



Community capacity building in the area of livelihoods and agroforestry for forest Landscape restoration in The Mayaga Region”.

**CAPACITY ASSESSMENT IN THE GREEN AMAYAGA  
PROJECT AREA OF INTERVENTION  
MID TERM REVIEW**



**Kigali, Rwanda**

## Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	ii
1. Introduction and background .....	1
2. Methodology .....	1
2.1. Data collection tool data collection .....	1
2.2. Respondents .....	3
2.3. Data entry, processing and analysis .....	3
3. Results.....	5
3.1. Summary Results of the ECC Capacity Development Scorecard in Amayaga Region.....	5
3.2. Detailed Results from the Capacity Development Scorecard .....	6
4. Conclusion, recommendations and way forward.....	15

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

APEFA:	Action pour la Protection de l'Environnement et la Promotion des Filières Agricoles
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CC:	Climate Change
ECC	Environment and Climate Change
FLR:	Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga region project
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
REMA	Rwanda Environment Management Authority

## 1. Introduction and background

---

Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga region project, also known as Green Amayaga Project, is one of the initiatives being implemented to drive Rwanda's development towards a new phase of societal transformation. It is a six-year project aimed at restoring the forest landscape in four districts (Kamonyi, Ruhango, Nyanza, Gisagara) of Rwanda. The project is implemented by the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) in collaboration with relevant stakeholders. Its main objective is to restore the forest landscape in four mentioned districts and secure the associated biodiversity and carbon benefits while enhancing the resilience of livelihoods through clean technology and forest landscape restoration. The project also seeks to build individual and institutional capacities for successful implementation, contribute to Rwanda's commitment to the Bonn Challenge, and align with the country's long-term vision for 2050, which reflects the changing development context towards a new phase of societal transformation.

Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) has partnered with *Action pour la Protection de l'Environnement et la Promotion des Filières Agricoles (APEFA)* to implement the capacity-building component of the Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mayaga Region Project (also known as the “Green Amayaga Project”).

In this regard, a capacity assessment was conducted to evaluate the extant capabilities in the Amayaga region that would facilitate the successful implementation of the project. The results of this assessment provide baseline information on extant capacities within the project's intervention area, upon which other programmes can build to strengthen institutions and individuals in ECC-related matters.

## 2. Methodology

---

### 2.1. Data collection tool data collection

---

The mid-term capacity assessment was conducted in Amayaga region using a dedicated open-ended questionnaire, following UNDP Capacity Assessment Methodology.

The questionnaire has been designed to cover three dimensions of the capacity assessment framework as per the UNDP guidelines. These are:

- **Points of entry:** the capacity resides on different levels – the *enabling environment, the organisational and the individual*. This assessment is tailored on enabling environment and organisational levels.
- **Core issues:** All of the four capacity issues that are the most commonly encountered across sectors and levels of capacity have been assessed:
  - (1) Institutional arrangements
  - (2) Leadership (Inclusion, Participation, Equity and Empowerment);
  - (3) Knowledge (Access to Information, Development Knowledge and Technology); and
  - (4) Accountability.
- **Functional and technical capacities:** Functional capacities are necessary for creating and managing policies, legislations, strategies and programmes. All of the following functional capacities have been assessed:
  - (1) Capacity to engage stakeholders
  - (2) Capacity to assess a situation and define a vision and mandate as well as objectives
  - (3) Capacity to formulate ECC policies and strategies;
  - (4) Capacity to manage and implement ECC programmes
  - (5) Monitoring, evaluation and learning.

**NB.** Each functional capacity is evaluated from the three angles of point of entry: enabling environment, the organizational and the individual points of view.

Data were collected using focus group discussion where respondents explain the prevailing situation in Amayaga on a given topic and with discussions, the level of achievement is ranked between 0 and 5. The data collection also used targeted interviews.

## 2.2. Respondents

---

A systemic, institutional and individual capacity assessment was conducted using the UNDP Capacity Scorecard at the district level. Representatives from various sectors including land management, forestry, agriculture, gender, youth, and local governance were involved in the assessment. Their role was to identify the gaps in the district's institutional and systemic capacity, with an aim to identify gaps that would facilitate a capacity-building plan to address these gaps. By building the capacity of district-level institutions, the project aims to enhance their ability to coordinate and implement Forest Landscape Restoration initiatives, ultimately contributing to the project's objective of restoring the forest landscape and strengthening livelihoods in the target areas.

## 2.3. Data entry, processing and analysis

---

The Aggregated Capacity Score (ACS) is a metric used in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Capacity Scoring system to measure the overall capacity of an organisation or institution. The UNDP Capacity Scoring system is a tool used to assess an organisation's capacity in various areas such as leadership, management, finance, and communication.

The Aggregated Capacity Score is calculated by averaging the scores obtained in each of the areas assessed using the UNDP Capacity Scoring system. Each area is scored on a scale of 0-5, with 0 indicating no capacity and 5 indicating fully developed capacity. The scores are then added together and divided by the number of areas assessed to obtain the ACS.

For example, if an organisation is assessed in five areas and scores **2**, **3**, **1**, **2**, and **3** in each area, respectively, the Aggregated Capacity Score would be calculated as follows:

$$(2 + 3 + 1 + 2 + 3) / 5 = 2.2$$

In this case, the organisation's ACS is 2.2, indicating a moderate overall capacity level. The UNDP Capacity Scoring system indicates areas where an organisation needs to improve its capacity and to develop strategies to enhance capacity-building efforts.

A dedicated excel tool was designed for data entry and automatic processing for the components mentioned in 2.1 (points of entry, core issues, functional and technical capacities).

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Summary Results of the ECC Capacity Development Scorecard in Amayaga Region

Strategic Areas of Support	Systemic	Institutional / Organisational	Individual	Average %
1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies and programs to manage and improve environmental management and climate change adaptation & mitigation interventions as well as restoration efforts	3/5 <b>61.60%</b>	3/5 <b>52.50%</b>	Not applicable – individuals do not conceptualise nor formulate policies	<b>57.05%</b>
2. Capacity to implement policies, programs and projects to facilitate and improve better management of environment management and climate change & restoration interventions?	2.8/5 <b>55.1%</b>	2.7/5 <b>55.9%</b>	2/5 <b>52.8%</b>	<b>54.33%</b>
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders to manage and improve environment and climate change & restoration interventions	3/5 <b>61.8%</b>	3/5 <b>63.8%</b>	3/5 <b>65.2%</b>	<b>63.6%</b>
4. Capacity to mobilise information and knowledge to improve ECC management and restoration interventions	3/5 <b>68.9%</b>	2.8/5 <b>57.6%</b>	3/5 <b>61.0%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn to improve environment and climate change & restoration interventions	2/5 <b>59.8%</b>	3/5 <b>60.5%</b>	3/5 <b>62.10%</b>	<b>60.80</b>
<b>TOTAL Score and average for %'s</b>	<b>61.60%</b>	<b>58.06%</b>	<b>60.08%</b>	<b>59.86%</b>



### 3.2. Detailed Results from the Capacity Development Scorecard

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
<b>1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate strategies and programs to manage and improve environmental management and climate change adaptation &amp; mitigation interventions in Amayaga region</b>					
	<b>Systemic</b>	The agenda for ECC management exists at District, sector and association levels (NGOs, CBOs)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Existence of strategies and programs for ECC intervention</li> <li>2. Anecdotal evidences of capacity</li> <li>3. Partially developed capacity</li> <li>4. Widespread, but not comprehensive, evidence of capacity</li> <li>5. Fully developed capacity</li> </ol>	3	Limited capacities within organisations (NGOs and CBOs) whereas for public institutions this capacity is provided by respective higher hierarchy Organisations lack human resources capacities
	<b>Institutional</b>	Existence of policies, plans and programmes related to ECC management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Institutions have no plans or strategies;</li> <li>2. institutions have some sort of mechanism to update their strategies and plans, but this is irregular or is done without proper consultation</li> <li>3. some institutions do have strategies and plans, others don't</li> <li>4. institutions do have strategies and plans, but</li> </ol>	3	Districts and sectors are catered for by central government  Other institutions such as NGOs/CBOs lack human resources and financial capabilities

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			<p>these are old and no longer up to date</p> <p>5. institutions have relevant, participatorily prepared, regularly updated strategies and plans</p>		
<b>2. Capacity to implement policies, programs and projects to facilitate and improve better management of environment management, climate change and restoration interventions?</b>					
	Systemic	There are adequate skills for Environment and CC adaptation and mitigation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a general lack of planning and management skills;</li> <li>2. Some skills exist but in largely insufficient quantities to guarantee effective planning and management;</li> <li>3. Necessary skills for effective ECC management exist but are stretched and not easily available;</li> <li>4. Majority of institutions have other don't</li> <li>5. Adequate quantities of the full range of skills necessary for effective IAS prevention, control and management planning and management are easily available</li> </ol>	2.8	<p>District and sectors have departments (units) and staff dedicated to environment and climate change issues.</p> <p>Specialised capacity is lacking within NGOs, CBOs and associations.</p>

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
	<b>Institutional</b>	Existence of mechanisms to implement ECC programmes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mechanism does not exist</li> <li>2. Mechanism exists but not functional</li> <li>3. Mechanism exist but not required staff and know how</li> <li>4. Mechanism in place and fully functional in some institutions but not others</li> <li>5. Mechanism fully functional</li> </ol>	2.7	<p>One of causes is the lack of budget for better management especially for ecosystem restoration</p> <p>Action plan exists (NGOs) and ECC is imbedded in Imihigo at sector and district levels</p> <p>Follow up and Monitoring is done on a regular basis</p> <p>Capacity development needed in the field of ecosystem restoration &amp; CC adaptation for to effectively implement planned activities</p>
	<b>Individual</b>	Individuals are appropriately skilled for their jobs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Skills of individuals do not match job requirements;</li> <li>2. Individuals have some or poor skills related to ECC and ecosystem restoration</li> <li>3. Individuals are reasonably skilled but could further improve for optimum match</li> </ol>	<b>2</b>	<p>Insufficient skills in ECC and ecosystem restoration especially within non-governmental organisations.</p> <p>Trainings on climate ECC and</p>

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			with job requirement; 4. Some individuals have full capacities other don't 5. Individuals are appropriately skilled for their jobs		ecosystem restoration is done by external actors (who have planned for it).
<b>3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders to manage and improve environment and climate change interventions</b>					
	<b>Systemic</b>	Existence and quality (frequency, use) regular relations with political authorities of the appropriate executive and legislative areas	1. No evidence of such space 2. The space exists but is not active 3. Spaces exist in some institutions 4. Spaces exist and active but meet on irregular basis 5. Space in place and functional	3	Partnerships are built on specific projects or activities. There are spaces to discuss sustainable development in general which include ECC as well.
	<b>Institutional</b>	Existence of partnerships and networks with important stakeholders, e.g., citizens, NGOs, interest groups, industry, other public authorities?	1. No partnership with stakeholders 2. Partnership built but dormant 3. Stakeholders developed for some institutions but nor for others 4. Fully developed partnership and stakeholders participating in ECC activities	3	Partnerships with relevant stakeholders are always built, depending on the activity or project, including ECC and ecosystem restoration. Other projects are coming to implement similar projects to FLR which is the result of these partnerships

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
	Individual	Individuals' involvement in ECC activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No evidence of relevant capacity</li> <li>2. Anecdotal evidences of capacity</li> <li>3. Partially developed capacity</li> <li>4. Widespread, but not comprehensive, evidence of capacity</li> <li>5. Fully developed capacity</li> </ol>	3	The district is fully involved in FLr implementation. However, it has not yet started developing similar project on its own initiatives. NGOs are bringing similar projects
<b>4. Capacity to mobilise information and knowledge to improve ECC management and restoration interventions</b>					
	Systemic	Institutions have the information they need to develop and monitor strategies and action plans for ECC management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information is virtually lacking;</li> <li>2. Some information exists, but is of poor quality, is of limited usefulness, or is very difficult to access;</li> <li>3. All information available but scattered</li> <li>4. Much information is easily available and mostly of good quality, but there remain some gaps in quality, coverage and availability;</li> </ol>	3	Information available but not centralised

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			5. ECC institutions have the information they need to develop and monitor strategies and action plans		
	<b>Institutional</b>	institutions have the information needed to do their work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information is virtually lacking;</li> <li>2. Some information exists, but is of poor quality, is of limited usefulness, or is very difficult to access;</li> <li>3. All information available but scattered</li> <li>4. Much information is easily available and mostly of good quality, but there remain some gaps in quality, coverage and availability;</li> <li>5. ECC institutions have the information they need to develop and monitor strategies and action plans</li> </ol>	<b>2.8</b>	Same as above
	<b>Individual</b>	Individuals working on ECC interventions work effectively together as a team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Individuals work in isolation and don't interact;</li> <li>2. Individuals interact in limited way and sometimes in teams but this is rarely effective and functional;</li> </ol>	3	Staff shortages have an effect on functionality of teams

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			3. Individuals interact regularly and form teams but are not coordinated 4. Individuals interact regularly and form teams, but this is not always fully effective or functional; 5. Individuals interact effectively and form functional teams		
<b>5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn to improve environment and climate change &amp; restoration interventions</b>					
	<b>Systemic</b>	Existence of evaluation guidelines, procedures, etc for ECC & restoration intervention	1. There are no evaluation guidelines, procedures, etc. 2. Guidelines, procedures exist but are old and outdated 3. Guidelines exist in place but not used 4. Guidelines used for certain activities 5. Guidelines procedures in place and effectively used	2	Evaluation is done using adhoc crafted tools
		Stakeholders are involved in ECC management monitoring and evaluation	1. There is no involvement at all 2. Involvement limited to some stakeholders 3. There is a reasonably open public dialogue going on but	4	Concerned institutions are involved in ECC monitoring if they are related to those activities

Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			certain issues remain taboo; 4. Stakeholders are fully involved in ECC monitoring		
	<b>Institutional</b>	Institutions are highly adaptive, responding effectively and immediately to change	1. Institutions resist change; 2. Institutions do change but only very slowly; 3. Institutions tend to adapt in response to change but not always very effectively or with some delay; 4. Institutions are highly adaptive, responding effectively and immediately to change	<b>3</b>	
	Institutional	Institutions have effective internal mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning	1. There are no mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting or learning; 2. There are some mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning but they are limited and weak; 3. Reasonable mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and	<b>5</b>	



Strategic Area of Support	Target for Capacity Development	Outcomes	Outcome Indicators (Scorecard)	Results of the Evaluation	Evaluative Comments
			<p>learning are in place but are not as strong or comprehensive as they could be;</p> <p>4. Institutions have effective internal mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning</p>		
	<b>Individual</b>	Individuals are adaptive and continue to learn	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no measurement of performance or adaptive feedback;</li> <li>2. There is measurement of performance but no adaptive feedback;</li> <li>3. Performance is irregularly and poorly measured and there is little use of feedback;</li> <li>4. There is significant measurement of performance and some feedback but this is not as thorough or comprehensive as it might be;</li> <li>5. Performance is effectively measured and adaptive feedback utilised</li> </ol>	3	Performance Management System of individuals exist on an annual basis at district and sector levels but not institutionalised at NGO and CBO levels

#### 4. Conclusion, recommendations and way forward

---

The capacity assessment for Amayaga Region (Gisagara, Nyanza, Ruhango and Kamonyi Districts) in the FLR project intervention area focused on evaluating three key components, **namely systemic, institutional, and individual**, also called **points of entry**. The systemic, institutional and individual assessment aimed to evaluate the overall capacity of the three districts to effectively carry out activities related to Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR), presented in an aggregated score. The assessment revealed that overall, the districts have moderate capacity to translate existing policies, guidelines, and laws related to FLR into action. Overall, the capacity in Amayaga region is developed at the level of 59.86% with 61.6% for systemic capacity, 58% for institutional capacity and 60% for individual capacity.

However, there were still some areas that needed improvement. The assessment highlighted the need for better knowledge sharing between FLR stakeholder actors at all levels, as they exhibited only moderate capacity in this aspect. It also emphasized the importance of upskilling technical staff through training on FLR to enhance their capacity to carry out FLR activities more effectively.

Another area that requires attention is the institutional capacity for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of FLR projects – and to take over the initiative after the project lifespan expires. The assessment revealed that there is a need for modern tools and a centralized M&E system to enhance institutional capacity in monitoring and evaluating FLR projects. The M&E system will enable better tracking of the progress of FLR projects, identify areas that require improvement and make necessary adjustments for improved outcomes.

While the districts have moderately high capacity to carry out FLR activities, there is still a need for improvement in various aspects such as knowledge sharing, technical capacity building, and institutional capacity for M&E. Addressing these areas of improvement will enable the districts to carry out FLR activities more effectively and achieve their FLR goals. The results of this assessment will be useful in designing capacity-building interventions that are tailored to address the specific needs identified in each district, which will further enhance their capacity to implement FLR activities.