

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10096

Project Title

Ecosystems/Landscape approach to climate proof the Rural Settlement Program of Rwanda

Date of Screening

December 4 2018

Screeners

Guadalupe Duron

Panel Member

Ferenc Toth

**STAP Overall Assessment:
Concur**

STAP welcomes UNDP's project "Ecosystems/Landscape approach to climate proof the Rural Settlement Program of Rwanda". The project aims to climate proof the Rural Settlement Program of Rwanda through a Ecosystems/Landscape approach piloted in Gakenke and Kirehe Districts. Given the magnitude of the investment in terms of physical infrastructure (establishing new village centers) and social disruption (leaving home and resettling at a new place), it will be very important to ensure that the new residential areas are not vulnerable to the possible impacts of long-term climate change. STAP believes that the problem analysis is articulated well, supported by data and references. STAP appreciates the endnotes, and additional explanations to support the analysis. The components are also described clearly and support the project objective. The roles and responsibilities of the wide range of stakeholders (Section 2) are well presented. In addition, the presentation of possible risks, their impacts and probabilities and mitigation options (section 5) is good, and can serve as the basis for course correction during project implementation. STAP also is pleased to note the proposed knowledge management approach that will inform the project's adaptive management. In addition, STAP believes the project can benefit from the development of a theory of change - in particular, identifying the causal relationships between the outcomes and describing the assumptions required to achieve the project's objective. STAP welcomes all four components, and believes the project has the potential to contribute to evidence on the application of climate information for landuse planning and climate adaptation in Sub-Saharan Africa. Identifying the challenges and solutions in downscaling climate information at the province level (Gakenke and Kirehe) would strengthen the development of future climate risk approaches for farmers. STAP encourages UNDP to consider the sensitivity to climate change and its impacts on agriculture when identifying adaptation measures and livelihood alternatives (component 2). Climate risks should be considered beyond the lifetime of the project. STAP's advisory response is concur. STAP believes the PIF is well-developed: it is scientifically and technically sound. In order to strengthen the project, STAP recommends below how to improve the project design.

Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		

Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. The objective is clear, relevant to adaptation benefits, and responds to the problems articulated in the document.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes. The activities support the objective, and the proposed outcomes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits? Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes. The outcomes reflect reducing the vulnerability of the targeted communities to climate change. Yes. The problem analysis demonstrated the need to achieve adaptation benefits: 1) strengthened capacity to assess climate risks; 2) rehabilitate degraded landscapes and strengthen the resilience of ecosystem services; and, 3) policy frameworks that support communities capacity to assess climate risks, and institutional cross-sectoral work to embed climate adaptation strategies. Nonetheless, STAP suggests that the project team identify indicators for each of the 12 adaptation benefits, and explain how each benefit will be measured and progress assessed. STAP believes that 12 adaptation benefits may be ambitious, given the analysis of the problem.

Outputs	<p>A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project.</p> <p>Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?</p>	<p>Only if the assumptions are validated. STAP proposes that the project team define the assumptions associated with achieving the outputs and the outcomes.</p>
Part II: Project justification	<p>A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.</p>	
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	<p>Is the problem statement well-defined?</p>	<p>Yes. The problem analysis is comprehensive, informative, and rooted in scientific and valid assumptions. The problem diagnosis is supported by references and data on socioeconomic, land use, and climate information. In Section 1.1 Problem, root causes and barriers: the Climate Monitoring International Partnership (CMIP) information is very useful. However, STAP believes it is important to say under which scenario the additional temperature increase of 2.5 degC by the 2050s is projected. There is a minor issue with the placement of some of the items: Section 1.3 (Barriers to mainstreaming climate risk into the rural component of the Human Settlement Program) should be moved to Section 1.1. The text provides an excellent presentation of the key problems.</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>The barriers are detailed and relevant (and recent) references are provided to support the analysis.</p>

For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?

Non-applicable

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?
 Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?
 Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?

The baseline narrative sets out ongoing programs relevant to the context of the project. STAP encourages the project team to develop a results framework based on baseline data for the core indicators, and other indicators that will be used to measure and monitor the 12 adaptation benefits.

Not yet. The baseline and results framework will be provided at CEO endorsement.

Yes, the additional cost reasoning is sufficiently robust. It is based on the baseline narrative and business as usual scenario of what would occur to livelihoods and ecosystems in the absence of LDCF interventions.

For multiple focal area projects: Non-applicable

are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators; Non-applicable

are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and Yes. The PIF states that the project document will provide, and draw from, lessons learned from relevant projects, "...to inform the landscape concept and development of training material." | The PIF also mentions briefly several initiatives on which it will draw from to develop actions on climate resilience, and landscape management.

how did these lessons inform the design of this project? See above.

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

What is the theory of change?

Some elements of the theory of change are specified (e.g. context of the problem, detailed description of components) while other aspects are not (e.g. assumptions). STAP recommends that UNDP describes the theory of change by setting out: 1) the context of the problem; 2) causal relationships between the components that would lead to achieving the objective, including feed back loops; 3) description of the components; 4) the assumptions that describe the conditions under which change needs to occur; and, 5) the indicators to measure and track the adaptation benefits, outcomes, and assumptions.

What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?

The project's objective is to climate proof the planning and implementation of the rural settlement program. This will improve the resilience of the communities and ensure sustainable benefits. The project will adopt a landscape and community-based adaptation approach to mainstream climate risk into the imidugudu programs to address: the socioeconomic status of the targeted population; the abundance of degraded land, or land at risk of being degraded; threatened ecosystem services; and, communities' vulnerability to climate change (droughts and flooding), Four components are proposed: 1) enhanced institutional capacities and knowledge; 2) collection, analysis and delivery of reliable and timely climate forecasts for beneficiaries; 3) mainstream climate risk considerations into the imidugudu in a coordinated effort across all relevant sectors and vertical planning; and, 4) knowledge management to ensure that lessons from this project inform nation-wide replication of the climate proofed imidugudu.

· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?

See above.

· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?

The mechanism of change is plausible if the theory of change is developed and monitored. In particular, the project team is encouraged to understand the nature of the problem and the causal relationships. If the causal relationships are complex, complexity should be reflected in the theory of change.

· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?

No. STAP encourages the project team to detail how the theory of change will be confirmed, or revised, to assess progress towards achieving the project's objective. STAP also encourages the project team to use the knowledge management component to foster reflection and innovation that will enable the team to assess possible barriers, or enabling factors, that require the project to adapt.

5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?

Non-applicable

LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed additional cost reasoning activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?

Yes. STAP believes the additional cost reasoning is appropriate. However, STAP would like to encourage the project team to develop a theory of change, and a monitoring plan to assess its progress. This includes identifying indicators for the theory of change, and for the 12 adaptation benefits.

6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?

Non-applicable

Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? Initially, yes. The problem statement is based on valid assumptions (e.g. lack of access to climate information, or skills to interpret climate information for land use planning purposes), and the proposed components are logically tied to the problem analysis. However, the causal feedbacks between the outcomes, assumptions and indicators need to be detailed. STAP recommends making use of the theory of change to monitor progress of the multiple adaptation objectives on climate adaptation and landscape management. This process may require metrics for short-term processes, such as meaningful stakeholder engagement, as well as metrics to assess landscape approaches, or longer term processes, that achieve livelihood benefits, rehabilitation of degraded areas, and effective water conservation measures. The project team may refer to the following paper for further information: Sayer, J.A., Margules, C., Boedhihartono, A.K. et al. *Sustain Sci* (2017) 12: 465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-016-0415-z>

Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined? Non-applicable

Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? Non-applicable

What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change? The project focuses on strengthening capacity to assess climate risks. In particular, the activities will focus on climate information and decision-making tools to support planning and implementation of community-based adaptation measures.

7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	STAP believes that innovativeness is clearly demonstrated in Section 1.7, and the potential for scaling up is significant. The project has the potential to be innovative by contributing to the evidence base (problems and solutions) on the use of climate information for landscape planning. It also could be innovative on how to translate this evidence into farmer friendly decision-making methods. The project proponents may consider the following paper: Zougmore, Z. et al. (2018) "Facing climate variability in sub-Saharan Africa: analysis of climate-smart agriculture opportunities to manage climate-related risks". https://doi.org/10.1051/cagri/2018019
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, particularly for enhancing capacity and knowledge on landuse planning and climate adaptation (component 1).
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	It is unclear whether incremental adaptation or more transformational change will be required to assess resilience and the change that is required, STAP recommends applying the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment Framework (www.http://www.stagef.org/rapta-guidelines) or the Stockholm Resilience Centre's resilience tool, Wayfinder (https://wayfinder.earth/).

2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.

Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?

Yes. However, UNDP may wish to approach stakeholders involved in the project "Rwanda Climate Services for Agriculture": <https://ccafs.cgiar.org/building-climate-services-capacity-rwanda#.XAEG1vKjIU> Furthermore, it would be valuable to add farmers and communities to the list of stakeholders. Providing an opportunity to farmers and communities to inform the capacity building exercises on the use of climate information for land use planning, may motivate farmers to apply the training in future decision making. (See: Dayamba, D. et al (2018) Climate Services. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2018.07.003>)

What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?

Information included in the stakeholder section of the PIF.

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd

Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?

Yes. STAP believes the issues are clearly presented and that it is reasonable to address them in the complete project document. However, STAP would find it useful to see specific actions on gender in the PIF.

Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?

Not based on the information provided. However, STAP encourages the project team to consider obstacles that may hinder the participation of an important stakeholder group when applying gender sensitive methods in the design and implementation of the project.

5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design

Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?

Yes.

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?
For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:

Yes. Social and environmental risks have been included in the risk matrix.

- How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?

Climate projections until 2050 are used to describe climate change in Rwanda. STAP encourages the project team to set out how the climate projections will affect the selection and implementation of adaptation measures. Consideration also should be given whether measures that deliver more transformational change will be needed.
- Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?

Partially. The PIF provides climate projections for the country. Component 1 will strengthen capabilities to downscale climate modelling information for landuse planning and climate adaptation purposes. However, it is unclear whether the sensitivity to climate was considered when articulating component 2, in particular in the selection of adaptation measures and livelihood alternatives.
- Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?

Partially. The project will apply a landscape approach and community-based adaptation to reduce communities' vulnerability to climate risks. STAP recommends applying a system assessment which is a central feature of resilience thinking. It identifies potential risks, points of no return and key influencing factors (controlling variables) associated with anticipated future shocks or changes (including climate risks), as well as opportunities for adaptation or transformation to meet project goals. System assessment considers whether the system is currently on a trajectory towards a desirable or undesirable future. It analyzes the risk of crossing thresholds associated with known risks, shocks or trends. STAP recommends applying RAPTA or Wayfinder to assess the need for incremental adaptation, or transformational change: <http://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines> <https://wayfinder.earth/>
- What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

The project seeks to strengthen capacity to interpret and apply climate information for landscape planning, and climate adaptation measures. This is a critical capacity gap in Rwanda as explained in the PIF. (References were provided in the PIF to validate this statement.)

6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives

Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?

Partly. The baseline programs and project coordination sections describe initially how the project will collaborate with on-going initiatives. However, STAP recommends providing details on how the knowledge and learning from other projects will be used to foster innovation on landscape management and climate adaptation measures.

Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?

Yes.

Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?

Partly. STAP recommends providing lessons from the projects mentioned in the PIF, and how this project will build on this knowledge and learning.

How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?

See above.

Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?

Yes, through the knowledge management component, and a participatory M&E system that will methodically document successes and failures to inform adaptive management, and upscaling. STAP also is pleased that the M&E system will inform an impact assessment strategy – using a randomised control design – to document best practices and lessons learned. STAP looks forward to seeing the knowledge management approach.

8. Knowledge management. What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used? Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.

Unknown. STAP encourages the project team to detail the knowledge management approach, and identify indicators and metrics to monitor knowledge management outcomes.

What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?

The project intends to organize learning exchange workshops, and encourage the adoption and scaling-up of best practices.

STAP Notes