



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit



SECOND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND

Country case study report

Rwanda

January 2023

TRUSTED EVIDENCE.
INFORMED POLICIES.
HIGH IMPACT.

Second Performance Review of the Green Climate Fund

RWANDA COUNTRY CASE STUDY REPORT

01/2023

© 2023 Green Climate Fund Independent Evaluation Unit
175, Art center-daero
Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004
Republic of Korea
Tel. (+82) 032-458-6450
Email: ieu@gcfund.org
<https://ieu.greenclimate.fund>

All rights reserved.

First Edition

This evaluation is a product of the Independent Evaluation Unit at the Green Climate Fund (GCF/IEU). It is part of a larger effort to provide open access to its research and work and to contribute to climate change discussions around the world.

While the IEU has undertaken every effort to ensure the data in this report is accurate, it is the reader's responsibility to determine if any and all information provided by the IEU is correct and verified. Neither the author(s) of this document nor anyone connected with the IEU or the GCF can be held responsible for how the information herein is used.

Rights and Permissions

The material in this work is copyrighted. Copying or transmitting portions all or part of this report without permission may be a violation of applicable law. The IEU encourages dissemination of its work and will normally grant permission promptly.

Citation

The suggested citation for this evaluation is:

Independent Evaluation Unit (2023). *Second Performance Review of the Green Climate Fund: Rwanda country case study report* (January). Songdo, South Korea: Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund.

Credits

Head of the GCF Independent Evaluation Unit: Andreas Reumann

Task manager: Dr. Archi Rastogi, Evaluation Advisor a.i., Independent Evaluation Unit

Editing: Beverly Mitchell

Layout and design: Giang Pham

Cover photo: Replanting eroded slopes with diverse and climate-adapted trees, FP073 Green Gicumbi, ©Daisuke Horikoshi

A FREE PUBLICATION

Printed on eco-friendly paper

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	IV
A. Introduction	1
B. Background and context.....	1
1. Country context	1
2. Climate change priorities, policies and institutions	2
a. <i>Climate vulnerability</i>	2
b. <i>National climate change policies and priorities</i>	2
c. <i>Institutional roles and responsibilities for climate change</i>	3
3. Climate finance context.....	4
a. <i>Support for readiness</i>	4
b. <i>Climate investment</i>	4
c. <i>GCF portfolio</i>	5
C. Key findings	8
1. Country needs, ownership and strategy.....	8
a. <i>Links from GCF programming to broader climate strategy and finance processes</i>	8
b. <i>Perceived comparative advantage of the GCF in country</i>	10
c. <i>Effectiveness of NDA, Secretariat and AE roles and relationships at the country level</i>	11
2. Improving access to the GCF	12
a. <i>Access to AEs that cover country programming priorities for the GCF</i>	12
b. <i>Meeting DAEs' needs for capacity-building to access the GCF</i>	14
3. Programming and implementation	14
a. <i>Meeting country programming needs through GCF readiness support</i>	14
b. <i>Effectiveness of processes for funding proposal origination, development and appraisal to meet country needs</i>	15
c. <i>Sufficiency of funded activity implementation and supervision processes</i>	16
4. Progress towards results and impact of GCF investments	17
a. <i>Evidence that intended outputs and outcomes have been achieved/are likely to be achieved</i> ..	18
b. <i>Progress of funded activities toward paradigm shift</i>	21
c. <i>Women and other vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples</i>	22
d. <i>Catalysing public and private finance</i>	23
e. <i>Knowledge management and learning efforts within GCF-funded activities</i>	23
5. Emerging lessons for the GCF	24
REFERENCES	25
APPENDIX 1. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	25
APPENDIX 2. PORTFOLIO DATA	26
APPENDIX 3. GREEN GICUMBI PROJECT (FP073): IMPRESSIONS FROM THE SPR MISSION FIELD VISIT	32

ABBREVIATIONS

AE	Accredited entity
AfDB	African Development Bank
APR	Annual performance report
BRD	Rwanda National Development Bank
CN	Concept note
CP	Country programme
DAE	Direct access entity
EE	Executing entity
FAA	Funded activity agreement
FONERWA	Rwanda Green Fund
FP	Funding proposal
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GGGI	Global Green Growth Institute
IAE	International accredited entity
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
KfW	<i>Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau</i>
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MoE	Ministry of Environment
NCT	National Coordination Team
NDA	National designated authority
NDC	Nationally determined contribution
NoL	No-objection letter
PPF	Project Preparation Facility
PSF	Private Sector Facility
REMA	Rwanda Environment Management Authority
RGIF	Rwanda Green Investment Fund
RPSP	Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme
SAP	Simplified approval process
(S)PIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
SPR	Second Performance Review
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

A. INTRODUCTION

This country case study has been conducted as an input into the Second Performance Review (SPR) of the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The SPR was launched by the Board of the GCF through decision B.BM-2021/11 and is being conducted by the GCF’s Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). The SPR focuses on assessing the progress made by the GCF in delivering on its mandate, as well as on assessing the results of the GCF, including its funded activities and its effectiveness and efficiency. The SPR is informed by multiple data sources and methods, including country case studies.

This country case study report for Rwanda is based on desk review, interviews (see 0) and a country mission that was undertaken from 21 to 25 March 2022, including site visits to the *Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda* project (FP073), referred to as the “Green Gicumbi” project. The country mission team included Detlev Puetz (ICF senior consultant), Daisuke Horikoshi (GCF IEU) and Rose Uwagirisa (ICF national consultant). The report benefited from the findings of an earlier IEU country case study conducted during the GCF Forward-looking Performance Review in 2019.

B. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This section presents background information to better contextualize Rwanda’s experience with the GCF, including both the broader country and climate finance contexts.

1. COUNTRY CONTEXT

Table 1. Overview of Rwanda country context

CATEGORY	COUNTRY CONTEXT
Demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total population is 13.2 million, with 82.3 per cent in rural areas, 17.7 per cent in urban areas (World Bank, 2022b; Central Intelligence Agency, 2022). Approximately 55 per cent of Rwanda’s population live in poverty.
GCF group status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Africa; least developed country (Green Climate Fund, 2019).
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As evaluated on six World Bank governance indicators (World Bank, 2020), Rwanda ranks highly on Control of Corruption (70th percentile) and Government Effectiveness (64th percentile). Rwanda hovers around the middle range among all countries for Regulatory Quality (58th percentile), Rule of Law (57th percentile) and Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism (48th percentile). It is comparatively the lowest among all countries for Voice and Accountability (18th percentile). Fragile and conflict-affected state status: N/A (World Bank, 2022a). Governance: Rwanda has been politically stable since the 1994 genocide. The Rwandan Patriotic Front maintains an absolute majority in Parliament. President Paul Kagame was re-elected to a seven-year term in August 2018, following an amendment to the Constitution granting a third term (World Bank, 2022d).
Economy and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development status: Low-income country (World Bank, 2022e). Important economic sectors: The agriculture, forestry and fishing sector accounts for 25 per cent of total gross domestic product (GDP); industry accounts for 19 per cent of total national GDP. Rwanda is aiming for a rapid expansion of the industry sector, particularly focused on information and

CATEGORY	COUNTRY CONTEXT
	<p>communication technology (Central Intelligence Agency, 2022; World Integrated Trade Solution, 2019).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlook: Despite threats related to the COVID-19 pandemic, Rwanda's economic outlook is positive, with recovery expected to continue in 2022. Rwanda made significant economic progress in the two decades before the pandemic – life expectancy increased substantially, per capita income tripled and economic growth averaged 7.2 per cent from 2010 to 2019. Poverty and unemployment in Rwanda are on the rise, particularly among women and female-headed households that have been hit particularly hard by the pandemic, setting back the progress made by Rwanda in promoting gender equity. The Government of Rwanda is making efforts to reduce pandemic-related economic scarring. • COVID-19 remains a significant risk to development due to the large share of the population that is still unvaccinated and the emergence of new variants (International Monetary Fund, 2022).
Access to finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rwanda has a public sector-led development model. Financing Rwanda's development priorities pre-pandemic was challenging, and private financing has become a key strategy to support development. Fiscal incentives and large public infrastructure projects have become cornerstones of this strategy. Private investment is hindered by low domestic savings, lack of skilled workers and the high cost of energy (World Bank, 2022d). Higher spending needs in response to the pandemic, coupled with emerging climate change vulnerabilities, have put pressure on public finances. Rwanda would now need additional resources equal to approximately 21.3 per cent of GDP per year to meet the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030, a notable increase on the pre-pandemic figure (15.7 per cent) (International Monetary Fund, 2022). • The debt-to-GDP ratio is rising following the COVID-19 pandemic. Starting from 19.4 per cent in 2010, it rose to 56.7 per cent in 2019 and is estimated to have reached 71.3 per cent in 2020 (World Bank, 2022d). • World Bank Ease of Doing Business Index: Rwanda ranks as 38 out of 190 countries considered in the index (World Bank, 2022a).

2. CLIMATE CHANGE PRIORITIES, POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONS

a. Climate vulnerability

Rwanda's development pathway is threatened by recurring climate-related natural hazards, including floods, droughts, earthquakes, storms and lightning. Over the last decade, the frequency and intensity of hazards have increased (Green Climate Fund, 2020). These changing conditions are expected to negatively affect agricultural productivity, food availability, water resources, human health, ecosystems, and energy production and use (U.S. Agency for International Development Structure, 2019).

b. National climate change policies and priorities

Rwanda's climate change policies and strategies are summarized in Table 2 below. Rwanda has a guiding national policy on climate change and has begun to integrate climate into other key policies, including its 7 Years Government Programme: National Strategy for Transformation (NST1) 2017-2024 (Rwanda, n.d.) and the National Energy Policy of 2015. Rwanda has also submitted an updated nationally determined contribution (NDC) and an adaptation communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. These policies identify the following climate-related priorities for Rwanda:

- Low-carbon development to 2050, including actions and priorities for both mitigation and adaptation, and methods to mainstream climate into economic planning and key sectors (Rwanda, 2011).
- Strengthening governance and coordination of environment and climate change activities across government agencies and among stakeholders (Rwanda, 2019).
- A 16–38 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2030, as targeted in the updated NDC (Rwanda, 2020).
- As outlined in the NDC, 24 adaptation interventions for the following sectors: water, agriculture, land and forestry, human settlement, health, transport, mining and cross-sectoral (e.g. access to finance and disaster risk monitoring) (Rwanda, 2020).

Table 2. Rwanda national climate change policies and strategies

STRATEGY	STATUS	BRIEF DESCRIPTION
National climate change policy	Enacted	The National Environment and Climate Change Policy , developed by the Ministry of Environment, succeeds Rwanda’s Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy (which covered the period 2011–2018). It supports developing the national economy with a focus on green growth and climate-resilient goals. It outlines seven objectives, including promoting climate change adaptation and mitigation, and strengthening environmental and climate change governance (Rwanda, 2019). The National Strategy for Transformation 2017–2024 focuses on improving cross-sectoral coordination, particularly for agriculture, urbanization, infrastructure and land-use management (Rwanda, n.d.).
Updated NDC (2020)	Submitted	Rwanda is the first African country to update its NDC, which was submitted in May 2020. The NDC presents mitigation and adaptation targets to 2030 that will require USD 11 billion of climate-related investments, of which most (60 per cent) will need to come from international sources (Rwanda, 2020).
National adaptation plan	Under development	Rwanda’s national adaptation plan is under development (Rwanda, 2021).
Adaptation communication (2021)	Submitted	Rwanda’s Communication highlights its ongoing adaptation actions, including building government capacity to advance national adaptation planning processes, integrated water resource management plans for nine catchments, wetland resource management and rehabilitation, forest/land restoration and conservation, and increasing resilience of vulnerable communities (Rwanda, 2021).

c. Institutional roles and responsibilities for climate change

The Ministry of Environment (MoE) is responsible for the design and monitoring of national climate change policies. It coordinates and oversees the implementation of NDC actions and other climate change goals across ministries. The Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) promotes and ensures the protection of the environment and the sustainable management of natural resources through decentralized structures of governance and still lacking a national standing to emerging global issues (such as climate change) with a view to enhancing the well-being of the Rwandan people. Additionally, REMA is the national designated authority (NDA) and is the interface between the GCF and the country. The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) and the Rwanda Green Fund (FONERWA) – Africa’s first green fund, established

in 2012 – are responsible for mobilizing resources for NDC-related initiatives. Sector working groups, which bring together a variety of stakeholders, follow up on the implementation of sectoral plans and investments through Joint Sector Reviews (Rwanda, 2020).

Rwanda's Third National Communication identifies the key gaps of technical and capacity constraints such as low levels of knowledge, a lack of skills and awareness of climate change issues among the national stakeholders, and a lack of common objectives and clear roles for each of the relevant stakeholders. Moreover, the Third National Communication highlights the need to engage the private sector to support climate-resilient and low-carbon projects in the face of increasing climate-related vulnerability and risk (Green Climate Fund, 2020).

3. CLIMATE FINANCE CONTEXT

a. Support for readiness

Rwanda ranks in the upper quadrant among developing countries in terms of readiness for climate finance, with an ND-GAIN¹ readiness score of 0.415, making it the 93rd most ready country overall (University of Notre Dame, 2022). Following COP 26, the country was selected as one of five pioneer countries for a task force on access to climate finance due to its track record of effectively utilizing climate finance and its bold NDC vision.

Rwanda has worked in coordination with the NDC Partnership since 2018. The NDC Partnership's support has included the development of an NDC implementation framework identifying priority projects from different sectors, which is expected to be a central planning tool for the MoE, MINECOFIN and FONERWA (NDC Partnership, n.d.). In March 2022, Rwanda signed a climate and development partnership with Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development that aims to foster collaboration to implement Rwanda's NDC. In the pipeline are two projects, the Green City Kigali (EUR 30 million²) and the NDC Facility at FONERWA (EUR 26 million³) with the *Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau* (KfW) (Germany, 2022).

b. Climate investment

From 2016 to 2019, Rwanda received a total of USD 1 billion in development finance targeting climate change (Stockholm Environment Institute, 2022).

Adaptation. Development finance commitments targeting climate adaptation totalled USD 426 million from 2016 to 2019. Recent climate-related projects include building the capacity of Rwanda's government to advance the national adaptation planning process (Global Environment Facility (GEF)), reducing vulnerability to climate change through community-based adaptation (Adaptation Fund), climate-proofing a rural settlement programme (GEF), and building the capacity of vulnerable communities to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change through livelihood diversification and investment in rural infrastructures (GEF) (Stockholm Environment Institute, 2022). Table 3 lists the top development partners, sectors and instruments for funding adaptation projects in Rwanda.

¹ The ND-GAIN Country Index summarizes a country's vulnerability to climate change and its readiness to improve resilience. It aims to help governments, businesses and communities better prioritize investments to respond to global challenges. For more information, see <https://gain.nd.edu/about/>.

² KfW contribution

³ Ibid.

Table 3. Top development partners, sectors and instruments for adaptation investments in Rwanda 2016–2019”

TOP DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS		TOP SECTORS		TOP INSTRUMENTS	
Name	USD (M)	Name	Share (%)	Name	Share (%)
African Development Bank	182.0	Water supply and sanitation	47.4	Multilateral development bank loans	72.3
World Bank	130.0	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	16.7	Official development assistance grants	24.6
United States	34.0	Other multi-sector/cross-cutting	10.3	Multilateral development bank grants	1.2
The Netherlands	17.3	Disaster prevention and preparedness	6.6	Official development assistance loans	1.1
GEF	15.4	General environment protection	6.2	Private development finance	0.9

Source: Stockholm Environment Institute (2022). Aid Atlas.

Mitigation. Development finance commitments targeting climate mitigation totalled USD 618 million from 2016 to 2019. Recent projects include developing a regional hydropower plant (African Development Fund (AfDB)), scaling up energy access (AfDB), several sustainable cities impact programmes focused on biodiversity, land degradation and climate change (GEF), strengthening the capacity of Rwandan institutions to implement the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement (GEF), and developing a renewable energy fund to facilitate private sector participation in off-grid electrification (Climate Investment Funds) (Stockholm Environment Institute, 2022). Table 4 lists the top development partners, sectors and instruments for funding mitigation projects in Rwanda.

Table 4. Top development partners, sectors and instruments for mitigation investments in Rwanda (2016–2019)

TOP DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS		TOP SECTORS		TOP INSTRUMENTS	
Name	USD (M)	Name	Share (%)	Name	Share (%)
World Bank	259.0	Energy	75.2	Multilateral development bank loans	84.5
AfDB	208.0	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	7.2	Official development assistance grants	10.3
Climate Investment Funds	50.9	Water supply and sanitation	6.0	Official development assistance loans	4.6
European Investment Bank	36.9	General environment protection	2.0	Private development finance	0.5
AfDB	19.1	Communications	1.9	Multilateral development bank grants	0.2

Source: Stockholm Environment Institute (2022). Aid Atlas.

c. GCF portfolio

National designated authority. The NDA in Rwanda is located in REMA. In addition, MINECOFIN chairs a GCF Steering Committee (the National Coordination Team (NCT)).⁴

Accredited entities. In addition to international accredited entities (IAEs) and regional direct access entities (DAEs), Rwanda has access to one national direct access entity (DAE), shown in Table 5; a second national DAE has been nominated and started the accreditation process in 2018.

Table 5. DAEs for Rwanda

NAME OF DAE	DATE OF ACCREDITATION	ACCREDITATION LEVEL
MoE (formerly Ministry of Natural Resources of Rwanda)	08/07/2015	National

Readiness and project preparation. Rwanda has received more Readiness support from the GCF than the average amount other African countries have received.⁵ Rwanda has received six Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme (RPSP) grants (see Table 6), approved for a total of USD 3.7 million, of which USD 2.5 million has been disbursed. These grants include requests for support related to NDA and DAE capacity-building, country programming, and readiness for green city development, flood resilience and subnational actors such as municipalities. Rwanda developed a GCF country programme (CP) in 2016; an updated CP is currently under development. Rwanda also received support from the Project Preparation Facility (PPF) for four projects, as summarized in Table 7.

Table 6. RPSP grants to Rwanda

RPSP GRANT NAME	DELIVERY PARTNER	APPROVAL DATE / STATUS	OUTCOME AREAS
NDA Strengthening + Country Programming	Rwanda Green Fund	07/02/2015	NDA strengthening, including country programming
Readiness and preparatory support to implement Green City Development Projects in Rwanda's Secondary Cities	Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	23/02/2018	Strategic framework
National Adaptation Readiness and Preparatory Support for Building Flood Resilience Capacities in Rwanda	GGGI	26/01/2020	Adaptation planning
Readiness Support to Capacitate Rwanda's Subnational Level Actors in Green Growth and Climate Resilience	GGGI	29/04/2020	Strategic framework
Direct Access Capacity-	REMA	29/12/2020	NDA strengthening,

⁴ NCT permanent members include MINECOFIN as Chair, the Private Sector Federation as Vice-Chair, REMA as Secretary, the MoE, the Rwanda Environment Non-Government Organisations Forum and FONERWA. Representatives of relevant sectors, including the private sector, participate as non-permanent guests, depending on the nature of the project/programme assessed and discussed.

⁵ On average, African countries have received USD 0.7 million in GCF Readiness support. Source: IEU DataLab, RPSP grants approved for 2015 to 2022.

RPSP GRANT NAME	DELIVERY PARTNER	APPROVAL DATE / STATUS	OUTCOME AREAS
Building Project: Strengthening NDA capacity and Empowering NIEs			including country programming
Support for accreditation gap assessment and action plan for the Rwanda Development Bank	PricewaterhouseCoopers	23/02/2021	DAEs have established capacity to meet and maintain the GCF's accreditation standards

Source: IEU DataLab (2021)

Table 7. PPF grants received by Rwanda

PPF	NAME	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE	FOCUS	APPROVAL DATE / STATUS
PPF001	Rural Green Economy and Climate Resilient Development Programme	Public	Cross-cutting	09/03/2016, PPF completed (funding proposal submitted)
PPF025	Green City Pilot	Public	Cross-cutting	28/08/2019, disbursed
PPF027	Mainstreaming Climate Smart Planning and Implementation into Agricultural Development	Public	Cross-cutting	08/11/2019, disbursed
PPF030	Transformative green development for the Congo Nile Divide: Stimulating investment in developing sustainable economies through enhanced environmental services and climate resilience	Public	Cross-cutting	27/05/2020, disbursed

Source: IEU DataLab

Funding proposals. Rwanda has received more in GCF financing than the average amount other African countries have received.⁶ Seven projects have been approved for Rwanda, for a total of USD 101.2 million in GCF financing, of which two are national projects and five are multi-country projects. Multi-country projects account for the majority of GCF financing.

Only two projects are currently operating in Rwanda: the *KawiSafi Ventures Fund* (FP005) and *Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda* (FP073). The *Transforming Eastern Province through Adaptation* project is effective but not yet disbursing. Four multi-country projects with potential engagement in Rwanda are not yet operating in Rwanda (Table 8).

Rwanda's pipeline includes two concept notes (CNs) and two funding proposals (FPs) (see Table A - 3).

⁶ On average, African countries have received USD 78.1 million in GCF financing. Source: IEU DataLab, finance by results area for 2015 to 2022.

Table 8. Rwanda's funded activity portfolio

FP	NAME	SINGLE/ MULTI- COUNTRY	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE	FOCUS	AE	APPROVAL DATE / STATUS
FP005	KawiSafi Ventures Fund	M	Private	Cross-cutting	Acumen Fund, Inc.	05/11/2015; effective and operating since 2016
FP073	Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda	S	Public	Cross-cutting	MoE	01/03/2018; effective and operating since 2019
FP148	Participation in Energy Access Relief Facility	M	Private	Mitigation	Acumen Fund, Inc.	13/11/2020; not yet operational in Rwanda
FP151	Global Subnational Climate Fund – Technical Assistance Facility	M	Private	Mitigation	IUCN	13/11/2020; not yet operational in Rwanda
FP152	Global Subnational Climate Fund – Equity	M	Private	Mitigation	Pegasus Capital Advisors	13/11/2020; not yet operational in Rwanda
FP167	Transforming Eastern Province through Adaptation	S	Public	Cross-cutting	IUCN	01/07/2021; effective since 2022 but not yet disbursing
FP181	CRAFT – Catalytic Capital for First Private Investment Fund for Adaptation Technologies in Developing Countries	M	Private	Adaptation	Pegasus Capital Advisors	07/10/2021; not yet operational in Rwanda

Source: IEU DataLab

Abbreviation: AE (accredited entity), FP (funding proposal), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)

C. KEY FINDINGS

1. COUNTRY NEEDS, OWNERSHIP AND STRATEGY

a. Links from GCF programming to broader climate strategy and finance processes

Currently, **GCF programming is substantially linked to broader climate strategy and finance processes in Rwanda**. Rwanda's first CP, established in 2016, identified intervention areas and specific projects for GCF finance in full alignment with Rwanda's 2015 NDC. The 2016 CP, which was revised in 2018, was a comprehensive document, providing context and many sector and project ideas for GCF funding that were only partly followed, and ultimately narrowed down and concretized. Plans to mobilize the private sector in the CP were not well defined.

Building on lessons from the 2016/2018 CP, the new GCF CP under design will present a more specific and sectorally inclusive project pipeline, according to the NDA CP drafting team. The pipeline will be well aligned with the NDC, including having a stronger focus on the private sector. The 2022 CP development process has included the active participation of country partners through

workshops and other means. Among the five additional GCF projects planned over the coming years are proposals on transport (Ministry of Infrastructure), water and sanitation, and green cities (Ministry of Infrastructure, Municipality of Kigali and others). Other objectives of the CP are (i) emphasizing the private sector and “de-risking” other entities’ finance, especially in agriculture, energy and disaster management, (ii) achieving paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways, and (iii) increasing the DAE project size to medium (through accreditation of the Rwanda National Development Bank (BRD)) and including the on-granting capabilities of the MoE during DAE reaccreditation.

In 2020, Rwanda became the first country in Africa to update its NDC.⁷ Rwanda’s recent NDC update emphasizes green private sector investments. As the main agency for mobilizing and coordinating climate finance in Rwanda, FONERWA counts on future GCF contributions in financing the updated NDC, especially through support for home-grown, private sector investments. This renewed the effort by the Rwanda GCF NDA and GCF partners in the country to accelerate the GCF accreditation of BRD and to develop a GCF funding proposal for a Rwanda Green Investment Fund (RGIF) in collaboration with FONERWA, AfDB and BRD. The GCF also helped with national adaptation plan formulation and implementation, particularly through its work on Green Cities (via the RPSP) and the launch of the Green Gicumbi pilot project (FP073); this is an ongoing process led by the MoE in partnership with REMA.

The GCF institutional architecture and operational modalities in Rwanda facilitate coherence and complementarity with partners in pursuing NDC objectives. MINECOFIN and the MoE work closely together to determine the use and integration of GCF resources in government strategy and budget planning for climate finance – MINECOFIN on the financial side (through the NCT) and the MoE (and closely associated organizations such as REMA and FONERWA) on the technical and environmental side. They are helped by the collective experience of GCF partners in the NCT, the GGGI and various accredited entities (AEs) and executing entities (EEs), several closely linked to the MoE, and including the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Infrastructure as future EEs. The MoE-led Sector Working Group on environment and natural resource management and the related policy-oriented joint sector review are the two most important mechanisms of alignment and complementarity of the GCF with other climate finance channels. This also includes a thematic sub-working group, headed by FONERWA, on external and internal green resource mobilization and coordination for Rwanda. The seat of the NDA, REMA, is also responsible for dealing with the Climate Investment Funds and GEF, and the MoE coordinates with the Adaptation Fund.

The GCF Secretariat has played primarily a facilitating role in Rwanda with respect to the **upstream programming process and aligning GCF partners and programmes with country strategy objectives**. Several decisions on programming and accreditation were taken in consultation with the GCF Secretariat, particularly prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, through GCF staff and consultant visits in Rwanda and exchanges during structural dialogues. Decisions related to the development of FP073, the use of RPSP and the nomination of BRD as a private sector DAE (see later sections). In November 2021, during the most recent and still ongoing CP design, the drafting team had some interactions with the GCF Country Division and noted improvements in GCF team support. But so far there is no evidence of an in-depth, strategic and tripartite discussion – which would include Rwanda, relevant AEs and the GCF Secretariat – ahead of the development of the

⁷ GCF funds did not directly contribute to this process as it was sufficiently supported by others (the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme, GEF, GGGI, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability, and bilaterals). But the GCF contributed indirectly through its strong links with and support for the MoE, the lead agency for the NDC.

new CP. Currently, the GCF Secretariat appears to be more reactive than proactive, an illustration of this relates to the effort to comment on the first CP draft.

Rwanda's GCF portfolio shows some evidence of **complementarity with other climate finance channels**. The most notable example is the Green Cities Pilot FP, currently under preparation, and its intention to scale up a pilot green neighbourhood effort funded by KfW (KfW Development Bank, n.d.), in coordination with the ongoing GEF-funded Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (implemented by the World Bank and executed by the Ministry of Infrastructure, REMA and the City Administration of Kigali) and the forthcoming GEF-funded Sustainable Cities Impact Program child project in Rwanda.⁸ This complementarity appears to be driven by the government agencies involved and coordinated by the GCF Readiness programme delivery partner, GGGI, who has delivered multiple RPSP grants to support this coordinated process. See also section C3a below on Readiness support for programming.

b. Perceived comparative advantage of the GCF in country

Compared to other climate finance channels, stakeholders in Rwanda report that the **comparative advantages of the GCF are its country-drivenness, the scope and diversity of its funding and capacity-building, and its mechanisms for de-risking investments**. According to government officials, the GCF is much appreciated for its ability to offer grants, its focus on tangible outcomes and its strong alignment with national policies and plans. Government staff interviewed also pointed to the as yet untapped large potential for mainstreaming climate change in diverse infrastructure projects through the GCF.

Above all, the GCF is seen as enabling the most country-drivenness among all development partners, as evidenced through the extensive no-objection procedures (an AE must have a no-objection letter (NoL) from the NDA before submitting a concept note (CN) or FP to the GCF), NCT review process and prioritization of proposals by national stakeholders, albeit with some room for further improvements (as outlined below). The Government of Rwanda expects that its future GCF country portfolio will be implemented mainly through Rwandan DAEs and their EEs, except where an international accredited entity (IAE) can demonstratively do better, such as in terms of project size and leverage, gap filling or specialized technical competencies. GCF funds channelled through IAEs in the coming CP are expected to be reduced to 30 per cent, down from the current 60 per cent. Private sector funding should in the future be mainly through BRD, once it is accredited. Although not yet fully utilized, the GCF is regarded as having unique mechanisms for de-risking green private sector investments, catalysing innovation and using diversified financial instruments.

The areas where the GCF is perceived as less well positioned in Rwanda are related to its **limited opportunities for civil society organizations' (CSOs) implementation and the accreditation implications of the MoE, in particular for funding infrastructure, especially in water and energy**. Over the years, MINECOFIN has been trying to increasingly leverage the GCF and its commendable funding opportunities through broadening the scope of GCF projects to infrastructure and other line ministries (beyond agriculture and landscape restoration). But direct access is still limited, and the engagement of IAEs has not yet been actively pursued for this purpose. Many government officials are not yet fully aware of GCF opportunities. Some CSOs are modestly involved in ongoing or planned GCF projects, mainly community-based organizations, but the civil society organization community also wishes to see more substantial access pathways to directly implement or execute GCF projects or subprojects by themselves. Both GCF limitations are planned to be addressed gradually, starting with the new GCF CP and through seeking on-granting

⁸ The GEF term "child project" refers to a country-specific project in a larger GEF programme or framework.

accreditation capabilities for the MoE during its current reaccreditation process to facilitate CSOs' execution of the project.

c. Effectiveness of NDA, Secretariat and AE roles and relationships at the country level

All stakeholders agreed that over the past three years, cooperation and coordination among them in Rwanda has significantly improved, despite some difficulties caused by COVID-19. Country stakeholders also report a higher comfort level and know-how in the preparation of CNs and FPs.

NDA staffing and technical capacity in Rwanda has stayed about the same since the initial resource mobilization period; overall NDA capacity is still low but has been improving in recent years thanks to capacity-building. RPSP support was usefully deployed in Rwanda for awareness building on GCF objectives and processes and for portfolio development, but despite high motivation and notable improvements in communication with the GCF, the NDA is still operationally challenged due to low dedicated staffing. Rwanda has had a total of six RPSP grants so far, four of which are ongoing. Most of these grants have been used for programme and project development, particularly for the groundwork of the Green Cities Pilot FP, general training and awareness building of various stakeholders, and specific DAE support (see subsequent sections on DAE capacity-building and Readiness support for programming). Readiness grants also helped to advance FPs/CNs on vulnerable communities in the Congo–Nile divide and climate smart agriculture. But some critical country readiness capacities are not yet sufficiently developed, particularly in the NDA – for example, for review of CNs and FPs.

The two GCF RPSP grants for NDA support were helpful to develop some foundational NDA capacities and processes and for stakeholder trainings on GCF objectives and processes. They also supported broader capacity development of REMA staff, which helped REMA beyond GCF-specific programming. But the core NDA team remains too small, overburdened and without fully dedicated staffing. It was not seen as possible to fund a GCF desk in REMA from RPSP resources, and NDA work is either done part-time or by consultants. The head of the NDA is at the same time the Director General of REMA and has multiple other responsibilities. An institutionally stronger NDA would be particularly important should the NDA also be expected to increase its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and reporting capacities of the active GCF country portfolio.

Opportunities for developing, diversifying and expanding capacities are increasing. The NCT, led by MINECOFIN, has become more assertive and has expanded its membership. The NCT Vice Chairpersons are representing the private sector and FONERWA, and the team also includes BRD, the nominated private sector DAE. CSOs are represented adequately, too. Non-permanent members may be invited according to the expertise needed. There is a clear NoL policy and terms of reference for the NCT and the NDA. Decisions on projects and nominations for accreditation are taken jointly, with the process being overseen and informed by the NCT and its members. The transparency of country decisions on the project pipeline and AE matching of projects is regarded as higher now than in 2019.

The NDA's working relationship with the Secretariat has improved since the initial resource mobilization period. The GCF Secretariat has been doing “much better” overall in GCF-1 according to several sources, especially with faster and more reliable communication during programming and pipeline development, and its intent for better dialogue with countries is noticeable even though not fully implemented. For instance, the NDA managed to establish a stronger, more permanent and more effective link with staff from the GCF Africa regional desk. Responsibilities within the Secretariat are still seen as fragmented, however. A high-ranking interview partner requested the GCF to clearly designate a single counterpart person/desk in the

GCF that would take charge, or be the focal point, of all aspects of country and entity work programmes in Rwanda throughout the project cycle.

Country stakeholders also still perceive GCF Secretariat and independent Technical Advisory Panel comments on proposals as often being out of country context, noting that the GCF has no direct way of assessing projects and annual performance reports (APRs) by validating information with other country stakeholders. A positive exception, apparently, was the design of the RGIF FP in 2021, in which excellent, extensive and quick turnaround and commenting by the GCF's Private Sector Facility (PSF) were reported. This success was partly due to the momentum built from the stronger private sector focus in the updated NDC, the engagement by future EEs FONERWA and BRD, the strong political backup from the Government of Rwanda, and prospects of a game-changing private sector project for the GCF.

The time lag with South Korea is another problematic factor for better working relationships and delivery. Also, due to the pandemic, there have been almost no physical interactions and communications with GCF representatives in country or in South Korea in recent years. Country interview partners point out that, unlike other major development partners, the GCF does not participate in the MINECOFIN annual investment planning process to facilitate national government budget coherence and complementarity. GGGI as delivery partner can only be a weak substitute for linking country stakeholders to the GCF and interpreting GCF intentions, as it is recruited by and working for the NDA and has no mandate to speak for the GCF. Country stakeholders believe a GCF physical representation in the country or region would help resolve some of these issues.

The Rwandan DAE and IAEs with physical presence in Rwanda engage regularly with the NDA, but IAEs without presence or with only multi-country projects only engage occasionally, mostly to obtain the NoL. The MoE as DAE is intimately engaged in GCF processes in the country and so are the IUCN and AfDB as IAEs for their single-country projects. For multi-country projects, however, there has not been much interaction with the NDA or other country partners (including by IUCN and AfDB, and the local executing partner for FP005) except at the NoL stage. The NDA did not obtain the annual performance report (APR) for FP005 from Acumen.

2. IMPROVING ACCESS TO THE GCF

a. Access to AEs that cover country programming priorities for the GCF

Rwanda's current access to AEs does not yet cover its programming priorities for the GCF. The major gaps are a private sector DAE with on-lending capacity and a DAE with broader coverage of infrastructure sectors, preferably medium size and with engagement of CSOs. The nominations of the MoE as a public sector DAE and BRD as a private sector DAE for Rwanda were strategic, but the MoE finds it difficult to cover the large interest in GCF access from infrastructure sectors and CSOs, and BRD accreditation is taking much longer than expected (and is not yet complete).

The MoE was an early, relevant candidate for DAE based on its policy mandate of mainstreaming environment and climate change across sectors, its technical expertise and its implementation background in the Adaptation Fund (which enabled it to get "fast track" accreditation). The MoE was among the first GCF DAEs, achieving accreditation in July 2015 for small projects up to Category B risk, and for basic project management (i.e. no grant awards or on-lending). The MoE as the principal DAE has dominated formulation and execution of nationally originated GCF projects. The MoE implements the only active public sector project, Green Gicumbi (FP073), is the proposed AE for two of four submitted FPs (the other two are by AfDB) and submitted five out of seven ongoing CNs (see Appendix 1, Table A - 3).

Some shortcomings of the MoE as the only public sector DAE are widely acknowledged and discussed in Rwanda. Its structures are not fully suited for broader mainstreaming and impact across sectors, particularly infrastructure, due to MoE accreditation limits of USD 50 million projects and its lack of on-granting capability, limited implementation capacities and particular interests as a cross-cutting ministry for environment and natural resource management. As one interview partner explained, “The kind of projects submitted depends on the kind of AE. The MoE will submit other kinds of projects than a line ministry would.” Government interviewees also anticipated that the MoE as DAE would find it difficult to oversee and supervise GCF projects executed by other senior ministries, such as those for agriculture and infrastructure. Last, there are some lingering concerns about too much closeness and internal lines of reporting between the MoE, REMA (as NDA), and FONERWA (as executive entity (EE) for FP073) and the representation of REMA and FONERWA by the MoE in the Cabinet. The NCT oversight structure alleviated some of the latter concerns to some extent.

The NDA nominated BRD in 2018 as the main entity for channelling private sector funds due to its potential of attaining medium-size accreditation with the GCF, but it has not yet achieved accreditation. FONERWA was discussed as an alternative as it is more experienced with the green climate finance agenda, but it was seen as having lower potential for private sector on-lending and finance leverage than BRD, if any. The GCF reportedly was consulted in the nomination of BRD as second DAE at the time. The accreditation process for BRD was initially slow because of a lack of experience in green funding and with GCF processes. The process has now accelerated given several factors, including the momentum for private sector mobilization from the NDC update process in 2020 and capacity support for BRD (see later in this section). BRD is interested in leveraging GCF funding to diversify and complement its portfolio of investors and ongoing green investments in solar power, green cooking and housing.⁹ BRD also appreciates GCF concessional finance and long-term conditions.

Government interview partners expressed satisfaction with future direct national access through two entities, a public and a private one, while recognizing that these are not yet optimal. Direct access to medium-size public GCF projects (USD 50–250 million) and loans remains a long-term goal for Rwanda. However, no other nominations are currently planned, such as of sector ministries or other entities, due to the complexity and length of the GCF accreditation process, uncertainties about the qualifications of potential DAE candidates, and their appetite to embark on such a process. In the meantime, international access is an alternative mechanism, particularly for line ministries with more ambitious projects. This option would, however, depend on the realization of the planned 30 per cent cap for IAE portfolio share in the new CP and its enforcement.

In retrospect, a public national DAE that could have led to broader access, mainstreaming and larger size projects may have been preferable. But the only qualified institution at the time of the decision was MINECOFIN, which does not have an operational mandate nor the technical expertise and supervision structures required for an implementing entity. Some interview partners suggested that alternative country ownership and access mechanisms to GCF funds might work better, more akin to institutional arrangements in the Global Fund and to basket funding arrangements. For example, with the Global Fund there is permanent representation in the country, a country coordination mechanism and all project decisions are taken in the country based on an allocated budget.

Several entities prefer, and are sufficiently adaptable, to gain access to GCF funds as EEs, even if agency fees are lower than for an AE. Current and planned EEs include the Ministry of Agriculture, the Rwanda Forest Authority, district administrations, the Wildlife Conservation Society, and the IAEs; IUCN and the Belgian development agency (Enabel). BRD and FONERWA will also be EEs

⁹ Among them are the European Investment Bank, KfW and the World Bank.

if a recently submitted funding proposal by AfDB (for the RGIF) is approved. For CSOs, their best short-term hopes in Rwanda are for future on-granting capabilities by the MoE (should the MoE be able to demonstrate sufficient past on-granting experiences during its reaccreditation process) or on-granting through an IAE. On-granting would also be useful for municipalities and certain types of private sector engagement.

MoE accreditation is expiring in July 2022. Its request for reaccreditation was submitted in November 2021, comments were received by late January 2022 and responses sent in late March for a second round of reviews by the GCF. Reaccreditation is expected to be completed by mid-2022. The MoE is hoping to lift its on-granting limitation during its ongoing reaccreditation process with the GCF but has not applied for medium-size projects during this round.

b. Meeting DAEs' needs for capacity-building to access the GCF

In Rwanda, national DAEs' needs for capacity-building to access the GCF are being partially met through GCF support. BRD was nominated in 2018 as a DAE and reportedly took time to realize its need for support. An RPSP grant of USD 33,000 was eventually approved in May 2021 (with PricewaterhouseCoopers as delivery partner (DP)), but it was only designed to provide a gap assessment. Instead, BRD benefited more from another, parallel support grant for GCF accreditation that it received from the Investment Climate Reform Facility of the European Union / European Investment Bank / KfW and that was executed by *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*. In contrast to the GCF RPSP grant, this grant not only supported the gap assessment but also hands-on technical assistance for completing the whole self-assessment process, which reportedly allowed for major recent progress in the BRD accreditation process. In addition, the forthcoming private sector FP on the RGIF is expected to pave the way for BRD to become an EE to further develop and expand its green private sector lending and help with developing its first direct access FP once approved as a DAE.

The latest 2021 RPSP grant with REMA as delivery partner is also providing some capacity-building support to the MoE for expanding its capacities for project development and implementation, but the SPR country mission was not able to assess the scope and results of such support, particularly for developing MoE capacities in portfolio management and supervision.

3. PROGRAMMING AND IMPLEMENTATION

a. Meeting country programming needs through GCF readiness support

Rwanda has engaged in several ways with GCF support for country readiness and has regularly sought PPF support for FP development. Country needs appear to be substantially met through the GCF or other available resources. PPF grants were helpful to develop the Green Gicumbi project (FP073), the Green City Pilot CN/FP, the building resilience of communities in the Congo Nile Divide FP and mainstreaming climate smart planning and implementation into agriculture CN; other projects originating in-country were developed and submitted with country's own resources. The GCF PPF is perceived as more comprehensive than other donor project preparation support in terms of what can be covered. In recent years, however, government and AE interviewees report that it has become more difficult to access the PPF. PPF implementation can also become challenging when, for instance, GCF Secretariat responses are received by AEs after consultant team contracts have already expired, which has been the case for Rwanda.

The RPSP and PPF together have played a particularly important and coordinated role in supporting the development of a Green City Pilot CN, which is expected to be submitted as an FP in the first half of 2022, with another follow-up CN on the same theme already being prepared. Developed by the MoE, the Green City Pilot has been supported by three RPSP grants and a PPF grant since 2017, with GGGI as the delivery partner, for a total of over USD 3.5 million in support of Kigali City and

various district municipalities. The RPSP grants covered (i) building flood resilience, (ii) implementing green city development projects in secondary cities and (iii) capacitating subnational actors (e.g. municipalities) through greening city master plans. The work took advantage of GGGI's strong global knowledge of green cities and its presence in six secondary cities in Rwanda. Through these activities, the programme also contributed to the national adaptation plan regarding flooding, especially in urban areas. A project by GEF under its eighth replenishment cycle, 2022–26 (GEF-8), is now supposed to build on this work in the Rusizi River Basin, with plans for further crowding in of IUCN and European Union funds.

The Readiness grants also helped with existing greening city development master plans that were receiving implementation funding from other development partners, such as the World Bank.¹⁰ Among others, GGGI worked with the Rwanda Housing Authority under the Ministry of Infrastructure to help green the Rwanda Secondary Cities Master Plan and to build the capacity of local environmental committees. The private sector was targeted as a priority: green business companies and start-ups are already increasing their pilot activities, such as green brickmakers that use recycled materials (financed partly through FONERWA's non-GCF funds).

Initially, the ideas put forward for RPSP grant requests were primarily being driven by NDAs and international actors, such as GGGI. But for the most recent Readiness Needs Assessment several other stakeholders were consulted and helped to identify the readiness needs from which RPSP ideas will be generated. A standout reason for stakeholders not seeking more RPSP grants or support is the long process of gaining GCF RPSP approval: a new RPSP proposal can only be submitted once the previous one has been approved by the GCF. Other contributing factors include that needs are being met partly by other sources (e.g. for NDC design). There are also some limitations in the NDA's capacity to manage support requests and formulate them in a timely fashion.

b. Effectiveness of processes for funding proposal origination, development and appraisal to meet country needs

Rwanda has been working since 2015 to develop a sizeable and diverse GCF portfolio. The portfolio is mostly country-originated, with the exception of four multi-country projects that plan to invest in Rwanda and one that has already been working in Rwanda since 2016 (see Table 8 and Table A - 1). Many pipeline FPs and CNs centre around rural ecosystems and landscapes and are promoted by the MoE and its traditional national partners such as the IUCN, the Wildlife Conservation Society and the Ministry of Agriculture (Table A - 3). The Green City Pilot CN that was developed based on several RPSP grants and a PPF grant is ready to be submitted as an FP in the coming months. Consistent with the focus of Rwanda's updated NDC, a final version of the RGIF is expected to be submitted to the GCF PSF by mid-2022. Other FPs and CNs originate from IAEs (the AfDB adaptation benefits and REDD+) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (the UNEP/GCF global cooling initiative).

The Rwanda project portfolio was strategically determined in part, based on the priorities of the Government of Rwanda and the NCT, and considers the core competencies and ongoing or past work of engaged AEs and delivery partners. Current gaps on broader infrastructure development and climate mainstreaming are planned to be filled gradually, as envisioned in the revised CP.

Rwanda has a fair number of CNs and FPs in the pipeline. Faster progress towards funded activities is impeded by the complexity of the GCF approval process and the limitations of

¹⁰ Rwanda is a participating country in GEF's Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot programme, implemented by the World Bank, and the subsequent Sustainable Cities Impact Program. Rwanda has also received support from KfW to develop a pilot concept for a green district in Kigali (KfW Development Bank, n.d.).

NDA and DAE capacities. The lack of adequate DAEs, especially from the private sector, and uncertainty about how the number of submitted FPs will affect their approval (i.e. the “right” number and funding volume of FPs for the country) also affects their numbers. Regarding capacities, some interviewees noted continued in-country issues in developing sound CNs and called for better internal reviews by the NDA before CN submission to the GCF. For example, the MoE submitted two simplified approval process (SAP) CNs with implications for private sector engagement that were not accepted by the GCF Secretariat. The rationale given by GCF staff was that the MoE is not accredited for the type of interactions with the private sector as proposed, be it on-granting or on-lending. The CNs are now on hold until the MoE acquires its on-granting capacity and can possibly team up with BRD on on-lending at some point.

Currently, stakeholders find the submission through appraisal process cumbersome but possible, with notable improvements in the approval to funded activity agreement (FAA) stage in GCF-1. Rwandan interview partners report improvements in GCF programming processes but continue to express frustration about the GCF’s pace, quality of appraisal comments and expectations on climate rationale. Since the Rwanda country case study was conducted for the Forward-looking Performance Review of the GCF in 2018, country stakeholders have become more comfortable and conversant with GCF CN and FP programming expectations and investment criteria. Where the GCF has really improved in Rwanda during GCF-1 is on the speed of signing FAAs, interactions with the Division of Portfolio Management on active projects and better digital interactions supported through the Secretariat’s Portfolio Performance Management System. See also the section above on Secretariat, NDA and AE roles.

GCF expectations on evidence for climate rationale are widely regarded as unrealistic and unnecessary for the Rwandan context, where adaptation to climate change is well argued for and strategically addressed in various national strategies. In fact, Rwanda’s updated NDC of 2020 explicitly comments on the GCF climate rationale criterion (the only time that the GCF is mentioned in the report) as an artificial division between climate change and development that seriously hampers the ability of the Government to address the impacts of climate change (Rwanda, 2020).

c. Sufficiency of funded activity implementation and supervision processes

During implementation, the GCF has had limited¹¹ engagement with the DAE in Rwanda (the MoE) to identify and manage risks and results. The DAE does not have processes for regular, structured supervision of its GCF projects that would be comparable to those in public international entities. Apart from written comments by the GCF Secretariat on the 2019 and 2020 APRs, there were no direct interactions between the GCF Secretariat and the FP073 project regarding results and risk management (or the Independent Redress Mechanism or Independent Integrity Unit), nor is there any APR reference to any risks having been identified or managed in FP005 (which is managed by an IAE and a regional EE).¹² No major risks were raised in the APR nor were there any known formal complaints to the GCF on the projects. But an independent report by Transparency International noted that there were no risk registers for all project components to mitigate possible risks (Transparency International, 2021). Risks were assessed as high for floods and droughts and as rare or unlikely for leadership, financial risks and individual abuse.

For the Green Gicumbi project (FP073), the project team described to the SPR mission a number of government accountability systems in Rwanda for tracking results and identifying and addressing

¹¹ Substantial engagement might include the Secretariat and/or independent units raising risk flags or early warnings, working together with the DAE to address implementation challenges, and substantive feedback on APRs that results in some adaptive management of the GCF project; limited engagement might include minor feedback on APRs that does not result in any adjustments.

¹² The SPR mission did not have access to the comments on the APRs of either project, but the *SPIU* of the Green Gicumbi project had no direct interaction with the GCF Secretariat. No major risks were raised in the APR.

risks in the project in a timely manner. The GCF has so far accepted these systems as adequate. The single DAE in the country, the MoE, has effective basic project accountability, results and risk management systems in place. MoE project oversight mechanisms for the ongoing project in Gicumbi include (i) a Project Steering Committee that occasionally visits the field; (ii) a Technical Steering Committee with multiple stakeholders, which is a new mechanism introduced by the MoE for the GCF Gicumbi project; (iii) regular reports by the EE (FONERWA) on financial compliance (monthly) and implementation progress (quarterly); (iv) audits commissioned by the MoE; and (v) periodic field visits by the MoE implementation unit. Oversight is facilitated by special tools for project monitoring such as the project management information system. A review of the MoE APR by the NDA is part of the oversight mechanism of the Rwanda GCF system. Some political economy risks that affected primarily community engagement, feedback, institutional governance, and social issues were raised by the independent Transparency International review of the project in 2021, upon invitation by the Government of Rwanda and with financial support by the German government. Transparency International's report pointed to certain shortcomings in community consultations, feedback and mobilization that were explained by the project as partly related to COVID-19 restrictions.

The MoE established a Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) responsible for project management, oversight and supervision of different MoE projects, with 17 staff members, among them several technical specialists. Its capacity is planned to be extended with new GCF projects, such as the forthcoming Congo Nile Divide FP. Some interviewed observers questioned whether the unit already has the capacity to fully oversee and supervise project implementation, particularly with a rapidly expanding GCF portfolio. The SPIU also apparently combines project execution and supervision tasks, but not in the GCF Green Gicumbi project, which is executed by FONERWA. The SPIU prepares the APRs for the GCF and, as noted above, undertakes regular quarterly missions for quality assurance that also provide recommendations to the EE for consideration. In addition, the Project Steering Committee provides recommendations to the EE in its meetings. Beyond its quarterly visits the SPIU does not carry out annual, summative, multi-person supervision missions with related reports, ratings and action plans, as is common practice in a number of other organizations with similar-sized development projects, particularly international ones (international financial institutions, the United Nations system, etc.). It is well noted that such annual supervisions are not a GCF requirement. An interim project evaluation review is planned for September 2022, as required by the GCF. It was pointed out by high-level interview partners that the implementation management fees from the GCF for the AE and EE do not cover the full costs of the MoE and FONERWA implementation.

The weak link in the potential identification and management of risks was late feedback from the GCF. The SPIU of the Green Gicumbi project appreciated the feedback to the APR and comments received from the GCF but felt the GCF comments on the two APRs so far were submitted rather late. The SPIU has not yet had any direct contact with the GCF but would very much welcome GCF visitors.

4. PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS AND IMPACT OF GCF INVESTMENTS

Implementation of most GCF projects is not far advanced in Rwanda, with only two projects fully effective and in implementation. Green Gicumbi (FP073) is in its third year of implementation (2019–2025); and FP005 is in its sixth year of implementation (2016–2028). Neither project has yet carried out their interim evaluation and no (D)AE supervision reports apart from the APRs submitted to the GCF were available to the evaluation team.

a. Evidence that intended outputs and outcomes have been achieved/are likely to be achieved

GCF-funded activities are on track to deliver expected results in Rwanda and are partly ahead of schedule. Although the implementation of most GCF projects is not far advanced in Rwanda, some improvements in the resilience of vulnerable populations to climate change can already be discerned, particularly in the Green Gicumbi project in Northern Rwanda (FP073). This project has been operational since February 2020 and has made significant and impressive progress on project outputs and demonstration pilots in the two years of implementation, despite COVID-19, as confirmed during a field visit by the SPR team. Activities in the three project components of watershed management, community-based forestry and green human settlements are on track, and in the case of the watershed component, ahead of schedule (Green Climate Fund, 2021). The project is highly participatory and generating considerable local employment and know-how, with attention to gender equality and targeting. Community mobilization and changing mindsets have been somewhat set back by the restrictions on meeting during COVID-19 but are reportedly picking up now.

As assessed during the SPR team field visit and confirmed by several other country stakeholders, the PIU is well qualified and motivated. It realizes and analyses problems and challenges and addresses them, to the extent possible, with outside assistance (such as the Technical Steering Committee). Green Gicumbi is also part of the long-term GCF/IEU LORTA study. Under LORTA, a baseline survey was completed with control villages in non-project areas and a midterm line survey is under way (Kagenza and others, 2020).

The multi-country private sector project and company BBOXX, which is supported by the GCF in Rwanda (via GCF FP005, with Acumen and KawiSafi as AE and EE respectively), also had some early success in promoting rural access to off-grid renewable energy but reached a plateau in the 2020–2021 period. Acumen is the IAE for this project, working through the regional KawiSafi Ventures Fund, which also supports a parallel investment and similar enterprise in Kenya and other parts of the region. BBOXX serves individual customers in the most remote communities of Rwanda, mainly with lighting, mobile phones and phone chargers and other small appliances, partly for business purposes (such as hair cutters). So far, the company has opened 26 shops across the country, all of them targeting rural areas. BBOXX finances, installs and services solar-powered equipment, which is first leased and then eventually owned by customers. BBOXX expanded rapidly between 2016 and 2018 but has stalled in recent years as access to electricity in Rwanda increased from 20 to 65 per cent between 2014 and 2022 (80 per cent of which was through grids), and due to the effects of COVID-19. The company is now trying to diversify its business model into liquefied natural gas cooking gas for urban areas. There are some indications that BBOXX has indeed changed the lives of vulnerable people in rural areas, increased resilience and contributed to GHG reductions. Nonetheless, a customer satisfaction survey conducted by KawiSafi indicated a relatively low customer satisfaction in Rwanda of 30 per cent, compared with 87 per cent in Kenya (Green Climate Fund, 2021).¹³

To date, BBOXX has not interacted with the Rwandan NDA, and its management is not aware of GCF funding in KawiSafi, but BBOXX does have a partnership with the Rwandan Ministry of Infrastructure. However, since the early stages of its implementation the BBOXX model has not been seen by the NDA as well aligned with government priorities for rural green energy and electrification.

At the same time, according to BBOXX company staff, the BBOXX project does have some potential for market development outcomes by changing the way green energy is marketed and

¹³ An impact study was conducted by a BBOXX staff member in the context of her PhD, but it could not be made available to the SPR country team as the staff member had left the company.

made affordable in Rwanda and elsewhere in Africa. The company's most innovative aspects are its accessible customer management, business model and electronic platform that allow for flexible use and payments of green energy services. It remains to be seen how much of this potential will be turned into real market outcomes in the future, such as through investments that use the marketing concept of KawiSafi Ventures Fund (the EE for this project) in Rwanda and other African countries. Evidence regarding the outcomes of GCF-funded activities is presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Summary of evidence of outcomes

OUTCOME	EVIDENCE FROM GCF-FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Reduced GHG emissions	<p>After one year of operations, Green Gicumbi has reported achieving 19 per cent of its final GHG emission targets slated for the end of the project (Green Climate Fund, 2021). But the project reports that it is not yet applying the methodology proposed in the FP (which could change this figure), as it included existing forests in establishing the midterm and final targets.</p> <p>In terms of BBOXX, KawiSafi reports 11.8 million MTCO₂e of emissions saved so far, compared with only 1.0 million tons planned for Kenya and Rwanda combined, thus far exceeding the project's targets (by 1,000 per cent) (Green Climate Fund, 2021).</p>
Increased resilience	<p>In terms of beneficiaries, the Green Gicumbi project has so far reached 36 per cent of its planned final direct and indirect beneficiaries (who are benefiting from the adoption of diversified climate-resilient livelihoods options), a satisfactory result at the current project cycle stage. The project improved erosion control on 770 hectares (ha) of eroded land through improved terracing, soil management and perennial grasses; it started a pathway towards more durable and profitable forests on endangered slopes through planting more than 1 million improved and diverse seedlings, including for agroforestry.</p> <p>Data from the national survey on the assessment of climate change in Rwanda (2018) show that in the Northern Province, Gicumbi District ranks highest in potential impact caused by climate hazards (Rwanda, 2018). The high dependency of the people in the targeted areas on agriculture as a source of food and income makes them highly vulnerable to the degradation processes occurring within the catchment. Particularly at risk are tea and coffee farmers as both crops are highly sensitive to climate change and adverse losses in productions are already evident.</p>
Enabling environment	<p>For the Green Gicumbi project, its action research, pilot demonstrations, and invitations and tours for numerous visitors are expected to generate mid- to long-term impacts on the enabling environment, but without any linked evidence of success yet. At its relatively early stage, the project has not yet influenced any green policies or regulatory frameworks, which is one of its objectives.</p> <p>There is no information on changes in the enabling environment for FP005 (Acumen/KawiSafi).</p>
Co-benefits	<p>Notable sustainable co-benefits in Green Gicumbi include alternative livelihoods through new employment for more than 17,000 farmers dependent on rain-fed cultivation, which was particularly beneficial as they coincided largely with the COVID-19 lockdown when other income options were limited. Environmental co-benefits were generated through increasing soil fertility on over 810 ha of degraded terraced lands, water provision through rainwater harvesting tanks, and cook stoves to reduce deforestation.</p> <p>The BBOXX project generated additional livelihood options for its customers, particularly those who purchased appliances specifically designed for income generation (such as hair cutters), and also through facilitating the use of mobile phones in rural areas.</p>
Other notable outcomes	Achievement of beneficiary targets in KawiSafi/BBOXX stands at 150 per cent

OUTCOME	EVIDENCE FROM GCF-FUNDED ACTIVITIES
	<p>(15 million beneficiaries achieved vs. 10 million planned, including indirect beneficiaries, in Rwanda and Kenya), after 5 years of project operations (out of 12). There is not much information on the vulnerability and resilience of beneficiaries in the KawiSafi/BBOXX project.</p> <p>The BBOXX project's innovative business model to provide new technology coupled with finance access and electronic monitoring is an additional market outcome that looks promising for potential replication in other green enterprises.</p>

Source: Annual progress reports 2020, unless otherwise stated.

The key drivers influencing the achievement of the intended project-level outputs and outcomes are beneficiary consultations, learning from previous projects and sufficient preparation funds. COVID-19 and a lack of a programmatic approach limited achievements somewhat. Several supportive factors were frequently mentioned by interviewees in Rwanda for achieving results in the GCF portfolio. All projects in the GCF pipeline in Rwanda are expected to have tangible impacts because they have been developed in consultative ways with all key stakeholders, including the public and private sectors, CSOs, international agencies, and local entities involved in the process. Other positive factors include building on and learning from previous projects, embedding projects in local structures and systems (which especially motivated district officials) and sufficient preparation funds. The Green Gicumbi project was particularly well prepared and ready from day one. Detailed GCF project design helped, and the PIU team has been regularly coached by senior, experienced Rwandan experts involved in project design, even after start-up. Rwanda is also considered to have a strong government-driven strategic planning and M&E culture, which helps with results and risk management.

Apart from COVID-19, only a few limiting factors for results and impact were noted, mainly the long time taken until FP FAA effectiveness and start-up for GCF projects (most projects have been taking four to five years, notwithstanding some recent improvements in the time taken between GCF Board approval and FAA effectiveness) and the lack of a programmatic approach that could make it possible to initiate similar GCF projects in different regions with common purposes and features and bring them to scale (as had initially been planned for Rwanda when designing FP073 but was rejected by the GCF).

No unintended consequences associated with GCF-funded activities were identified in Rwanda.

Figure 1. Replanting eroded slopes with diverse and climate-adapted trees (Project Green Gicumbi project FP073)



Source: SPR country mission to Rwanda, 2022

b. Progress of funded activities toward paradigm shift

GCF-funded activities in Rwanda show emerging signals of paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways. For the Rwandan GCF community, SPR interview partners indicated that the awareness of what paradigm shift means in the GCF context has further improved since 2019, particularly through the Green Gicumbi project (FP073) and its demonstration and outreach activities. Since its inception, this project has been very much concerned about contributing to paradigm shift through scaling and replicating its innovative concepts and practices in other parts of Rwanda and ultimately in neighbouring countries (see Table 10 and Box 1).

Table 10. Summary of evidence of dimensions of paradigm shift

DIMENSION	EVIDENCE FROM GCF-FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Scale and replicability	<p>Scaling is a main goal of the Green Gicumbi project, which, according to several interviewed stakeholders in Rwanda familiar with the project, is purposefully developing into a showcase for green mainstreaming in Rwanda and receives many national and international visitors. The project is already scaling up and further improving green and climate-smart technologies and practices explored elsewhere in Rwanda. A major aim of the project is to demonstrate that green practices do not slow down growth and can improve quality and profitability.</p> <p>Notwithstanding its potential, some details for sustainable replication still appear to be missing, such as an assessment of the ultimate profitability of eco-smart interventions for farmers and instruments for broad adoption by communities for financing and market support. For component three, the green settlement pilot model still leaves out a number of ecological aspects due to technical and financial problems (e.g. availability of green building materials and high costs of green energy, such as batteries), as explained by the FP073 project team.</p> <p>Beyond Rwanda's BBOXX project, KawiSafi Ventures Fund, the EE of this project, already reports incremental investments in other East African companies with high green</p>

DIMENSION	EVIDENCE FROM GCF-FUNDED ACTIVITIES
	development impact and replication potential, facilitated through the GCF's equity investment, among other sources (Green Climate Fund, 2021).
Sustainability	Too early to observe in both projects.

Box 1. How Green Gicumbi aims to contribute to paradigm shift?

The project team developed a narrative of paradigm shift through a combination of scaling and replication, innovative action research, and behavioural change of communities and individual beneficiaries. The uniqueness of the Green Gicumbi project lies in the integration of different components that have been piloted in earlier projects; bringing together agriculture, forest and environmental institutions; supporting one-stop green centres for construction and infrastructure; and its research and demonstration to influence policy, national strategies, other districts, and domestic agencies.

The project is carrying out action research to influence policy and aims to improve on existing practices that could be transformative and scaled up. Examples are an energy efficiency assessment of biomass and other ways to save on wood as a traditional source of energy; the reforestation of project lands with more durable seed varieties, mixed-species planting and different bamboo varieties for river protection; and demonstration plots for tea plantations on mountains as an alternative to valley tea production. The project team also found that water tank durability was not sufficient for sustainable rainwater harvesting, so they changed the type of water tanks used.

The PIU realizes that the main bottleneck and project objective is to change farmers' and businesses' mindsets. For this reason they try to proactively involve communities in decision-making, with beneficiaries organized in groups and cooperatives for landscape and forest activities. Private (community and non-public) forest management through cooperatives on 747 ha of land has been a major innovative and upscaling experience from Enabel, the Belgian development agency (Enabel is also a GCF IAE).

Scaling and replication are a main purpose of the project, including through demonstration plots for the many visitors it receives (recently five members of the Rwandan parliament visited Green Gicumbi). The project works closely with the Ministry of Agriculture and the Rwanda Forest Authority to have spillover replication effects to other activities and projects carried out by these two organizations. Key innovative practices such as terrace soil management and mixed forest-species planting tested in Gicumbi are being scaled in Gicumbi and other sites in Rwanda.

The Green Gicumbi project has so far tested and promoted technologies and green practices that were often given away to farmers and other beneficiaries for free. Financial, economic and market aspects of replication, particularly of costly private infrastructure that requires collective action (such as terraces) have not yet been fully considered; their finance and needs for continued support are not yet evident. Farmer cooperatives exist that might be used for this purpose. Market development, particularly of niche markets, may offer opportunities. The coming Interim Evaluation in September 2022 could be a good opportunity to assess the financial, economic and organizational constraints and opportunities for broader adoption, investments and scaling up by farmers and businesses.

Source: SPR Rwanda case study field visit and interviews, 2022

c. Women and other vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples
In Rwanda, the GCF-funded activities under implementation include women in capacity-building, decision-making and the sharing of benefits. Rwanda interview partners noted that the government is strongly committed to gender equality, and gender plans and indicators are standard in Rwanda.

The Green Gicumbi project exceeded its gender goal: 52.3 per cent of the beneficiaries from public works and species selection in agroforestry were women, compared to a goal of 50 per cent. Many early project benefits for women came from participation in and income generation through public works. In the project's first year of implementation, 21,000 green jobs were created, of which 52 per cent were held by women. Of the participating beneficiaries in project public works, 40 per cent were women from women-headed households (Green Climate Fund, 2021). Also 108 out of 180

persons trained on seedling management were women. It is too early to assess the broader income effects of other project benefits – for instance, from improved agricultural and forestry practices.

But women were far less represented in leadership roles and decision-making committees than men. Compared to the Gender Action Plan target of 40 per cent, the share of women in community consultation committees was only 20 per cent, in the technical coordination committee it was 26 per cent, and in the project steering committee it was only 11 per cent (Transparency International, 2021).

For KawiSafi, 50 per cent of the total lives impacted were those of women, exceeding the 40 per cent target, and 60 women were trained for portfolio companies at BBOX and D.Light. The KawiSafi APR also offers three action areas with detailed planned activities to support gender elements for the next reporting period.

Potential environmental and social safeguards risks were addressed in the Green Gicumbi project. Local resistance against certain land terracing was dealt with through meetings with farmers, promised co-benefits and some postponement of activities where necessary. A resettlement action plan and a Livelihood Resettlement Action Plan were developed for the green settlement component. GCF grievance mechanisms were communicated to community coordinating committees, and the project put an electronic grievance mechanism portal in place. Two grievances were received regarding non-receipt of project benefits in 2020 (for land terracing and participation in project construction work). Agreements were signed to state that the benefits would be received the following year. For KawiSafi/BBOX, annual environmental, social and governance surveys were completed by all portfolio companies and there were no pending issues.

d. Catalysing public and private finance

The potential to catalyse finance is low in the Green Gicumbi project because there is no significant co-finance, apart from a USD 1.6 million contribution by the World Bank to implement the Community Adaptation Fund. There is some leverage in other GCF projects implemented or designed by IAEs in Rwanda that are not yet operational (such as those implemented by the IUCN and AfDB) but it is relatively low. Interview partners also noted that they sense less pressure from the GCF compared to other similar organisation for public sector projects to mobilize co-finance and forms of finance other than climate funds. In contrast, KawiSafi Ventures Fund matched the GCF's anchor equity investments by a factor of 2.3. Out of a targeted USD 100 million, KawiSafi raised USD 67.5 million from 18 investors at fund closure in 2018. This included USD 20 million from the GCF.

e. Knowledge management and learning efforts within GCF-funded activities

GCF-funded activities under implementation show substantial evidence of knowledge and learning effects. The Green Gicumbi project is already receiving many visitors as part of its knowledge outreach and efforts to promote broader paradigm shift. The EE (FONERWA) is working on further improving its knowledge and learning activities in the project. They are considered to be critical for innovations and scaling up and not yet seen as optimal, particularly in terms of dedicated project funds for knowledge and learning. For instance, the Green Gicumbi PIU would appreciate having more budget for connecting with colleagues abroad, such as through exchange study tours. KawiSafi/BBOX reported finalizing a study on energy storage in East Africa in 2020.

5. EMERGING LESSONS FOR THE GCF

The following emerging lessons for the GCF can be drawn from the GCF's engagement in Rwanda: Institutional architecture and accreditation credentials are important drivers for GCF projects and anticipated results in countries. In the case of Rwanda, there is strong interest in a GCF portfolio that is DAE-dominated, with limitations stemming from the MoE's small-size accreditation level and structural issues in the types of projects that the MoE can oversee. Completing the accreditation of the private sector DAE and broadening the coverage of a public sector DAE will be important to close access gaps in Rwanda.

Interaction with the Secretariat has slightly improved in GCF-1. But it still tends to be more reactive than proactive and with limited understanding of country context, with some exceptions for Rwanda such as interactions with the GCF/PSF on the RGIF. No evidence was readily available of strategic upstream support from the Secretariat for the new CP.

The collaboration between the NDA, GGGI and others on advancing the green cities concept in Rwanda has been innovative and produced early results. This involved using a RPSP and PPF modality for developing GCF FPs, creating awareness and capacities in green urban city planning, and linking up with others to leverage green finance. This demonstrates the flexible use of GCF access modalities by the NDA, tailored to local needs. Cooperation of GCF partners in Rwanda around the GCF has been improving and most partners gained familiarity in navigating GCF procedures and requirements.

The Rwanda GCF portfolio and its strategic planning and ownership have been advancing since 2019, despite some persistent and familiar issues with the GCF in programming. NDA and NCT dedicated staff capacities are still weak links in the GCF institutional architecture in the country.

The accredited DAE in Rwanda, the MoE, implements the public sector funding activity well by using local powers, expertise and knowledge. At the same time, and even in a country with relatively advanced M&E and accountability standards and practices, the MoE in Rwanda has not yet developed comparable standards and tools of supervision to those that are considered good practice in many IAEs.

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

NAMES	FUNCTION	AFFILIATION
Jeanne d’Arc Mujawamariya	Minister of Environment	MoE
William Mugabo	Green Economy Specialist	
Beatrice Cyiza	Director General of Environment and Climate Change	
Alain Michel Doricyusa Gabiro	Advisor to the Ministry	
Teddy Mugabo	Chief Executive Officer	FONERWA
Innocent Mugabe	External Resources Mobilization Officer & Chair of NCT	MINECOFIN
Fred Sabiti	ENRM and Climate Change Planning and Resource Mobilization	
Jean Pierre Munyeshyaka	Green City Development Specialist	
Brigitte Nyirambangutse	Senior Officer	
Liliane Mupende	GCF National Adaptation Plan Project Co-ordinator	GGGI
Dr Alain Ndoli	Senior Programme Officer	
Juliet Kabera	Director General	
Herman Hakuzimana	Programme manager	
Malaika Rousseau Ilibagiza	Manager, Fund Mobilization and FI	BRD
Jean Marie Kagenza	Project manager	Strengthening climate resilience in Northern Rwanda” project (FP073)
James Mugisha	M&E officer	
Felix Rurangwa	Forestry specialist	
Emile Nsengumuremyi	Watershed protection specialist	
Cyrille Turatsinze	Executive Secretary / Member of the NCT representing CSOs	Rwanda Environment Non-Government Organisations Forum (CSOs)
Justus Mucyo	Managing Director	BBOXX
Bernis Byamukama	Macro Economist	African Development Bank (AfDB)
Reico Shibata	Program advisor in agriculture	JICA
Alex Mulisa	Independent Consultant	World Bank; MoE (FP073)
Jean Ntazinda	Independent consultant	Consultant for REMA

Note: Due to legal and ethical considerations, we are not permitted to identify or list any agencies who have applied for but not yet received accreditation. These agencies are therefore not listed.

APPENDIX 2. PORTFOLIO DATA

Table A - 1. Rwanda funded activities (FAA effective)

PROJECT NUMBER	PSF/DMA ADAPTATION (A) / MITIGATION (M)	FAA EFFECTIVE-NESS	STATUS	NAME	AE	EE PARTNERS	MULTI-COUNTRY (# OF COUNTRIES)	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (USD MILLION)	GCF COSTS (USD MILLION)	FI	DISBURSED (USD MILLION)	NOTES
FP005	PSF A/M	Aug-16	Active	KawiSafi Ventures Fund	ACUMEN	KawiSafi (Regional EE)	MC (2)	110	25	Equity (20k) Grant (5k)	13.6	
FP073	DMA A/M	May-19	Active	Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda	MoE	FONERWA (National EE)		33.2	32.8	Grant	15.1	Approved in Nov. 2015; NoL 2015; PPF of USD 1.5 million LORTA baseline
FP 148	PSF M	Nov-21	Disbursing, but not yet active in Rwanda	Participation in Energy Access Relief Facility	ACUMEN	Social Inv. Managers & Advisors; Energy Access Relief Fund B.V.; Climate CV	MC (9)	60	30	Equity	20.0	

PROJECT NUMBER	PSF/DMA ADAPTATION (A) / MITIGATION (M)	FAA EFFECTIVENESS	STATUS	NAME	AE	EE PARTNERS	MULTI-COUNTRY (# OF COUNTRIES)	TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (USD MILLION)	GCF COSTS (USD MILLION)	FI	DISBURSED (USD MILLION)	NOTES
FP151	PSF M	Apr-21	Disbursing, but not yet active in Rwanda	Global Subnational Climate Fund – Technical Assistance Facility	IUCN		MC (42)	28	18.5	Grant	2.2	
FP152	PSF M	Apr-21	Disbursing, but not yet active in Rwanda	Global Subnational Climate Fund – Equity	Pegasus Capital Advisors		MC (42)	750	150	Equity	50	
FP167	DMA A/M	Dec-21	Not yet disbursing	Transforming Eastern Province through Adaptation	IUCN	RFA, Enabel, IUCN Rwanda Office		49.6	33.8	Grant	Not yet	NoL Dec. 2017
FP181	PSF A	Jan-22	Disbursing, but not yet active in Rwanda	CRAFT - Catalytic Capital for First Private Investment Fund for Adaptation Technologies in Developing Countries	Pegasus Capital Advisors	Lightsmith, GCF CRAFT Holdings (Delaware), Pegasus	MC (6)	400	100	Equity	20.0	

Note: Apr in the table refers to April.

Table A - 2. Rwanda RPSP grants

PROJECT NUMBER/TYPE	DATE OF SUBMISSION / APPROVAL	STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION/ APPLICATION	NAME	DELIVERY PARTNER	GCF COSTS (USD)	DISBURSED (USD)	NOTES
RPSP 1705-14604	Nov-15	Completed	NDA strengthening and country programming	FONERWA	210,506	250,000	RPSP completion report was done but not available to the SPR team
RPSP 1709-14896	Mar-18	Completed	Readiness and preparatory support to implement Green City Development Projects in Rwanda's Secondary Cities	GGGI	600,000	600,000	RPSP completion report
RPSP 1904-15715	Submitted in Jan-20	Ongoing	National adaptation readiness and preparatory support for building flood resilience capacities in Rwanda	GGGI	1,823,993	600,000	
RPSP 1909-15927	May-20	Ongoing	Readiness support to capacitate Rwanda's subnational level actors in green growth and climate resilience	GGGI	699,940	310,000	
RPSP 1906-15807	May-21	Ongoing	Direct Access capacity-building project: Strengthening NDA capacity and empowering NIEs	REMA	297,677	120,000	
RPSP 2102-16671	Dec-20	Completed	Support for accreditation gap assessment and action plan for the Rwanda Development Bank	PricewaterhouseCoopers	33,415	33,415	Approved in Feb. 2021

Table A - 3. Rwanda project pipeline: Submitted FPs (not yet Board approved) and CNs (with NoL)

PROJECT STATUS/TYPE	DATE OF SUBMISSION (LATEST FOR FP AND FIRST FOR CN)	STATUS OF APPLICATION	NAME	AE	EE PARTNERS	PPF	NOTES
FP	Feb-22	Ongoing	Building resilience of vulnerable Communities in Congo Nile Divide through Forest and Landscape Restoration	MoE	Wildlife Conservation Society	PPF USD500k	NoL Feb. 2018
FP	Mar-21	Ongoing	Upper Nyabarongo Catchment Restoration Plan Implementation	MoE	IUCN, Rwanda Water Resources Board	No PPF, own MoE resources	
FP	Jan-21	Ongoing	RGIF	AfDB	FONERWA and BRD		Was stalled for a while in 2021 due to problems experienced by AfDB with its GCF portfolio. Moving again and expected to be submitted by mid-2022
SAP FP	Jul-21	Ongoing	Program for the Delivery of Adaptation Benefits in Africa	AfDB	Regional project		Regional SAP; Rwanda with USD 2 million
CN	Jun-17	Ongoing, ready to be submitted as FP in 2022	Green City Pilot	MoE	City of Kigali et al.	PPF	NoL Feb. 2018 Ready for submission to the GCF after 5 years

PROJECT STATUS/TYPE	DATE OF SUBMISSION (LATEST FOR FP AND FIRST FOR CN)	STATUS OF APPLICATION	NAME	AE	EE PARTNERS	PPF	NOTES
							of work. This is part of the Green City Kigali project, a pioneering concept, the first “green city” in Africa
CN	Jul-16	Ongoing	Mainstreaming Climate Smart Planning and Implementation into Agricultural Development	MoE	Min. of Agriculture	PPF	NoL Dec. 2017 CN was approved in 2020
SAP CN	Nov-21	On hold	Engage private sector in CC adaptation through improved forest management in the North-West of Rwanda for low-emission cooking solutions for urban areas (EPAFLEC)	MoE			First SAP CN was not accepted by the GCF, as the MoE is not accredited to on-grant/lend to private sector
SAP CN	Aug-21	Ongoing	Rwanda Cooling Initiative	UNEP	UNEP/GCF initiative		https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/event/scaling-gcf-projects-energy-efficient-and-climate-friendly-cooling.pdf

PROJECT STATUS/TYPE	DATE OF SUBMISSION (LATEST FOR FP AND FIRST FOR CN)	STATUS OF APPLICATION	NAME	AE	EE PARTNERS	PPF	NOTES
SAP CN	Feb-21	Ongoing	Support to Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) investments in Africa	AfDB	IUCN		
SAP CN	Feb-19	Ongoing	Improving Water Security in Rwanda through Rainwater Harvesting	MoE			
SAP CN	Nov-18	On hold	Climate Smart Smallholder Tea Development in Rwanda	MoE			First SAP CN not accepted by the GCF, as the MoE is not accredited to on-grant/lend to private sector

APPENDIX 3. GREEN GICUMBI PROJECT (FP073): IMPRESSIONS FROM THE SPR MISSION FIELD VISIT

Terraces

- The SPR team visited a project site with 30–50 ha of bench terraces (also called radical terraces). Waterways, canals and soil erosion control were pointed out. Soil improvement, organic matter, and the like were used to increase productivity. Costs were about USD 2,700 per hectare. It appears that farmers did not have to pay for the rehabilitation of the terraces. Work was carried out to the extent possible with paid local labour, which generated jobs.

Forest rehabilitation

- The project pointed out to plot owners the long-term benefits of slope replanting with the right species and a diversity of trees, protecting seedlings and letting trees grow over a longer time.
- Competitions were organized for the highest seedling survival rates to incentivize farmers to take care of trees; local media were involved.
- Avocado and tree tomatoes were used as a way to promote agroforestry.
- Private (community) forest management through cooperatives on 747 ha of land is a major innovation, upscaling experiences from the Belgian organization Enabel in Rwanda.
- The component also benefited from the participation of the national World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) Board in Kigali.

Tea plantations

- The project promotes 50 ha mountainside demonstration plots of tea plantations on mountains that have been planted with new tea varieties. The project also aims to encourage mountainside planting rather than solely relying on planting tea in the valleys, where flooding is increasingly becoming a problem due to the higher variability of rainfalls.
- The project also built better drainage canals for valley tea plantations to avoid water erosion.

Climate-smart housing

- The demonstration site consists of 40 houses that cost around USD 40,000 each. Climate-smart construction design incorporated water management and storage, as well as solar lighting for streetlamps. Electricity will be provided traditionally through the local grid, as solar power paired with batteries would have been too expensive. Biogas was tried and failed in neighbouring communities.
- At least a fraction of the homes will be provided free of charge to needy persons selected by the district, mostly coming from environmentally risky zones with lots of flooding or other risks.
- A few future beneficiaries were interviewed; they were mainly casual labourers in Uganda (seasonal farm workers and others), and they liked the way the housing promoted community and mutual support. The housing site includes a children's nursery, playground and primary school. The beneficiaries hope to make money more easily, to use for the education of their children.

REFERENCES

- Central Intelligence Agency (2022). The World Factbook - Rwanda. Available at <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/rwanda/#geography>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- Germany, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (2022). Germany and Rwanda sign Climate and Development Partnership. Press release, 1 March. Available at <https://www.bmz.de/en/news/press-releases/germany-and-rwanda-sign-climate-and-development-partnership-105014>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- Green Climate Fund (2019). Countries - Rwanda. Available at <https://www.greenclimate.fund/countries/rwanda>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- Green Climate Fund (2020). *Readiness Proposal with Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI) for Republic of Rwanda*. Songdo, South Korea: Green Climate Fund. Available at <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/rwanda-nap-gggi.pdf>.
- Green Climate Fund (2021). *2020 Annual Performance Report for FP073: Strengthening Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Northern Rwanda*. Songdo, South Korea: Green Climate Fund. Available at <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/2020-annual-performance-report-fp073-strengthening-climate-resilience-rural-communities>.
- International Monetary Fund (2022). *Rwanda: 2021 Article IV Consultation and Fifth Review Under the Policy Coordination Instrument-Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Rwanda*. Washington, D.C. Available at <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/CR/Issues/2022/01/13/Rwanda-2021-Article-IV-Consultation-and-Fifth-Review-Under-the-Policy-Coordination-511923>.
- Kagenza, Jean Marie Vianney, and others (2020). *Learning-Oriented Real-time Impact Assessment (LORTA) – Impact evaluation baseline report for FP073: Strengthening climate resilience of rural communities in northern Rwanda “Green Gicumbi Project.”* Songdo, South Korea: Green Climate Fund. Available at <https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/evaluation/210525-lorta-rwanda-baseline-report-top.pdf>.
- KfW Development Bank (n.d.). A green district for the city of Kigali. Available at <https://www.kfw-entwicklungsbank.de/International-financing/KfW-Development-Bank/Our-topics/SDGs/SDG-11/Green-City-Kigali/>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- NDC Partnership (n.d.). Country pages - Rwanda. Available at <https://ndcpartnership.org/countries-map/country?iso=RWA>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- Rwanda (n.d.). *7 Years Government Programme: National Strategy for Transformation (NST1) 2017–2024*. Available at https://www.nirda.gov.rw/uploads/tx_dce/National_Strategy_For_Transformation_-NST1-min.pdf.
- _____. (2011). *Green Growth and Climate Resilience National Strategy for Climate Change and Low Carbon Development*. Available at https://www.rema.gov.rw/rema_doc/RGG&CRS%202011/Rwanda%20Green%20Growth%20Strategy%20FINAL%20high%20res.pdf.
- _____. (2020). *Updated Nationally Determined Contribution*. Available at https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/ndcstaging/PublishedDocuments/Rwanda%20First/Rwanda_Updated_NDC_May_2020.pdf.
- Rwanda, Ministry of Environment (2019). *National Environmental and Climate Change Policy*. Available at [https://plasticsdb.surrey.ac.uk/documents/Rwanda/Ministry%20of%20Environment%20\(2019\)%20Rwanda%20National%20Environment%20and%20Climate%20Change%20Policy,%20Rwanda.pdf](https://plasticsdb.surrey.ac.uk/documents/Rwanda/Ministry%20of%20Environment%20(2019)%20Rwanda%20National%20Environment%20and%20Climate%20Change%20Policy,%20Rwanda.pdf).

- _____ (2021). *Rwanda's Adaptation Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Rwanda%20AdCom.pdf>.
- Rwanda, Rwanda Environment Management Authority (2018). *Assessment of Climate Change Vulnerability in Rwanda*. Available at [https://rema.gov.rw/cc_vulnerability_Rwanda\(2018\)-Final_report.pdf](https://rema.gov.rw/cc_vulnerability_Rwanda(2018)-Final_report.pdf).
- Stockholm Environment Institute (2022). *Aid Atlas*. Available at <https://aid-atlas.org>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- Transparency International (2021). *The Assessment of Climate change Governance of Green Gicumbi project: The use of Political Economy Analysis approach*. Kigali, Rwanda: Transparency International Rwanda. Available at https://tirwanda.org/IMG/pdf/assessment_of_climate_change_governance_of_green_gicumbi_project_the_use_of_political_economy_analysis_approach.pdf.
- University of Notre Dame (2022). *Rankings*. ND-GAIN: Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative. Available at <https://gain.nd.edu/our-work/country-index/rankings/>. Accessed on 3 May 2022.
- U.S. Agency for International Development Structure (2019). *Climate change risk profile: Rwanda*. Fact sheet. Available at https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2019_USAID-ATLAS-Rwanda-Climate-Risk-Profile.pdf.
- World Bank (2020). *Worldwide Governance Indicators - Rwanda*. Available at <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/Home/Reports>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- _____ (2022a). *Ease of doing business rank (1=most business-friendly regulations) - Rwanda*. Available at <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.EASE.XQ?locations=RW>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- _____ (2022b). *FY22 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations*. Available at <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/bb52765f38156924d682486726f422d4-0090082021/original/FCSList-FY22.pdf>. Accessed on 3 May 2022.
- _____ (2022c). *Rwanda*. Available at <https://data.worldbank.org/country/rwanda>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- World Bank (2022d). *The World Bank in Rwanda*, 17 April. Available at <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/rwanda/overview>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- World Bank (2022e). *World Development Indicators - The World by Income and Region*. Available at <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/the-world-by-income-and-region.html>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.
- World Integrated Trade Solution (2019). *Rwanda trade balance, exports, imports by country 2019*. Available at <https://wits.worldbank.org/CountryProfile/en/Country/RWA/Year/2019/TradeFlow/EXPIMP/Partner/by-country>. Accessed on 10 May 2022.



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Independent
Evaluation
Unit



Independent Evaluation Unit
Green Climate Fund
175, Art center-daero, Yeonsu-gu
Incheon 22004
Republic of Korea
Tel. (+82) 032-458-6450
ieu@gcfund.org
<https://ieu.greenclimate.fund>

