 relates to NAP, given that NAP is already financed in Rwanda and duplicative activities must be avoided under any circumstance; please consider removing this output if it is found to be redundant - the funding for that output could be reallocated to Component 2 to foster on-the-ground implementation.

(ii) Please provide an estimated number of beneficiaries for output 2.3

(iii) Please specify which kind of rainwater harvesting and which kind of alternative energy options would be piloted under output 2.4, and why;

(iv) Please note that after output 2.5, the next output listed is output 2.7. Please include output 2.6 or adjust numbering.

DS, October 29, 2018:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Agency Response
1. Output 1.2 will focus on local level adaptation planning (district and community level) thereby supporting the activities financed under NAP. This is important to link national and local level adaptation activities especially in the context of this practical project. This has been specified in Table B.

2. An estimated number of beneficiaries has been included (2,500), and will be updated at PIF stage.

3. This has been incorporated briefly in the table, while details are already provided in the narrative. Biogas and solar energy systems will be piloted because of the availability of these energy sources in the project areas and the long term net benefits. The technologies have been successfully tried in other countries and their costs are globally going down. Rainwater harvesting will include both roof and hillside runoff with both tank storage facilities (for domestic use) and ground level tanks (for agricultural purposes), supported by gravity and solar powered irrigation equipment.

4. This has now been adjusted.

**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Unclear. Please address the following:

(i) please specify which co-financing sources are "investment mobilized" and which ones are not. Please describe how the breakdown of co-financing was identified;

(ii) All co-financing is currently listed as "grant" co-financing. Please confirm that this is actually accurate, or adjust as needed to reflect in-kind and other types of co-financing as well.

DS, October 29, 2018:

The comment to distinguish between recurrent expenditure and investment mobilized, was not taken into account, or is not reflected in the submission through GEF Portal --- in the Table all co-financing is recurrent expenditure, no investment mobilized. Please adjust as needed.

DS, November 1, 2018:

Cleared.
(i) The indicative “investments mobilized” have now been specified in the table as indicative. A combination of direct government development budgets for the baseline programme and recurrent expenditure constitute government co-financing while grant financing constitutes UNDP co-financing.

(ii) An adjustment has been made to reflect grant and recurrent expenditure

JP, Nov 1, 2018 - Done as requested.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. 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):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The STAR allocation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focal area allocation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal area set-aside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Program Incentive?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**
### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

#### 5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS, October 25, 2018:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. PPG is within the allowable cap.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS, October 25, 2018:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please report on the following adaptation core indicators for any LDCF submissions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Number of direct beneficiaries (gender-segregated);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Number of hectares of land under climate-resilient management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Number of policies, plans and development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (gender-segregated).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DS, October 29, 2018: |
| Comment cleared. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The adaptation core indicators are included in the “Indicators” template following the guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project/Program taxonomy**
7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Partly unclear. The proposed alternative scenario describes clearly the expected outcomes and components of the project, though some aspects related to the proposed linkage with a planned GCF project on climate information services, remain unclear. In particular, the proposed LDCF project should retain its focus on climate-proofing the rural settlement program including as it relates to infrastructure, housing, village models and water harvesting.
DS, October 29, 2018:

Cleared for PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage, further information on complementarity with the envisaged GCF project is requested.

Agency Response
The text has been adjusted to reflect the linkage between the LDCF and the planned GCF project. The LDCF will have a specific focus on generating and providing climate information to inform climate proofing the Rwanda rural settlement programme, targeting housing, infrastructure and water housing, thereby demonstrating best practices in the model villages programme. The use of climate information under the LDCF project will provide a best-case example of how climate information is used in practical adaptation settings, from which the proposed GCF project will learn and scale up to other interventions. The GCF project will target other areas not covered by the LDCF project.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response
5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response
6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Partly unclear. Please explain the adaptation benefits expected as a result of this project.

DS, October 29, 2018:

Comment cleared.
Agency Response
The specific benefits have been clearly specified, and these are aligned with the outputs of the projects, and include those at the household, landscape and global levels.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project’s/program’s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
DS, October 25, 2018:

Partly unclear. Please explain why the box is not ticked in Section 3 for "Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment"?

DS, October 29, 2018:

The box is still not ticked, please correct.

DS, November 1, 2018:

Cleared.

Agency Response
The box has now been selected as the project will actively include gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps and promote equality. The omission was an oversight.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination
Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Not yet. Please explain why the proposed implementation structure includes only REMA and a single project implementation unit under REMA, whereas the rural settlement program is clearly cutting across various ministries and government entities. Please consider expanding the implementation arrangement accordingly, to ensure full integration of the proposed project in the rural settlement program.

DS, October 29, 2018:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response
While REMA will lead and house the Project Management Unit, the project Steering Committee and project implementation teams will include other stakeholders identified in the table under “Coordination with other projects.” This is important since the LDCF project will directly benefit the Rwanda Housing Agency, Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Land and Forestry. These will be part of the project coordination structure whose details and terms of reference will be detailed at PPG stage. The PIF has been adjusted to include a commitment to this coordination mechanism.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management
Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, October 25, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION /RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This LDCF project is recommended for technical clearance and PPG, to be included in the upcoming work program. The project requests $9.4 million from the LDCF, including PPG and Agency fees. It builds on $22.4 million in indicative co-financing from the government and UNDP.

With a total population of close to 12 million people and an average density of 497 persons per square km, which is the highest in Africa, human settlement in Rwanda has spread to land with over 50% slopes on hills and hilltops. Land holding in the rural areas averages at less than 0.2 ha/household. It is predicted that the population will more than double, reaching 26 million by 2050, with a population density of 987 people/square km. Rwanda’s topography, rainfall patterns, land cover and high population densities, and its high dependence on subsistence
agriculture for livelihoods and economic development, make it highly sensitive to the impacts of climate change.

The proposed project would climate-proof Rwanda's rural settlement program that establishes new settlements, helping the country cope with rural poverty. It focuses on two rural districts. The project has both soft policy measures such as revising human settlement policy, rules, regulations and planning frameworks to mainstream climate risk into the rural settlement program; and on-the-ground adaptation investments including rehabilitation of degraded land, upgrading housing and infrastructure to more climate smart versions in four villages, and provide rainwater harvesting structures. By mainstreaming climate change into the rural settlement program, the proposed project will safeguard development gains. Gender will be mainstreamed throughout project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. By utilizing a blend of on-the-ground investment with policy measures, and building on the government's rural settlement program, the project is poised to deliver sustainable benefits that are replicable and scale-able.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

At CEO endorsement stage, further information on complementarity with the envisaged GCF project is requested.

Review Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIF Review</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review (as necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>