



# FONERWA: Climate Risk Screening Tool



## Authors

**Julio Araujo,**  
SouthSouthNorth  
([julio@southsouthnorth.org](mailto:julio@southsouthnorth.org))



## Aim of the project

The **Coordination, Capacity Development and Knowledge Exchange Unit (CCKE)**, under the **Future Climate For Africa (FCFA)** programme, developed a pilot project for **Rwanda's Green Fund (FONERWA)**, Rwanda's Green Fund. The project centred on developing the capacity of FONERWA's project appraisal team to perform a rudimentary screening on all project proposals. The aim was to strengthen the review of applications for climate risks, and provide FONERWA with information they can share with applicants to better incorporate climate information into project design and implementation.



## Dates

February 2016–May 2018



## Countries

Rwanda



Participants engaging with the climate risk screening tool at a FONERWA workshop (Source: J. Araujo, 2017)

## Aim of co-production:

While the process was not initially defined as co-production, the project team established that, in order for the project to develop appropriate solutions, mutually build capacity and create ownership, co-production was necessary. One of the limitations to the causal approach to co-production was around financing co-production activities. Since the project did not begin with a co-production approach in mind, there was no allocated funding for multiple co-production activities and incentives. Similarly, this meant that there was a limited budget for project activities which did not involve finance for securing partner institutions. Therefore, financial incentives were not possible for motivating work/activities between the project team and partners. The co-production approach was aimed at building capacity within the FONERWA appraisal team, creating a sense of ownership and validating the results.

## Context:

FONERWA funds a wide range of environment and climate change projects, from community to national scales. While FONERWA funds projects from multiple sectors, the risk screening tool only covers agriculture. However, the principles of the tool can be applied to multiple sectors. Both the FONERWA staff and the project applicants had low capacity with regards to climate risks and climate change impacts. In order to both build the capacity of the relevant people as well as develop a tool that is relevant and accessible, co-production was necessary.

## Who was involved and what were their roles?

CCKE was the project team that led the co-production process. Initially, the project team expected to co-produce a climate information factsheet with the Rwanda meteorological agency, [Meteo Rwanda](#). However, the initial process, when it began, was one-sided, favouring the project team's work, which created tension with the partners and prevented co-production taking place with Meteo Rwanda.

In order to develop contextually relevant climate-smart agriculture information, the FCFA project team worked in partnership with the [International Center for Tropical Agriculture](#) to inform the development of a risk screening tool.

In order to ensure that the risk screening tool was appropriate for FONERWA's needs, further co-production occurred with the FONERWA team, in particular their private and public sector specialists who deal directly with the project teams applying to the fund.

## How was co-production done?

The co-production process was run through a combination of formal and informal relationships with project partners. However, no co-production was done with regards to the climate data and information that was used in the initial [climate factsheet](#) that was developed for FONERWA. As the co-production process was not initiated at the start of the project, a certain level of trust and goodwill was needed before the partners were able to collaborate with the project team.

## What was co-produced?



- **A Climate Risk Screening Tool:**

This tool, informed by climate-smart agriculture information, was co-produced to support the FONERWA appraisal process. The tool collates crop and livestock information relating to current climate impacts to provide an improved understanding of climate impacts and the associated risks for project development and sustainability as well as options for potential solutions, such as a range of Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) practices.



## Benefits of the co-production approach

- The co-production process increased the capacity of FONERWA project staff to discuss and make sense of climate information.
- The process has led to greater trust between the project team and partners, which could allow for easier collaboration on any future project.
- A key outcome of the approach is the ability of FONERWA to implement a formalised process to screen agriculture projects for climate risks and support staff in decision-making.

Initially, it was expected that climate information for the climate factsheet would be co-produced with Meteo Rwanda. This involved an initial desk-based draft from the project team and a workshop to discuss findings and explore options for future versions of the factsheet. However, the initial process was one-sided, favouring the project team's work, which created tension with the partners and led to a decline in the interest to participate in the output. As a result, the factsheet was still completed but was not endorsed by Meteo Rwanda, reducing its credibility in-country. The partnerships were formalised in a Memorandum of Understanding that outlined the responsibilities of the project team and the partner. However, issues around financial incentives and/or capacity development meant that the co-production failed to take place.

### Co-explore need

The co-production process with FONERWA took place at two formal workshops and training sessions, and the Project Document (PD) clinic – a workshop FONERWA runs, to help project developers build their final proposals. While the entire FONERWA team were involved in the workshops, the core co-production revolved around collaborations with their private and public sector specialists who deal directly with project teams applying to the fund. These engagements were used to explore the type of information needed to promote uptake of climate information and influence the FONERWA review process. During these workshops, FONERWA staff shared insight on how the project could improve their decision-making. Additionally, input from sector specialists gave rise to multiple revisions to the risk screening tool.

### Co-develop solutions

Co-production occurred with the CIAT through multiple in-country engagements, and expanded on previous [CIAT work](#). The project team defined co-production, which included the joint creation of information through a desk-based analysis and design from the project team and validating the results from the in-country partner. No formal partnership was established. However, mutual interest in the importance of strengthening FONERWA's capacity and developing climate-smart projects within Rwanda allowed for an informal agreement between the project team and the partner on work to be co-produced.

### Co-deliver solutions

Throughout the co-production process, the risk screening tool was intended to be a FONERWA product that fit with their existing processes. While the co-production process created a sense of ownership, the final tool was branded as a FONERWA product and

not under the FCFA branding guidelines. This further added to the sense of ownership by FONERWA. An initial baseline survey, and subsequent surveys, tracked the perceived change in capacity among the FONERWA staff. Similarly, the training workshops were designed to build the capacity of the group, while the PD clinics and use of the tool was designed to begin

the process of building the capacity of the project developers. Within all workshops, the participants were introduced to the basics of climate change and climate processes, including the methodology for the climate factsheet and the risk screening tool. Each engagement with the participants built on the progress of the last.

## Lessons to learn from:

The co-production approach worked well in terms of building capacity and creating a tool that is tailored and useful for the user needs. However, the approach would have been more effective were there more funds available and more regular in-country engagements. Some of the key lessons are outlined as follows:

- **Supporting capacity for co-production:** While co-production worked well to primarily incentivise participation in the project and build trust, without financial incentives it was not possible to appropriately attract partners who do not have a vested interest in the project outcomes. Not having dedicated funds for partner needs, such as capacity building and/or remuneration, significantly reduced their ability and willingness to co-produce. A certain level of capacity is needed before co-production of information and products can take place. Without this, users struggled to fully articulate their needs, which initially hindered the project team from developing an appropriate product.

- **Importance of a clear process:** Having a clear process for co-exploration and co-production at the start of the project would have provided better results for identifying the actual needs of FONERWA early on.
- **Collaborative nature of the project:** Sustainability of the project is driven by the co-design of the tool to align with FONERWA's project appraisal process. Similarly, co-producing information with local experts and branding the tool under FONERWA's guidelines created a greater sense of ownership.
- **Opportunity to replicate the process:** This process could be replicated within a similar context, especially for other emerging climate funds that currently do not have a structured climate risk screening process. In order for this process to function at its best, it would require higher levels of collaboration between the funding agency, the national meteorological service, local academic institutions and the teams applying to the fund.

## REFERENCES

- Araujo, J.A., Kagabo, D., Kabirigi, M., Zinyengere, N. and Owiti, Z. (2018) 'FONERWA climate risk screening tool: Agriculture'. (<http://www.futureclimateafrica.org/resource/foonerwa-climate-risk-screening-tool/>).
- Araujo, J.A., Zinyengere, N., Marsham, J. and Rowell, D. (2016) 'Rwanda country factsheet: Climate information for an uncertain future', in L. Joubert (ed.), *Africa's climate: Helping decision-makers make sense of climate information*. South Africa: CDKN. (<https://futureclimateafrica.org/news/news-report-equips-african-decision-makers-with-new-climate-science/>).
- World Bank, CIAT (2015) 'Climate-smart agriculture in Rwanda', in *CSA Country Profiles for Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean Series*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank Group. (<https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/69547>).