



FONERWA Metadata Handbook

FONERWA designed for



FMT financed by



**Updated in Logframe Revision
Workshop**

August 6th 2015

Introduction to the Handbook

This Metadata Handbook accompanies and supports the FONERWA results framework for the period 2013-2018. The FONERWA results are captured and measured by the logical framework matrix shown in **Annex A** (version revised August 2015). The Handbook elaborates the definition, measurement method, data sources, responsibility and frequency for reporting against indicators in the FONERWA logical framework.

The higher level FONERWA logframe indicators include national standards, tools and data sets; whereas the Logframe Output indicators are primarily informed by FONERWA supported project level performance. Within a standard results framework, outputs are typically *within the control* of the Management team, with the Outcome representing the change resulting *from the uptake* of these Outputs. In the case of the FONERWA results matrix, the Outcome monitors Fund-level performance and the Outputs reflect the performance of funded projects, (which are not directly within the control of the Fund Management Team/Secretariat.) This is somewhat unorthodox.

The following principles apply to the Logframe revision process:

- Output level targets should be based on the existing pipeline of projects¹ not anticipate future potential projects. This brings Outputs within the FMT control as far as possible. The decision to reflect approved projects only, allows FMT to be more accountable for Fund results.
- Targets set in the logframe revision of October 2015 reflect the 29 projects approved for funding as of August 2015.
- Approved projects must contribute to one or more of the FONERWA outputs; however they do not necessarily have to fit under an existing indicator². New indicators can be introduced to reflect projects in the pipeline during the annual logframe revision exercise.
- If projects are reflected under more than one indicator, they can be counted towards both targets³. Double counting is acceptable across indicators but there must be clarity on where this occurs. Double counting within each indicator is to be avoided.
- The 2014 revision exercise captured targets from project level and aggregated these to Fund level. However this approach took the projects at 'face value' and assumed that they would deliver as promised. If Fund level targets are formulated in this way, FONERWA could be penalised if projects do not implement according to plan or schedule. In addition FONERWA wishes to support innovative projects, but by its very nature innovation is more risky.
- Therefore it was agreed for 2015 that FMT should factor in an "acceptable level of failure" for project implementation, which would allow room for over-achievement. This is to be achieved by setting Fund level targets to reflect 80% of the cumulative targets from the project pipeline.
- The FONERWA logframe and the Metadata Handbook should be revised and updated on an annual basis to reflect the annual pipeline of the Fund - this version of August 2015 to be updated by October 2016.

¹ i.e. based on approved projects

² For example projects on pollution, marshland irrigation and mushroom farming have been approved but do not contribute to any indicator in the logframe.

³ For example where output indicator 1.1 contributes to 1.3.

IMPACT INDICATORS				
IMPACT indicator 1	Level of national climate change vulnerability index			
Definition	<p>The indicator reflects a composite index that covers the relationship between Exposure, Sensitivity and Adaptive Capacity using the following formula:</p> $V = ((E+S)/2) + AC/2;$ <p>where V is the vulnerability index, E – exposure, S – Sensitivity and AC is Adaptive Capacity.</p>			
Methodology	<p>The National survey on household vulnerability to climate change is designed to enable an analysis of how climate change is having an impact at the household level across all provinces and districts of Rwanda. The baseline for the Rwanda climate change vulnerability index was validated in April 2015, giving a framework or directory of national vulnerability indicators along with baseline data related to those indicators.</p> <p>Methodology covering a total of 38 high-level and ‘outcome’ oriented vulnerability indicators were recommended, covering the vulnerability parameters of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity. These are categorized into seven areas, which are: (1) Cross cutting; (2) meteorological/disaster risks reduction; (3) agriculture, food and nutrition; (4) health; (5) water; (6) territorial biodiversity; and (7) energy, transportation and infrastructure.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
REMA Reports	Every five years – aligning with EDPRS II in 2017 ⁴	Gender categories	REMA	REMA , NISR
IMPACT indicator 2	Rwanda National Green-house Gas Emissions reductions in relation to the baseline scenario			

⁴ At the sector level, there has been no target set against this indicator because of the complexity involved, the decision taken is to update the baseline after 5 Years.

Metadata Handbook

Definition	Green-house Gas emissions include: Carbon dioxide (CO ₂); Methane (CH ₄); Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O); Hydro fluorocarbons (HFCs); Per fluorocarbons (PFCs); and Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆). This indicator is measured at the National level as informed by the National communication.			
Methodology	<p>Figures refer to the difference between business as usual (reference/ scenario) and mitigation scenario Subject to current NAMA preparation study and work towards the 3rd National Communication expected Mid-2015, this indicator will be measured by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Tier 2 IPCC methodology for emissions calculation, informing 3rd National Communication with UNFCCC in 2015 2) National Observatory Bi-annual Reports on emissions status / projection 			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Biannual GHG inventory / National communications with UNFCCC / GoR Economic Data	Biannual updating of GHG inventory data	N/A	REMA	National Climate Change Observatory (Ministry of Education)

IMPACT indicator 3	Number of Green jobs created			
Definition	Green job is defined by the ICF as ‘any decent job that contributes to preserving or restoring the quality of the environment, including employment in green industries, in green occupations, and in environmental jobs’ ⁵ The indicator refers to direct not indirect employment			
Methodology	Calculation of total number of (green) jobs created At present this indicator is not measured by MIFOTRA. FONERWA has been tracking green jobs created based on ICF definition. There is ongoing discussions led by MINIRENA to include the green jobs category in the MIFOTRA database and tracking system. The Labour Survey has been postponed to 2016 and Secretariat are working with MIFOTRA for inclusion of the green jobs indicator in the survey. Note: A retrospective baseline survey for this indicator will be recommended to the National level stakeholders in addressing the earlier delays experienced.			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Employment records / NISR surveys/ EICV	3 years	By MIFOTRA categories: Permanent (<6 months); Short-term (3-6 months); Casual (> 3 months); Permanent (self-employed & employed)	NISR	MIFOTRA/MINIRENA

⁵ DFID direct jobs created metric

OUTCOME INDICATORS				
OUTCOME Indicator 1	Cumulative volume of finance [US\$ millions] mobilized for climate and environment purposes as A). contributions to Fund; B). leveraging			
Definition	<p>Mobilised funds are either additional funds or funds diverted from another (more fossil-fuel intensive) use. A is defined as the <i>total cumulative amount of funds raised/mobilised from Multilateral, bilateral, GOR and private sector</i>. This should capture resources which can be directed by the Fund towards projects. B is defined as <i>the process which occurs when the use of specified resources for a given objective causes more financial resources to be applied for that objective than would otherwise have been the case.</i>⁶ Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upfront co-financing i.e. resources committed to the Fund from additional donors or GoR at the time of project approval (i.e. beyond the original commitments specified in Project Document⁷) • Subsequent co-financing i.e. resources mobilized after the Fund began operating, where early success encouraged others to contribute • Project level co-financing i.e. funds catalysed by the grant that go directly into project budget. Project in-kind contributions should be reported on, but are not reported directly within this indicator. • Funds which are catalysed by FONERWA, and committed to other institutions without passing directly through FONERWA should be reported on, but are not reported directly within this indicator <p>Direct financing to FONERWA to support management operations and capacity building beyond contributions for direct funding to project based on contributions from development Partners including DFID, UNDP, KFW, the GoR, etc.</p>			
Methodology	<p>a) Sum all contributions to Fund b) Sum all leveraged</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Fund Financial Records	Quarterly and annually	a) private sector b) GoR	FMT	MINECOFIN, BDF

⁶ DFID public finance indicator

⁷ DFID's initial capitalisation of the Fund should be reflected in the baseline, thereafter milestones should show cumulative funds leveraged, which should be staggered over the years committed.

		c) MDBs / other development partners (including DFID)/other sources		
Outcome Indicator 2	% of projects successfully implemented			
Definition	Success is defined as the percentage of funded projects on track to achieve at least 80% of results planned in the project document.			
Methodology	<p>Number of projects achieving at least 80% of their output level milestones/targets expressed as a proportion of the total number of funded projects.</p> <p>For example if the project has planned 5 outputs and it has met its milestones for 4 of them, then it is on track.</p> <p>If the planned output is 500 trees planted, and the project has planted 400, then it is on track.</p> <p>If the output indicator is a qualitative one, then FMT will make a judgement as to whether it is on track.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project M&E reports / FMT M&E, quarterly and annual reports	Quarterly	By Thematic area	FMT	REMA/ SPIU ⁸

⁸ Single Project Implementation Unit

OUTPUT INDICATORS – OUTPUT 1	
Output Indicator 1.1	Area (ha) of land secured against erosion
Definition	Area of land where soil erosion has been mitigated, controlled or prevented Erosion is the process by which soil is worn away by the effect of wind, water, heat, cold and gravity, or a mixture of all these things.
Methodology	<p>At Project level:</p> <p>a) Identification of direct erosion control measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terracing; - Anti-erosion ditches - Other forms of erosion control (cover crops, contour bunds, planting of permanent vegetative cover and green manures, filter strips, wattling, brush layering, percolation ditches, conversion from annual to perennial crops etc.) <p>b) Measurement of the area protected by the measures</p> <p>The indicator will measure only the area of land under direct erosion control management. Project reports should include reference to indirect effects of this management, for example downslope from the terraced areas.</p> <p>Project logframes should describe the type of intervention, and overlaps between forms of erosion control should be noted, to avoid double-counting within this indicator. i.e. if two methods of control are used to secure 1ha land, then only 1ha can be reported at Fund level.</p> <p>Double-counting <i>across</i> indicators is acceptable (but not <i>within</i> indicators.) Although much of the current pipeline of 1.1, could be reflected under 1.3, 1.1 is an EDPRS indicator and it is therefore useful to show FONERWA's contribution. The various indicators under output 1 measure what the Fund is trying to achieve in different ways.</p> <p>Presently, there is no indicator to reflect quality (or longevity) of terracing or other forms of erosion control. Discussions should be held to investigate quality at project level, and for the longer term this could be aggregated up to Fund level.</p>

Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
RAB/MINAGRI / MINIRENA / project M&E	Annual	None	Implementing Projects Collated by FMT	REMA FMT NISR
Output 1.2	Area (ha) forest and agro-forest cover			
Definition	Total area of new forest establishment, restored forest or under agroforestry with specific adaptive tree species			
Methodology	<p>a) Afforestation: Direct area measurement of new forest, or estimated by no. trees planted x average spacing (from sample plots),</p> <p>b) Restored Forest (rehabilitated/ regenerated): Direct area measurement of restored forest, or estimated by no trees planted x average spacing in restored area Reporting to be supplemented by comment on nature of restoration (eg connecting existing forest areas / enrichment planting etc and how restoration being measured)</p> <p>c) Agroforestry: Area of land under new agroforestry system (with comment on type of system / No. of agroforestry trees planted x average spacing (from sample plots.)</p> <p>Reporting should also reflect the quality of forest, its composition and services provided Although agro-forestry could be classified under 1.1, it is agreed to retain measurement of agro-forestry under this indicator, as it has other benefits beyond just erosion control that include agricultural productivity. Double-counting <i>across</i> indicators is acceptable (but not <i>within</i> indicators.) The various indicators under output 1 measure what the Fund is trying to achieve in different ways.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project reports	Annual/ quarterly	a) afforestation b) rehabilitated/regenerated	Projects	NISR / NGOs / districts

		c) agroforestry	Aggregated by FMT	
Output 1.3				
Area (ha) of watersheds and water bodies protected				
Definition	The area in ha of works protecting watersheds and/or water bodies e.g. terracing, erosion control planting (trees, agroforestry bamboo etc) and buffer zone protection works.			
Methodology	<p>Project level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clear identification of works protecting watersheds and/or bodies ○ Measurement of area protected <p>Qualitative reporting to elaborate further on other water body protection e.g. water hyacinth removal/ clearing. Double-counting <i>across</i> indicators is acceptable (but not <i>within</i> indicators.) Current pipeline of projects that contribute to 1.1, also contribute to 1.3.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project M&E	Annual	N/A	Projects and FMT	NISR / NGOs / districts / REMA / MINAGRI
Output 1.4				
Pilot Model Mine				
Definition	A model mine is defined as a mine demonstrating green technologies that improve efficiency of operations, reduce waste and mitigate against damage to the environment ⁹ .			
Methodology	Development of PPD for model mine facilitated by FMT, green-lighted at the PPD review stage and selected by the FMC for funding.			

⁹ Model mine is defined by the Mining department in Rwanda Natural Resources Authority (RNRA)

	FONERWA can only fund greening ¹⁰ aspects and not exploration. FMT engagement of the mining sector will need to seek incentives and encourage the realisation that an environmental approach is more profitable.			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
RNRA	Annual	N/A	RNRA	MINIRENA, NISR
OUTPUT 2				
Indicator 2.1	Research and feasibility studies that facilitate adoption of clean and climate resilient technologies			
Definition	<p>This indicator comprises different parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of research products delivered • Number of feasibility studies delivered • Uptake of the results of Feasibility Study • Extent to which research and assessment is used to good effect and to inform green technologies 			
Methodology	<p>Reporting of this indicator should explain how the transition to implementation will be measured i.e evidence that findings are being taken up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of research products/ feasibility studies produced by FONERWA funded projects research assessed to be of sufficient quality • Proportion of Feasibility studies that lead to project implementation in two years (with some qualitative reporting at one year) • Dissemination of research product to the relevant audience. <p>The purpose of this indicator is to promote private sector participation in the Fund, and unlock investment from other potential investors. Applicants need to make the case for deficiencies of existing studies. E.g. geological study element could be missing and this alone funded by FONERWA.</p>			

¹⁰ Model mine concept developed by Geology and Mining Department (GMD)

	Measurement to this indicator include analysis on whether the study objectives were answered. The knowledge management framework will be used as plat form for dissemination of the research products generated.			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project reporting	Annual	Research & Development; Proof of Concept	FMT & projects	N/A
Output 2.2	a) Installed capacity (MW) b) Number of households with improved access to off-grid clean energy			
Definition	Clean energy is generated from both combustible ¹¹ and non-combustible renewables ¹² . <i>Installed Capacity</i> refers to the maximum electric output. <i>Off-grid clean energy</i> refers to access to off-grid renewable energy sources such as more efficient cook stoves, solar lanterns, biogas or other clean technologies which generate energy.			
Methodology	a) Summation of total MW installed from clean energy projects b) Record no. HH's with connections to off-grid renewable energy sources ¹³ . <i>To note: on-grid access cannot be included in these figures because once on-grid, it is impossible to determine the energy source.</i>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project reporting	Annual	For b - Female-headed household/ubudehe categories	Projects Collation by FMT	FMT MINIFRA, REG

¹¹ Combustible renewables and waste include biofuels (biogas, ethanol, biodiesel); biomass products (fuelwood, vegetal waste, pulp and paper waste, animal waste, bagasse), municipal waste (waste produced by the residential, commercial and public service sectors that are collected for disposal) and industrial waste;

¹² Non-combustible renewables include geothermal, solar, wind, hydro, tide and wave energy.

¹³ ibid

Output 2.3	Tonnes of CO2 equivalent emissions avoided			
Definition	This indicator intends to measure the impact of projects funded with activities relating to biogas, cook stoves by reduction in tonnes of CO2 emitted compared to quantities projected under Business As Usual (BaU) scenarios (the counterfactual)			
Methodology	Projected Baseline emission under Baseline scenario ('non-green' growth projections) minus actual emissions Projects should clearly define the counter-factual method used, based on <i>FONERWA Baseline Projection Fact-Sheet</i> ¹⁴ . The Fact-Sheet offers standardised guidance on Baseline scenarios (i.e. carbon sequestration per tree, assumptions on costs, emissions, usage etc for kerosene displacement.) Based on this projects should specify metrics to be adopted depending on technology type and define a standard market rate. Technical facility established under the collaboration between FONERWA and GGGI will be used in providing technical expertise to the calculations of carbon emissions avoided.			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
REMA Dept of CC projections / UNFCCC reporting / the Second Communication	Annual	N/A	Projects Data aggregated by FMT	FMT, REMA
Output 2.4	Number of people supported to cope with effects of climate change			
Definition	Number of citizens who have benefitted from FONERWA funded projects to adapt to climate change.			

¹⁴ To be developed by FMT and supporting consultant as agreed in the August 2015 Logframe Revision workshop

<p>Methodology</p>	<p>The indicator is measuring adaptation projects only, whereby the project is clearly defined as such within the PD – and the indicator will measure number of people benefitting from the project. Examples of adaptation projects will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Rain water harvesting and flood control for infrastructure, construction of weather proof post-harvest storage facilities (to protect against flooding etc.) drought resistant varieties of seeds etc.access to information e.g early warning systems • climate sensitive income generation activities e.g. small scale livestock - rabbit, goat, pig, poultry rearing, growing fruit trees such as tree tomato, mushroom production, honey etc) • Sale of drought resistant varieties of seeds, construction of weather proof post-harvest storage facilities (to protect against flooding etc.) etc. • The list is not exhaustive under this category and there is room for additional categories. • transition into peri-urban livelihoods (i.e. trades, small-scale manufacturing - leather, soap etc., agro-processing, handicraft etc) <p>This indicator does NOT capture mitigation activities, green jobs, renewables, direct employment etc. It does measure how people have been supported to get more money from their existing assets. Indirect beneficiaries/benefits are to be reported qualitatively by the projects</p> <p>Disaggregation will take place at project reporting level</p>			
<p>Data source</p>	<p>Frequency</p>	<p>Disaggregation</p>	<p>Responsible organisation</p>	<p>Partners</p>
<p>NISR HH surveys / REMA vulnerability index surveys / project reports / FMT reports</p>	<p>Quarterly</p>	<p>Gender / ubudehe categories 1 and 2 (to be updated following imminent revision of categories)</p>	<p>Projects</p>	<p>REMA, NISR, FMT</p>
<p>OUTPUT 3</p>				
<p>Output 3.1</p>	<p>National level MIS with sufficient environmental & climate change data to inform policy decisions</p>			

Definition	Development of PPD to establish, implement, manage and/or maintain a robust nation-wide Management Information System covering environmental and climate change data to inform policy decisions.			
Methodology	This indicator measures the development of a coherent, coordinated system that holds/ provides access to National level climate relevant data /information.			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Sector/sub-sector System Administrative Records PD clearance records	N/A	Sector /Sub Sector Strategic Plans, Action Plans and Budget.	MINIRENA	FMT
Output 3.2				
Number of strategies and development plans, influenced by FONERWA projects to incorporate climate and environment interventions				
Definition	This indicator is intended to measure the integration of Climate and Environment issues into existing or new planned programmes. FONERWA should offer additionality, through funding for mainstreaming of climate and environment actions, measures or benefits into existing plans or strategies e.g. greening of District plans.			
Methodology	Assessed and reported at screening stage			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
FMT Monthly, Quarterly and annual Reports	Annual	N/A	FMT	Projects
Output 3.3	Total number of programmes of action in the Green Growth Strategy supported by approved PDs			

Definition	<p>GGCRS Programmes of Action are:</p> <p>1. Sustainable intensification of agriculture; 2. Agricultural diversity in local and export markets; 3. Integrated Water Resource Management and Planning; 4. Integrated approach to sustainable land use planning and management; 5. Low Carbon Energy mix powering the National Grid; 6. Sustainable small-scale energy access in rural areas; 7. Green industry and private sector development; 8. Climate compatible mining; 9. Efficient resilient transport systems; 10. Low carbon urban systems; 11. Ecotourism, conservation and Payment for Ecosystem Services Promotion in Protected Areas; 12. Sustainable forestry, agroforestry and biomass energy; 13. Disaster Management and disease prevention; 14. Climate data and Projections.</p> <p>PDs under this indicator will directly support one or more of these PoAs.</p>			
Methodology	<p>Summation of PDs containing objectives addressing GGS PoAs.</p> <p>Assessed and reported at screening stage</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
PD screening records / FMT reports	Annual	N/A	FMT	REMA / MINIRENA
Output 3.4	Total number of green jobs created as a result of the Fund			
Definition	<p>Total number of Green jobs created, through FONERWA Funding</p> <p>A green job is defined as ‘any decent job that contributes to preserving or restoring the quality of the environment, including employment in green industries, in green occupations, and in environmental jobs (ICF indicator definition)¹⁵</p>			
Methodology	Summation from project reports of direct project employment (not indirect.)			

¹⁵ DFID direct jobs created metric

	This indicator cuts across outputs (i.e. jobs with short-term community focus under output 1; P/S construction jobs under output 2)			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Project reports / FMT reports	Annual	a) gender b) Youth c) Jobs sustained past the initial implementation phase	FMT	MIFOTRA
OUTPUT 4				
Output 4.1	% of a) Project Profile Documents; b) Project Documents reviewed within 20 and 60 working days respectively, and in accordance with agreed screening procedures			
Definition	<p>The total number a) Project Profile Documents b) Project Documents reviewed and responded to within 20 and 60 working days respectively, and in accordance with agreed screening procedures, cumulatively across quarterly calls</p> <p>Divided by total number of project profile documents/project documents received by FMT for screening</p> <p>This indicator is measured from the date of deadline for PPD/PD submission to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) PPD- feedback to applicants (to include thorough QA process of both red and green lighted PPDs); 2) PD - approval by FMC <p>The achievement of this indicator is based on 4 key assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Performance against the indicator depends on the volume of applications received – targets are based on an expected average of 60 applications per call - FMC/FTC required number of members convened and FMC/FTC members available to sign off on minutes 			
Methodology	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) FMT / staff time / technical experts time records by activity – PPD / PD screening b) Information system recording date proposal submitted, to whom sent and web page with successful PPDs listed OR PD feedback from FMC c) Total number returned within defined time periods divided by total number proposals received 			

Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
FMT / staff timesheets / MIS / reports / website	Quarterly	N/A	FMT	Projects
Output 4.2				
Cumulative % of total funds a) committed b) dispersed to approved projects				
Definition	This indicator measures the total amount of mobilised funds available to the projects; the commitment of funds to projects approved by FMC; and the disbursement of funds to projects following Grant agreement.			
Methodology	a) Summation of all funds available to be directed to projects b) Proportion of A committed to approved projects Proportion of A/B dispersed to projects			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
Fund financial records	Annual	Govt agency / Private sector / Civil Society / District	FMT	projects
Output 4.3				
% of implementing projects that demonstrate (a) community participation; b) a significant gender focus				
Definition	This indicator is intended to measure the ownership of the funded projects. The measurement of participation should be as a proportion of the total number of projects with deliverables at the household/community level. <i>Community</i> is defined as primary beneficiaries of the project. <i>Participation</i> is defined as consultation, action, engagement, decision making control – beyond employment under implementation or contribution of community labour.			

	<p>The indicator is seeking to measure meaningful consultation and transparent implementation which involves community through for example, a mechanism for beneficiary feedback/concerns.</p> <p>A <i>significant gender focus</i> will :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involve women actively in environmental decision-making at different levels, - Integrate gender concerns and perspectives in policies and programmes for sustainable development - Strengthen or establish mechanisms at the national, regional and international levels to assess the impact of development and environmental policies on women¹⁶ <p>Therefore the indicator measures projects which engage in analysis of how the project intervention will impact differently on men and women, and incorporate specific measures to target women/girls. It goes beyond the counting of female beneficiaries.</p>			
Methodology	<p>Projects should measure the number of community members involved in managing, monitoring or feedback on the project activities.</p> <p>The FMT is to produce a checklist of criteria/activities (in consultation with GMO) to support projects to self-assess the extent of their community engagement. Using this projects should measure the number of women or girls benefitting from gender-specific actions¹⁷.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
FMT Quarterly and annual Reports	Quarterly	Gender	FMT	projects
Output 4.4	Evidence that Substantive lessons learnt are being used to inform existing and future projects/programs			
Definition	Lessons learnt are based on evaluation experiences that can be applied to broader situations ¹⁸ - these frequently highlight strengths or weaknesses (i.e. both positive and negative.)			

¹⁶ The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, 2015 strategic objectives on women and the environment, as adopted at the National level by the Gender Monitoring Office.

¹⁷ The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 2015, criteria provides guide to self-assess on the extent of project gender focus

¹⁸ Development Assistance Committee.

	Lessons from projects will be of relevance to the FONERWA Fund and more broadly to inform decision making among other projects across sectors.			
Methodology	<p>The indicator will measure lessons learnt collected at the fund level and reflected in project reporting (lesson learning log) or communications. There should be qualitative reporting on the uptake of lessons i.e. the way lessons have been used to inform project implementation, or design/implementation of other projects. Lessons will be generated through annual lesson learning project review workshops. Project reporting and FMT validation (through spot-checks etc) will assess the extent to which lessons have been 'learnt', shared and used to improve/inform implementation.</p> <p>The indicator will also measure lessons learnt at the Fund level and reflected in Fund reporting or communications. There should be qualitative reporting on how lesson learning has informed Fund evolution (strategy, systems, approaches etc.). Lessons will be gathered through an annual lesson-learning event with stakeholders. FMT/Fund level lesson learning is to be published on the website for an inter/national audience.</p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
FMT M&E records	Semi-Annual (Two Quarters are needed before projects can learn lessons)	N/A	FMT	projects
Output 4.5	% of active projects reporting data of sufficient quality to satisfy FONERWA monitoring and evaluation system.			
Definition	This indicator measures the number of implementing projects submitting timely and comprehensive quarterly reports to FONERWA. The indicator measures only projects which have commenced implementation and reporting.			
Methodology	Measurement of the indicator will be based on scoring using the FONERWA Data Quality Standards, in each quarter's project quarterly reporting review. Projects achieving 3+ will be considered to have satisfied the M&E system.			

	<p>Score Quality Standard</p> <p>1 <i>The report – or one part of it - has not been submitted at all.</i></p> <p>2 <i>Report information is incomplete OR the logframe, work plan, or financial info has not been updated since the previous quarter.</i></p> <p>3 <i>Report information is 80% complete but some fields are not filled with necessary detail or updated. Lessons identified may not be meaningful OR there may not be sufficient explanation for milestones which are not achieved. Several follow-up clarification questions are required.</i></p> <p>4 <i>Report information is 90% complete – including logframe, work plan and financial info - all up to date with information from previous quarter. Most fields are filled with necessary detail, relevant lessons identified, rationale for slippage or deviation from milestones is given. In addition, Milestones/results/targets should be met or overachieved.</i></p> <p>5 <i>Report information is 100% complete – including logframe, work plan, financial info – all up to date with information from previous quarter. All fields are filled with necessary and sufficient detail. Lessons identified are relevant and suitable for wider distribution. Explanation of slippage or deviation from milestones is given. Page limit is respected. Supplementary annexed information is supplied which adds value to the overall report. In addition, Milestones/results/targets should be met or overachieved.</i></p>			
Data source	Frequency	Disaggregation	Responsible organisation	Partners
FMT reporting	Quarterly	N/A	FMT	projects



Monitoring and Evaluation Results Matrix for June 2013- June 2018 (5 year period)

FONERWA designed for



FMT financed by



PROGRAMME NAME	FONERWA Environment and Climate Change Fund (June 2013- June 2018)								Version August 2015
IMPACT	Impact Indicator 1	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
Rwanda's economic growth is environmentally sustainable, low carbon and climate resilient and contributes to wealth creation and poverty reduction	Level of national climate change vulnerability index	Planned	-	-	-	0.438	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Achieved		-	-	0.438			
		Source	ENR sector						
	Impact Indicator 2	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	Rwanda National Green-house Gas Emissions reductions in relation to the baseline scenario ⁱ	Planned	502,160	502,160	613,380	724,600	893,480	1,062,360	1,231,240
		Achieved							
		Source	Biannual GHG inventory / National communications with UNFCCC / GoR Economic Data						
	Impact Indicator 3	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	No' of Green jobs created in Rwanda ⁱⁱ	Planned	0	[to add]	[to add]	[to add]	[to add]	[to add]	[to add]
		Achieved							
		Source	MINIRENA, MIFOTRA The 2016 labour survey to define the methodology and a retrospective baseline would be another alternative						

OUTCOME	Outcome Indicator 1	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	Assumptions	
Sustainable and equitable ⁱⁱⁱ finance supports national programmes and private sector initiatives to address climate and environment priorities	Cumulative volume of finance [US\$ millions] mobilized for climate and environment purposes as A). contributions to Fund; B). leveraging (including co-financing for Fund supported projects) disaggregated by a).private sector b).GoR c).MDBs / other development partners (including DFID)/other sources ^{iv}	Planned	Aa. 0.0 b. 0.0 c. 0.0 Ba. 0.0 b. 0.0 c. 0.5	Aa. 0.0 b. 1.3 c. 8.7 Ba. 1.0 b. 2.1 c. 0.0	Aa. 0.0 b. 3.0 c. 30 Ba. 4.6 b. 0.0 c. 1.1	Aa. 0.0 b. 4.2 Ac 59.5 Ba.7.2 b. 6.2. c. 11	Aa. 0.0 b. 6.6 c. 70 Ba. 9.6 b. 8.2 c. 20	Aa. 0.0 b. 7.3 c.85 Ba. 12.1 b. 10.6 c. 30	Aa. 0.00 b. 8.0 c. 100.0 Ba. 14.9 b. 131 c. 40	Climate change and environment is mainstreamed into strategies and budgets ensuring sustainability of budget decisions
		Achieved		Aa. 0.0 b. 3.6 c. 53.2 Ba. 2.6 b. 7.0 c. 0.5	Aa. 0 b.4.2 c.59.5 ^v Ba.3.2 b.6.2 c.11.0	Aa. 0 b.3.4 c. 55.5 Ba.4.4 b. 7.7 c. 10.9				Climate and environment programmes complement wider pro-poor activities
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports; Project-level data This needs extensive consultation (GoR (MINECOFIN, MINIRENA), CIDT (FMT), and BDF).							
	Outcome Indicator 2	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	FMT gains the confidence of funding agents	
	% of projects successfully implemented. ^{vi}	Planned	0	0	80	80	80	80		
		Achieved		0	28	35				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports, project –level data							
INPUTS (UK£pounds)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)					
	4.7m	0.3m	0.0m	0.0m	5m					

OUTPUT 1		Output Indicator 1.1	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	Assumptions
Conservation and management of natural resources strengthened and sustained as a result of the Fund	Area (ha) of <u>land</u> secured against erosion	Planned	0	0	600	1599.	6851.44	10936.6	10936.6	Good quality projects / proposals approach the Fund for support under this funding window and are approved. Fund has sufficient resources to achieve its goals.
		Achieved		0	720	1193.5				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project-level data) checked against annual reports from Joint Sector Reviews of Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI) and Land Office Records Assessments							
	Output Indicator 1.2		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	Area (ha) <u>forest</u> and agro-forest cover (disaggregated by afforestation / restored forest / agroforestry)	Planned	0	0	2000	2206	3152.8	4099.6	5046.4	
		Achieved		0	0	946.8				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project-level data) checked against Rwanda Natural Resources Authority (RNRA) data							
	Output Indicator 1.3		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	Area (ha) of watersheds and water bodies protected	Planned	0	0	n/a	975	3760.5	6546	6546	
		Achieved		0	236.5	2785.5				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project-level data) checked against Rwanda Natural Resources Authority (RNRA) and Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) data							
	Output Indicator 1.4		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	Pilot model mine	Planned	n/a	n/a	n/a	PD for a model mine submitted	Continued FONERWA engagement of the mining sector	Model Mine PD approved	Model mine project under implementation	
		Achieved		n/a	n/a	Two PD for a model mine were submitted				
Source		Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources, Licencing documents, Cooperative records, Geology and Mining Department database								

IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)	25%								RISK RATING (H, M, L)	Medium
-----------------------------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------	---------------

OUTPUT 2	Output Indicator 2.1	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	Assumptions		
Renewable energy and other environmentally sustainable, low carbon and climate resilient practices and approaches adopted, developed and/or improved for use in Rwanda, as a result of the Fund	Research and feasibility studies inform adoption of clean and climate resilient technologies	Planned	n/a ^{vii}	n/a	n/a	n/a	Evidence of research products/ feasibility studies produced by	Evidence of clean and climate resilient technologies adopted as a result of research and feasibility studies	Evidence of clean and climate resilient technologies adopted and implemented as a result of research and feasibility studies	Private sector is interested in investing in low carbon, climate resilient activities and wider enabling environment supports this. Good quality projects / proposals approach the Fund for support under this funding window and are approved Fund has sufficient resources to achieve its goals	
		Achieved		n/a	n/a	Four PD for Bio-diversity, Renewable energy and Green buildings-Waste were approved					
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports								
		Output Indicator 2.2	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		
	a) Installed capacity (MW)- b) Number of households with improved access to off-grid clean energy	Planned	a. n/a b. n/a	a. n/a b. n/a	a. n/a b. n/a	a.0.57 b. 400	a. 0.9 b. 4187	a. 0.9 b. 7974	a. 1.7 b. 11761		
		Achieved		a. n/a b. n/a	a. n/a b. n/a	a. 0.003 b. 3787					
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project-level data) checked against MININFRA/EWASA data								
		Output Indicator 2.3	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		
	Tonnes of Co2 equivalent emissions avoided *:)	Planned	0	0	116	2136.48	5814	11307	13328		
		Achieved		0	0	507					

		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project level data)						
	Output Indicator 2.4		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018
	Number of people supported to cope with effects of climate change (Disaggregated by Male, female and Youth, ubedehe categories)	Planned	n/a	n/a	n/a	225310	225310	225310	225310
Achieved			0	93110	138172				
Source		FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project level data) checked against MINAGRI data							
IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)	25%							RISK RATING (H, M, L)	High

OUTPUT 3	Output Indicator 3.1		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	Assumptions
Environment and climate change issues mainstreamed into policies, programmes, plans budgets and activities for public and non-public agencies	National level MIS with sufficient environmental & climate change data to inform policy decisions (PD approved)	Planned	n/a	n/a	n/a	FONERWA knowledge and information management system in place	FONERWA knowledge and information management system in place	1 National level MIS PD submitted	National level MIS in project inception	Ministries are able to absorb additional resources Good quality projects/proposals approach the Fund for support under this funding window and are approved
		Achieved		n/a	Mateo MIS	FONERWA MIS is under implementation				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports							
	Output Indicator 3.2		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	
	Number of strategies and development plans, influenced by FONERWA projects to incorporate climate and environment interventions	Planned	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	10	15	20	
		Achieved		0	1	1				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports; Rwanda Green Growth Strategy							
	Output Indicator 3.3		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	

Total number of programmes of action in the Green Growth Strategy supported by approved PDs	Planned	0	0	3	9	10	11	11		
	Achieved		0	7	10					
	Source	FMT quarterly & annual reports (aggregating project-level data) checked against MININFRA data								
	Output Indicator 3.4	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		Assumptions
	Total number of green jobs created as a result of the fund	Planned	0	40	500	13792	31839	49886		67933
	Achieved		0	3473	18047					
	Source									
	Achieved		n/a	160						
	Source									
IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)	25%						RISK RATING (H, M, L)	Medium		

b

OUTPUT 4	Output Indicator 4.1	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018	Assumptions	
The Fund is sustainably, cost effectively and transparently managed	% of								FMT follow agreed financial and operational management procedures	
	a)Project Profile Documents	Planned	a.0 b.0	a.50 b.40	a.80 b.60	a.90 b.80	a.100 b.85	a.100 b.90		a.100 b.95
	b)Project Documents reviewed within 20 and 60 working days respectively, and in accordance with agreed screening procedures	Achieved		a.0 b.100	a. 0 b. 100	a. 100 b.100				
		Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports, verified by Fund Technical Committee.							
		Output Indicator4.2	Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017		Target June 2018
	Cumulative % of total funds a) committed b) disbursed to approved projects (disaggregated by recipient: government agency,	Planned	a) n/a b)n/a	a)n/a b) n/a	a) n/a b) n/a	a) 65 b) 25	a) 100 b) 40	a) 100 b) 44	a) 100 b) 45	The FMT provides strategic guidance and effective
		Achieved	a) n/a	a. 57.3	a.68.6					

private sector, CSOs)-			b) n/a	b. 8.2	b.16				decision making	
	Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports								
Output Indicator 4.3		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		
“% of implementing projects that demonstrate (a) community participation ; b) a significant gender focus	Planned	a. n/a b. n/a	a. n/a b. n/a	a. n/a b. n/a	a.60 b.60	a.65 b.65	a.70 b.70	a.75 b.75		
	Achieved		a) n/a b) n/a	100 63	a.100 b.100					
	Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports (aggregating project level data)								
Output Indicator 4.4		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		
Evidence that Substantive lessons learnt are being used to inform existing and future projects/programs	Planned	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Meaningful lessons identified in project/fund logs reporting	Lessons from projects and Fund are documented and disseminated to stakeholders	Evidence of lessons learnt being incorporated into programme implementation (through FMT annual assessment)		
	Achieved		n/a	n/a	n/a					
	Source	FMT quarterly and annual reports								
Output Indicator 4.5		Baseline June 2013	Milestone Dec 2013	Milestone June 2014	Milestone June 2015	Milestone June 2016	Milestone June 2017	Target June 2018		
% of active projects reporting data of sufficient quality to satisfy FONERWA monitoring and evaluation system	Planned	0	80	80	80	80	80	80		
	Achieved		-	28	39					
	Source									
IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)	25%						RISK RATING (H, M, L)	Low		Fund Management Team support GoR to build capacity Sufficient capacity exists to respond to lessons learnt

ⁱ As used in the SNC (difference between business as usual and mitigation scenario in tCO₂e) annual projections is the basis of the calculations and the next figures will come from 3rd National Communication

ⁱⁱ Green jobs would include low carbon development, green energy, ecotourism, mining & Natural Resource enterprises, etc.

ⁱⁱⁱ Referring to equitable distribution of resources given the levels of geographical dimensions of poverty, as highlighted in latest EICV survey

^{iv} The * throughout document highlight the ICF indicators

^v Only direct financing to FONERWA is considered (DFID, UNDP, KFW, LDCF/AfDB)

^{vi} Where success is defined as the project being on track to delivering at least 80% of the results set out in its Project Document

^{vii} Not applicable has been used for the 2013 and 2014 milestone targets for revised/new indicators that were not part of the log frame