



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

GEF ID:	<b>9385</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Rwanda</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga Region</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5702 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; CCM-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$200,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,213,538</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$25,777,500</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$31,991,038</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Pascal Martinez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Faris Khader</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	PM, 02/25/16: The proposal aims at restoring and sustainably managing forest landscape through the 3 following complementary components: 1- Decision support tools for planning of forest landscape rehabilitation 2- Skills and capacity for implementation of Forest landscape restoration plans 3- Incentives for adopting energy	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>efficient technologies to reduce pressure on forest resources. Most of the outcomes and outputs are aligned with the GEF strategic objectives and results framework. Nevertheless, the CCA Program 1 is not aligned with a SFM project aiming at forest landscape restoration and it represents nearly the half part of the budget (45% of GEF resources). Please explain the rationale for this and adjust the proposal, in particular its component 3, accordingly to align with the GEF 6 Programming Directions.</p> <p>17 May 2016: Addressed</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>PM, 02/25/16: Partially. Please complete presenting how the project is aligned and contribute to the INDC of Rwanda presented to the UNFCCC for the COP21.</p> <p>17 May 2016: Addressed</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>PM, 02/25/16: Partially addressed. The different drivers are clearly presented and correspond well to the project components. Nevertheless, due to the</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>relative importance of budget allocated to the wood energy sector, more details are required to justify such a choice in the project design. Furthermore, the innovative quality of the National Forest Policy is highlighted and the innovation of the projects is presented as increasing the tree cover on small properties. It remains unclear how this activity constitutes an innovation and if there are other innovations planned in the proposal. Please provide more details regarding the innovative approach of the project that appear to be weak as described.</p> <p>17 May 2016: Addressed</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>PM, 03/07/16: Partially addressed. In general, the project components do not clearly and explicitly link to the baseline investments and more details on the project contribution and synergies are expected when relevant. In particular, the proposal mentions the ambitious pledge of Rwanda to the Bonn Challenge to restore 2 million ha. While the GEF is preparing an important contribution to the Bonn Challenge, the project should be associated to the GEF current strategy. Please establish a link with</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the GEF strategy on Bonn Challenge with relevant entities in the country. Furthermore, the GEF already financed an SFM project in Rwanda (GEF5), implemented by the same national agency REMA. The relations, synergies and complementarity with this project should be established in the proposal. Please, provide detailed information on this issue.</p> <p>19 May 2016: Addressed</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>PM, 02/25/16: More information is required for some important activities of the proposal. The output 2.2 includes the establishment of 1,000 hectares of new natural forest planted and of 10,000 hectares of new plantation forests with fast growing species. The GEF gives priority to restoration efforts that utilize natural processes as far as possible, including natural regeneration, assisted natural regeneration, and planting of indigenous tree species. Please explain further the kind of land that are targeted, the consequences in terms of biodiversity, justify how the rehabilitation of 1,000 ha of public forests can meet the GEF strategy and give details on the financing for the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>10,000 ha as this activity of planting fast growing species should be covered by co-financing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the output 4.1 is unclear. We can wonder at this stage to which extend the barriers to private sector implication are unknown and need to be identified and how the project activities will be able to surely remove them.</p> <p>Finally, the proposal project NAMA implementation will lead to GHG emission reductions of approximately 5,770,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e based on carbon sequestration potential from avoided deforestation. Please provide explanation of the calculation.</p> <p>19 May 2016: The result framework is acceptable at PIF level and the explanations in the document are very helpful. Please use the PPG to confirm and detail the strategies, outputs, and activities.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	PM, 03/07/16: Adressed.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	PM, 03/07/16: Yes and it is noted that the proposal	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		uses the exact total amount of the remaining available resources.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	PM, 03/07/16: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	12 July 2016 SFM: it is noted that \$3,011,412 are requested from the SFM program (including project grant, PPG and agency fees). Please note that unfortunately, the available SFM resources can't cover all the requests received by the GEF for this program and the maximum amount that can be requested for this project is \$1 million.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	PM, 03/07/16: Not at this stage. The project has a good potential, is well integrated and clearly addresses several drivers of the environmental degradation to produce social and environmental benefits. Nevertheless, its design needs improvements to align with an SFM project, especially as regard to the important plantation of fast growing species, the relative importance given to the wood energy sector development, the eligibility of some outputs for an SFM project and the synergies with other ongoing	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>processes in which the GEF is involved such as the previous GEF5-SFM project and the Bonn Challenge.</p> <p>12 July 2016:                      Yes, all the comments have been correctly addressed. SFM resources are requested: please note that unfortunately, depending on the available SFM resources, the maximum amount that can be requested for this project is \$1 million (including agency fees and PPG). Please complete the project with additional co-financing resources or adjust its component/activities accordingly to make them fit with the new budget.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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 monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		



## CEO endorsement Review

<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.