

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

This section summarizes Rwandan priorities and key programmes and UNDP contributions to Rwandan achievements in the five areas of focus for UNDP support: the MDGs and poverty reduction, democratic governance, crisis prevention and recovery, responding to HIV/AIDS, and environment and energy. UNDP support in each area is outlined and the results of this support are analyzed.

3.1 ACHIEVING THE MDGs AND REDUCING POVERTY

3.1.1 RWANDAN PRIORITIES IN ACHIEVING MDGs AND REDUCING POVERTY

Rwanda's Vision 2020 aims to transform the country from a low-income to a middle-income country by 2020. It defines the following six pillars for development:

- Reconstruction of the nation and its social capital
- Transformation of agriculture
- Development of an efficient private sector
- Comprehensive human resources development
- Infrastructural development
- Promotion of regional economic integration and cooperation

Rwanda's first PRSP (2002-2005) was very much in line with their Vision 2020. Through stakeholder consultations, it identified six broad priority areas. Ranked in descending order of importance, these were: rural development and agricultural transformation, human development, economic infrastructure, governance, private sector development, and institutional capacity building.

In formulating both these policies, the GoR has emphasized the MDGs. The MDGs have been perceived as serving the same purpose as Vision 2020 and sometimes even as a subset of the Vision 2020 objectives.

An independent evaluation of the PRSP 2002-2005 found the PRSP to be relevant to Rwanda's development needs, although its treatment of poverty issues could have been more comprehensive. Stakeholders appreciated the transparency of the PRS preparation process, although the process could have been more participatory while still ensuring ownership by MINECOFIN. Stakeholders also valued the public sector reforms called for in the PRS although lack of capacity limited their implementation. The absence of reliable monitoring data made it difficult not only to assess impacts but also to adjust policies in an effective and sustainable manner.³⁵

A second-generation PRS—the EDPRS—was prepared following the evaluation mission. The EDPRS is the medium-term overall policy framework for 2008-2012. It will draw on Vision 2020 and the MDGs and be complementary with the Long-term Investment Framework/Plan. Sectoral policies and strategies will be synchronized with the EDPRS. Key elements of the EDPRS are:

- A public investment programme aimed at systematically reducing the operational costs of business and increasing national capacities to innovate and strengthen the financial sector
- Various measures to “release the productive capacity of the poor in rural areas,” such as public works, promotion of cooperatives, credit packages and direct support

35 UNDP, 'Evaluation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation and Aid Coordination (July 2005)', Kigali, Rwanda, 2005.

- “Building on Rwanda’s reputation for a low incidence of corruption” and a regional comparative advantage in soft infrastructure

The EDPRS is to be implemented through government investments intended “to maintain momentum in the social sectors, education, health and water and sanitation while also targeting agriculture, transport, information and communication technology, energy, housing and urban development, good governance and rule of law, proper land use management and environmental protection.”³⁶

The GoR, with UNDP support, prepared an MDG Status Report in 2003 analyzing the likelihood that Rwanda would achieve the MDGs by the target year of 2015. The report was valuable to policy debate and was used in the preparatory process for the EDPRS.

A ‘Preliminary Poverty Update Report’³⁷ was published in December 2006 presenting findings of the second Integrated Living Conditions Survey conducted in 2005-2006. Data from this survey was to greatly facilitate the preparation of the 2007 MDG Status Report (published after this evaluation took place). While the survey did not monitor all the PRSP or MDG parameters, a comparison of the results of the second Integrated Household Survey on Living Conditions with those of the first (conducted in 2000-2001), allowed analysis of changes in Rwandan development indicators. The two surveys interviewed approximately 6,900 and 6,400 households respectively and provided nationally representative estimates. They revealed the following changes over this period:

- Consumption per capita grew in real terms an average of 3.0 percent per year.
- The percentage of population living in poverty declined from 60.4 to 56.9 percent.

- The number of Rwandans living in poverty increased from 4.8 million to 5.4 million.
- Inequality has increased: The Gini coefficient increased from 0.47 to 0.51.
- Primary school enrolment increased from 74 to 86 percent.
- Secondary school net enrolment increased from 7 to 10 percent.
- The number of households with access to safe drinking water remained unchanged at 64 percent.
- The percentage of adult workers employed mostly in agriculture fell from 88 to 80 percent.
- The proportion of households owning livestock increased from 60 to 71 percent.
- The share of agricultural households using chemical fertilizers increased from 5 to 11 percent.

3.1.1 UNDP RWANDA’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO ACHIEVING MDGs AND REDUCING POVERTY

UNDP linked its interventions related to achievement of MDGs and reduction of poverty through a focus on two development outcomes:

- “Ministry of Finance able to effectively monitor poverty trends and formulate policies, strategies and plans to address poverty in Rwanda.”
- “National Human Development Report (NHDR) prepared addressing national priority issues.”³⁸

At the UNDP country office, the Strategic Planning and Economic Management Unit is in charge of these outcomes. Its most important partner institution has been MINECOFIN,

36 Government of Rwanda, ‘Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy, 2008-2012’, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Kigali, September 2007.

37 Government of Rwanda, ‘Preliminary Poverty Update Report: Integrated Living Conditions Survey’, National Institute of Statistics, December 2006.

38 UNDP Rwanda, ‘Annual Report 2005’, Kigali, 2006.

though projects have also been implemented through the Ministry of Commerce (MINICOM), the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) and the Rwandan Secretariat of New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD).

UNDP strategic collaboration with MINECOFIN started in the mid-1990s and continued into this decade with a series of projects that provide complementary forms of support:

- The 'Formulation of National Poverty Strategy' Project (1999-2005), with a budget of \$914,223 for the period, was financed through TRAC funding and was managed by the UNDP with direct execution modality.
- The 'Support to Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation and Aid Coordination' Project (2002-2005) with a budget of \$1,199,689 from TRAC was implemented by MINECOFIN.
- The 'Interim Support Project to MINECOFIN Capacity Building Initiatives 2005' received \$734,835 from TRAC and was implemented by MINECOFIN. This project was a bridging phase between preceding and subsequent projects.
- The 'Implementation of the Strategic Development Plan and Establishment of a SWAP [Sector Wide Approach] for Economic Governance' Project (2006-2008) has a budget of \$6,130,709 co-financed by UNDP-TRAC (19.6 percent), Department for International Development (DFID) (71.9 percent) and the European Commission (8.5 percent). It is implemented by MINECOFIN. The project focuses on capacity building. Comprehensive technical assistance and training are delivered in all main areas of MINECOFIN, with an emphasis in skills transfer. The ultimate goal of the project is to support establishment of a Sector-Wide Approach Programme to donor support for economic governance allowing for a merging of the two basket funds within MINECOFIN currently financed by different development partners.

Only the 'Support to Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation and Aid Coordination' project has been evaluated. The evaluation report published in May 2005 concludes that the project was relevant, fairly efficient, had positive impacts, and was relatively sustainable, thanks to investments in capacity development.

In addition to the projects mentioned above, UNDP supported MINECOFIN through 'Support to Rwanda's Special Initiatives for Poverty Reduction' Project with a budget of \$785,000 from UNDP-TRAC funds for years 2005-2006. The project consisted mainly of contributions to the organization of the Sixth African Governance Forum, organized in Kigali in May 2006 and preparation of the NHDR still underway.

The 'Support to the National Institute for Statistics of Rwanda' Project will be financed by a UNDP managed basket fund. Its \$11.5 million budget is provided by DFID, European Commission and the World Bank. The project is expected to start in 2007 and will last three years. The project will assist in developing and strengthening a permanent statistical capacity in Rwanda. Until recently, most of the activities in this field have been donor-driven, ad hoc systems.

The 'MINICOM Capacity Building Project' launched in September 2006 with a duration of two years and a budget of \$545,885 is financed by United Nations Commission for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and implemented by MINICOM. Its objective is to promote Rwanda's participation in global and regional markets. For this purpose, it has carried out the Diagnostic Integrated Trade Study. Main components relate to capacity building through studies, training and technical assistance.

'Support to the Implementation of the Rwanda TOKTEN [Transfer of Knowledge Through Expatriate Nationals] Volunteer Programme' is being implemented by the Ministry of Public Service and Labour (MIFOTRA) with a budget for the period 2005-2007 of \$307,500, of which half is UNDP-TRAC funds and the other half

from the Government of Japan. The project aims to use capacities of Rwandan professionals living in diaspora, mainly in North America. So far, it has organized two-month assignments for 28 individuals. According to the Ministry, the project has had very positive results and its main challenge is the financial sustainability.

The 'Support to MININFRA in ICT [Information and Communications Technology] Policy and e-Government' project had a budget of \$545,885 for the period 2005-2006, financed from UNDP-TRAC funds. MININFRA implemented the project. The project had three components: preparation of a national ICT plan, participation in the world ICT summit, and creation of an information kiosk for rural areas. The Ministry is exploring the possibility of a new phase, focusing more on implementation issues. While there is no monitoring and evaluation (M&E) information to assess the project's impact, MININFRA looks upon it very positively. Limitations in funding and project management skills were seen as the main challenges.

The 'Support to the Implementation of NEPAD Programme in Rwanda' project covers the years 2005-2007 and has a budget of \$2,426,050 co-financed by UNDP-TRAC and DFID. The project is conceived to strengthen the Rwandan Secretariat of the NEPAD. Its main achievement has been to contribute to the African Peer Review Mechanism that reviewed Rwanda's performance and published its report in 2006. The purpose of the Peer Review Mechanism is to identify African best practices for mutual learning, identify governance gaps, and propose an action plan and timeline to bridge gaps. The outcomes of the Rwanda African Peer Review Mechanism have been key inputs into the development of Rwanda's EDPRS, currently underway.

There is clear recognition of UNDP contribution to the socio-economic development of Rwanda at various levels in the GoR. The most frequently cited areas of achievement are capacity building (material inputs, training and studies) and aid coordination. GoR appreciates not only UNDP

outcomes but also its modus operandi. UNDP is said to be flexible and responsive to the government's needs and its operations are well aligned with government policies. According to many GoR officials, UNDP stands out from other donors in this respect.

A number of partners expressed concerns regarding UNDP operations, including the proliferation of small projects with limited budgets that are often difficult to ascertain. Partners also reported finding UNDP administrative procedures complicated and bureaucratic, with relatively high transaction costs. The respective roles and responsibilities of different UN organizations were not always clear and this also created confusion for some partners. UNDP does not always make optimal use of its technical advisory capacities, because much time must be devoted to project management tasks.

In summary, UNDP capacity development results with MINECOFIN have been significant. Some capacity building initiatives (such as the TOKTEN project) have even been innovative. UNDP support to MININFRA from 2005-2007 to formulate a National Information and Communications Infrastructure plan and e-Government Programme constitutes important groundwork, though its effects to date are still difficult to assess.

In general, field-level interventions by the UNDP have not been evaluated enough and there is little collection of evidence on the impact of UNDP interventions among local populations. Information available to the evaluation suggests that UNDP interventions are relevant, but their impact is limited in quantitative terms.

The UNDP project portfolio is increasingly moving 'upstream', towards supporting central and regional level government institutions. This means that the impact among local populations is becoming indirect and even more difficult to assess. According to various non-governmental organization (NGO) representatives, including the Rwandan Association of Local Government

Authorities, UNDP support at the local level is not seen much because UNDP mainly works through central government.

Overall support to MINECOFIN is one of UNDP's largest interventions in Rwanda. The Ministry appreciates the comprehensiveness of this support and considers UNDP activities adequate in relation to GoR priorities. As the bulk of inputs are in training and technical assistance, sustainability of its effects should be a primary concern.

3.1.3 UNDP RWANDA AND THE MDGs

There has been an informal alignment between UNDP strategy and the MDGs that has been expressed in various plans over the years. Nevertheless, the mid-term review of the UNDP CCF in 2004 found that CCF for 2002-2006 makes no specific mention of the MDGs, despite the fact that UNDP and the UN system are required to contribute to their attainment and report on progress towards reaching them.

UNDP prepared the MDG Status Report of 2003 together with the GoR. Its publication generated much publicity and has helped raise national awareness of the MDGs. Since then, the MDGs have been present in the development dialogue but not always in a systematic and organized manner. While the MDGs are commonly perceived in Rwanda as universal goals, some interlocutors questioned the significance of their role in the GoR's development strategy. The MDGs emphasize the social sectors, while official development policy in Rwanda stresses economic growth. Key government documents, such as Vision 2020 and the Long-term Investment Framework/Plan, emphasize economic factors much more than the MDGs do. Concerns were also expressed regarding the high costs of attaining the MDGs.

A new MDG follow-up report was prepared following the evaluation teams visit. UNDP has made a valuable contribution to this MDG analysis by managing the basket fund that supports the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda.

Annex D assesses factors affecting Rwanda's attainment of development outcomes related to the MDGs and poverty reduction. These outcomes projected by UNDP are fairly narrow in scope and their attainment does not necessarily translate into poverty reduction if other key conditions, such as economic growth and pro-poor spending, are not also met. The first targeted outcome—related to monitoring poverty trends and formulating policies, strategies and programmes to address them—has been largely completed. UNDP has made a significant contribution to this outcome. The second outcome—preparation of the NHDR—has not been fully achieved as the end product has not been published on schedule. The most recent Rwanda NHDR available at the time of the evaluation dated from 1999. A new NHDR was subsequently published during 2007.

3.2 FOSTERING DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

3.2.1 RWANDA'S KEY PRIORITIES IN FOSTERING DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

In the aftermath of the horrific events of 1994, reform and modernization of public administration became a central concern. Since then, the GoR has undertaken a number of measures to address key issues such as the country's institutional and legal framework and human resource requirements. An abiding difficulty has been severe capacity deficiencies—manifested in practically all sectors and levels of public administration. Consequently, capacity development has become a key theme in virtually all public-sector initiatives. The GoR has undertaken several initiatives, and numerous donors have supported them through different interventions. During the evaluation period, capacity development for good governance has been a central element in the UNDP programme portfolio.

Governance issues have been a key element of the GoR agenda since the 1990s. They are defined as priorities in both Rwanda's Vision 2020 and the 2002-2005 PRSP. Among governance issues, decentralization is seen as a strategic approach for enhancing public service delivery and

reducing poverty. With this purpose, the government adopted a policy of decentralization in 2000. Originally, it was conceived for a period of 15 years and was to be implemented in three consecutive phases: institutional set-up from 2000 to 2003, consolidation from 2004 to 2008, and optimization from 2009 to 2015. As a result of resource and capacity problems among the decentralized structures, the implementation schedule was revised: a first phase from 2001-2005 was devoted to decentralization of general administration, a second phase from 2006-2011 focuses on decentralization of sectoral services to the district level and local tax collection, and a third phase in 2012-2018 will consolidate and strengthen capacities at the local level.

A general institutional framework for the implementation of decentralization was created in the first phase. The MINALOC and its Decentralization Management Unit were assigned as the executors of the process. A Common Development Fund was established to finance development investments of the decentralized entities and to channel donor funding for this purpose. The Rwandan Association of Local Government Authorities was created to represent the interests of the districts. MINECOFIN has since become more active in the current phase of the decentralization. The Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Unit of MINECOFIN coordinates local taxation. It channels 5 percent of the national budget to the districts and transfers funds earmarked for the districts.

Rwanda's decentralization policy is delivered through the Decentralization Implementation Programme. Several donors financed it, and UNDP has had a key role in its management and capacity development. The approach of the Decentralization Implementation Programme, sometimes seen as too centralized and supply-driven, is being reviewed. It is now viewed as one element of a broader Rwanda Decentralization Strategic Framework that includes other actions for

the years 2007-2011. The Rwanda Decentralization Strategic Framework has strong links with the EDPRS.

A self-evaluation during the EDPRS preparatory work identified the following achievements of the first phase of decentralization:

- Laws and policies have been elaborated relating to elections, administrative functions, community development, and fiscal and financial decentralization.
- Administrative and financial management structures and procedures have been put in place.
- Local elections are held regularly.
- The establishment of the Common Development Fund has facilitated the financing of several local government initiatives. Districts are now regularly preparing project proposals for submission to the Fund.
- Donor confidence is being gained through the establishment of a structure targeting the coordination of the decentralization process.
- The Rwandan Association of Local Government Authorities is ensuring advocacy and lobbying.
- Districts have been regularly preparing their annual budgets.
- Fiscal and financial decentralization policy and transfers have been introduced to progressively match the increase in district responsibilities.³⁹

However, according to the same source, important challenges remain, including:

- Low fiscal potential in local governments
- Weak financial potential and revenues
- Poor service delivery
- Weak institutional coordination
- Un-coordinated and un-harmonized financial support

39 VNG International, 'Rwanda Decentralization Strategic Framework (RDSF) 2007-2011', The Hague, January 2007.

The decentralization process is a work in progress. While partners acknowledge that decentralization *per se* is appropriate, they also agree it needs careful follow up to ensure the desired results. Newly appointed administrators in districts and at other levels need sufficient support and time to ensure effective delivery of services as required.

3.2.2 UNDP KEY CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOSTERING DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

UNDP interventions in fostering democratic governance have been designed to contribute to the following outcomes in Rwanda:

- “Legal and institutional frameworks that enable free, fair, transparent and sustainable elections at all levels in place”
- “Local governments able to assume their responsibilities in Planning and Service Delivery and the Ministry of Local Government able to provide effective oversight and guidance for the decentralization process in Rwanda”
- “Rwanda’s public service reform programme effectively implemented for greater public sector efficiency and Parliament able to realize the representative and oversight duties of elected members”⁴⁰

3.2.3 UNDP SUPPORT FOR THE MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS (MINALOC)

The Governance Unit of the UNDP country office, together with various government institutions, has implemented a number of projects and programmes to support these outcomes. Collaboration with MINALOC started in 2000 and has included the following projects:

The ‘Support to Decentralization’ project was implemented in 2000-2004 with a UNDP-TRAC funded budget of \$806,685 combined with a Swiss trust fund of \$388,000 and a Dutch trust fund of \$1,797,825. The implementing agency was MINALOC.

The ‘Support to the Process of Peace, Decentralization and Poverty Reduction in Rwanda’ project was implemented by MINALOC in 2004 with a UNDP-TTF financed budget of \$100,000. It was the preparatory phase of the ‘Support to Decentralization Implementation Programme (DIP-5)’, which will extend from 2005 to 2009. UNDP finances \$1,000,000 of this project budget that includes other sources of funding, administered by other donor organizations.

The ‘Support to Decentralization and Community Development of Byumba’ project will continue from 2004 to 2008 with a total budget of \$6,650,000 of which United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) finances 86 percent and UNDP-TRAC the remaining 14 percent.

The ‘Support to Eastern Province Rural Development’ project is being implemented by MINALOC in 2006-2008 with a budget of \$2,379,830 entirely funded by the Government of Italy.

3.2.4 UNDP SUPPORT FOR THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND LABOUR (MIFOTRA)

MIFOTRA implemented the ‘Support to Public Service Reform’ project from 2000 to 2004 with a UNDP-TRAC budget of \$903,000 and a trust fund of the Netherlands of \$1,850,300. Projects components included modernization of government operations and methods, organizational restructuring of the government, and institutional strengthening and capacity building. A key area was strengthening the capacity of the Rwanda Institute of Administration and Management to design and deliver high-quality training to civil servants in all facets of public management. The same Ministry implemented ‘Support to Public Administration’ in 2005-2006 with a total budget of \$400,000 financed by UNDP-TRAC.

3.2.5 UNDP SUPPORT FOR OTHER GOVERNMENT PARTNERS

The ‘Technical Assistance for 2003 Elections’ project was implemented by the National Electoral

40 UNDP Rwanda, ‘Annual Report 2005’, Kigali, 2006.

Commission and financed by a UNDP-managed basket fund. Its budget of \$4,676,874 was funded by the European Commission (46 percent), DFID (22 percent), Belgium (12 percent), UNDP-TRAC (10 percent) and Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) (10 percent under the title of General Elections Support).

The National Electoral Council also implemented a project of 'Support to the 2006 Elections' in 2005-2006 with a budget of \$1,269,565 financed by DFID (68 percent) and UNDP-TRAC (32 percent).

The first phase of a project for 'Good Governance for Poverty Reduction' was financed in 2003-2005 by a Norwegian trust fund of \$1,295,750. It was implemented by the Parliament of Rwanda, National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC), Centre for Conflict Management of the University of Rwanda, and the Ministry of Justice (MINIJUST). A second phase in 2005-2007 with a budget of \$1,065,410 is financed by NORAD and UNDP-TRAC and is directed to NURC (36 percent), the Parliament (50 percent) and the Women Parliamentarians (14 percent).

A project of 'Capacity Building for the Ombudsman Office' in 2007-2008 has a budget of \$350,000 financed by United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF). At the writing of this report, the project had not yet started its operations.

Lack of systematic monitoring, largely due to an absence of related systems and mechanisms, makes it difficult to confirm how well outputs may have contributed to outcomes in these projects. Only a few projects have been evaluated according to normal standards of the project cycle management.

3.2.6 UNDP SUPPORT FOR JUDICIARY REFORM

In the aftermath of the 1994 genocide, Rwanda's judiciary was faced with an alarming lack of competent human resources, equipment and infrastructure. The subsequent reform of the judiciary has been guided by the principle that a functional justice sector is essential for the

establishment of good governance and democracy, as well as for long-term peace and political stability. A sound judicial system was also seen as a central building block for economic development and poverty reduction. The government's main objective has been to set up a judicial system that supports good governance and development, where laws are properly enacted and applied by an objective and independent judiciary that enforces sanctions to prevent and punish violations and to fight against genocidal ideology, while ensuring respect for the law and citizens' rights.

Reforms in the legal sector have ranged from constitutional review to review of existing legal institutions and creation of new ones. These reforms were conceived and owned by the government of Rwanda. The reform has seen the promulgation of legislation that established new courts, procedures, structures and standards including, academic and professional qualifications as well as regulatory and administrative frameworks.

UNDP support to the justice sector emphasized improved access to justice for the poor and strengthening the capacities of various national and local institutions to deliver justice. As co-chair of the Justice Sector Coordinating Group, UNDP supported MINIJUST to develop their harmonization agenda for the justice sector, which brings together other government institutions, development partners and civil society organizations in the areas of justice, human rights, reconciliation and law and order for the purposes of exchanging information and harmonizing efforts. Further support included:

- For the Supreme Court, supporting the development of a strategic plan for the court, rehabilitating 70 provincial and district court houses, sponsoring comparative study tours abroad for judges of the Supreme Court and District Courts, and providing of transports to judges to travel to provincial and districts courts to dispense judgement.
- For MINIJUST, training civil servants from different ministries working in legislative

departments in drafting legislation, training MINIJUST staff in basic ICT applications, and elaborating a Legal Assistance Strategy in collaboration with MINIJUST in line with the Access to the Poor programme.

- Support to the National Human Rights Commission (discussed in the following section).

Key Rwandan results that UNDP has contributed towards include:

- Rwanda now has a functioning Supreme Court, a High Court, the courts of Grand Instance and the courts of Lower Instance. Judges and registrars staff these courts.
- Appointment in the judiciary is transparent and goes through several processes to ensure competence in the delivery of justice and protection of human rights.
- An estimated 99 percent of legal staff is qualified—compared with the 5 percent level of qualified staff in 1995.
- Provincial and district courts have been rebuilt and equipped. Judges and magistrates have been trained. At the time of the evaluation, it was not possible to establish whether the numbers of newly trained judges are sufficient to handle the number of court cases, especially at the district and provincial levels.

All officials consulted believe that UNDP support to the justice sector has had a very positive impact. Training provided to judges, magistrates and court bailiffs has immensely enhanced their ability to perform and has improved their self esteem. Though no figures were available, it was reported that service delivery has improved and the rebuilding of the courthouses and provision of equipment has motivated the judges, magistrates and other staff members. These activities have given credibility to the system by providing accessible justice to the poor who could not otherwise afford to travel to access justice or to defend themselves.

In this support to the justice system, UNDP responded to one of the government's most

critical priorities. The view of all interviewed was that UNDP has been a valuable partner in the process, responding in a timely manner, exercising flexibility and responding in a demand-driven fashion.

Despite the good relationship between GoR officials and UNDP, there were also consistent complaints about inadequate resources and failure to inform the government in a timely manner about the availability of funds. Country office difficulties with fund mobilization can impede their ability to inform their government counterparts of the exact funds available at the time of project planning. This diminishes the government's ability to make medium and long term plans, while increasing their reliance on short term planning. The GoR made it clear they would like to see UNDP exercise greater transparency in this respect.

3.2.7 UNDP SUPPORT FOR DECENTRALIZATION

UNDP support to decentralization started in 2000 when the GoR first adopted its decentralization policy. This support has continued through various phases and is one of the largest interventions of the UNDP's Governance Unit. MINALOC appreciates this support and is keen to ensure it will continue when the decentralization strategy enters its third phase in 2012.

In many ways, the second phase of Rwanda's decentralization programme, which is now taking place, will be the test of the whole policy. This new phase will be wider in scope, involving many more actors than the first phase. It aims to mobilize resources and services and target them directly to local governments and communities. In this context, the outcomes of UNDP support are likely to mature slowly and depend on a number of factors, such as capacities at sub-national levels, allocation of resources to local governments and communities, relevance of district and local development plans *vis-a-vis* needs and priorities of the populations, as well as complementarity with other funding sources.

Decentralization of the line ministries is a particularly challenging dimension of the overall

decentralization process. Fiscal decentralization, in particular, poses challenges but some progress has been noted. For example, the Ministry of Agriculture has decided to channel 30 percent of its budget through district administrations. However, effective coordination of the decentralization process will likely require a more exact definition of the respective roles of MINALOC and MINECOFIN.

3.2.8 UNDP SUPPORT FOR ELECTIONS IN 2003 AND 2006

UNDP was instrumental in supporting the national elections in 2003 and municipal elections in 2006. The National Electoral Commission hopes that this UNDP support will continue through the parliamentary elections in 2008 and presidential elections in 2010. Concerns were expressed to the evaluation team by different partners involved in the election process regarding limitations on the involvement of political parties and in technical aspects of the elections, yet both elections were considered to have been reasonably fair and transparent overall.

The National Electoral Commission considers UNDP support vital in strengthening democracy in Rwanda. This support started through a UNDP-managed basket fund for the 2003 elections. UNDP was criticized by some basket fund contributors, who deemed UNDP accounting and reporting to have been insufficient and slow. According to UNDP, the problem was mostly a technical one, because the accounting system did not track the use of the individual contributions of different donors. The development partners' concerns at that time reduced the scope of a similar basket fund used to support the 2006 elections.

3.2.9 UNDP SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The outcome of UNDP support to public sector reform appears to have been modest. There is a need to more precisely define the scope of this support. The Mid-Term Review of the UNDP support for public sector reform with MIFOTRA⁴¹ concluded that:

- The Rwanda Institute of Administration and Management's institutional capacity is better than at the beginning of the project, but it is still not professionally and financially sustainable nor does it consistently deliver high quality programmes.
- The managerial skills of almost 900 Rwandan civil servants have been upgraded but only to the extent that they attended training programmes. No assessment has been made about the learning and capability enhancement that may have taken place.
- A common management culture in the Rwandan Public Service is far from evident and civil service reforms are yet to trickle down to the district level, though the project has helped establish a legal basis for decentralization and prepare a plan for internal organizational structures for agencies at the central level.

The Mid-Term Review found both positive and negative unintended results. There is no evidence of how the lessons from this review have been taken into account.

Most GoR stakeholders, such as MIFOTRA, give UNDP credit for its capacity building. MIFOTRA sees UNDP as the first donor in this area, characterizing UNDP support as having been 'permanent' whereas other donor contributions were 'periodic'.

Technical assistance has been a major input in several projects. In many cases, skills transfer has not been sufficiently emphasized and the outputs produced by consultants have not led to sustainable increases in institutional capacities. Some development partners consider that UNDP advisory capacity has not always been adequate. According to them, some of their UNDP advisors in decentralization have not had sufficient experience or expertise in the issues they dealt with.

41 'Mid-term Review of the Support to Capacity Building and Civil Service Reform in Rwanda', August 2003.

3.2.10 UNDP SUPPORT FOR DECENTRALIZED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

UNDP support for decentralization and community development in Byumba addresses needs and priorities of the target groups at the local level. The district administration of Gicumbi appreciated the support from UNDP. It believes that family incomes have increased, district tax income has increased, capacities have been improved, and administrative systems are stronger. The financial support channelled through District Development Plans not only contributes to local investment but also strengthens management systems and increases local ownership of the actions. The Rwandan Association of Local Government Authorities stressed the importance of supporting local governments through finance for their own development plans, which is the strategy of the project in Gicumbi/Rulindo. The micro-projects at the community level have improved cattle breeding, stoves, road construction, repair and maintenance of terraces and water supplies.

GoR partners appreciate the responsiveness and flexibility of UNDP programmes. Their relevance has been enhanced through the participatory approach followed during project preparation. Normally, project ideas come from the government, and this ensures their relevance to the GoR. They are then analyzed with stakeholders to make sure they match the strategic objectives of all parties. Most of the target groups within the government perceive UNDP programmes as highly relevant.

3.2.11 CONCERNS REGARDING UNDP SUPPORT FOR CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

There is a general appreciation that UNDP has made major contributions in capacity building (e.g. at MIFOTRA). The Supreme Court estimates that people's confidence in justice has improved as a result. However, some criticize that capacity development activities have been excessively focused on training, carried out in a scattered fashion, use a high number of external consultants, and do not always have a lasting effect. Some critics recognize that, in many cases,

the problem may have been in the Rwandan government's limited capacity to absorb capacity development support.

Sustainability issues receive little attention in UNDP supported interventions. The national execution modality mechanism is expected to promote national ownership and sustainability but, in practice, this does not always occur. Only a subset of the few available project evaluations have explicitly dealt with sustainability.

In certain areas, the capacity building for decentralization is not yet sustainable. In the Gicumbi project, for example, the District administration is assisted by a project coordination unit. If the latter disappeared, the District would have difficulty managing a direct relationship with the donors.

While capacity development is identified as a priority area of focus, capacity deficiencies at all levels of Rwandan administration diminish the impact of UNDP contributions.

While most current UNDP projects are managed through the national execution modality mechanism, they are not entirely integrated into the GoR administrative structures. Virtually every project has a technical secretariat or project management unit in charge of its administration, and the capacities of beneficiary institutions remains a major challenge. Skills transfer occurs to a limited degree, and it is not systematically included in the terms of reference of all the technical assistance. Financial sustainability is weak in almost every intervention as GoR activities continue to be highly dependant on donor funding.

Capacity building efforts could have a positive impact on sustainability, but this is not guaranteed. Excessive focus on training and consultancies, often with little attention paid to institutional and organizational development issues, may diminish the impact of capacity development activities. This may be the case in projects such as 'Support to MINECOFIN' and the 'MINICOM

Capacity Building Project'. The final evaluation of the 'Support to Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation and Aid Coordination' Project in 2005 concluded that the project's results and impact were seriously compromised because of dependence on over-paid local technical assistance and lack of stability in human resources. Considering the high proportion of technical assistance in other projects, it is possible that this problem is widespread.

In summary, UNDP's disparate contributions in this area have been correctly directed and GoR stakeholders consider them particularly relevant. The effects of UNDP contributions have not yet materialized fully due to a number of strategic and administrative difficulties. The attainment of outcomes has been partially satisfactory. Factors that influence the attainment of UNDP contributions to expected development outcomes in the area of democratic governance are presented in Annex D.

3.3 CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY

Rwanda's devastation in 1994 was intimately linked with governance. The Rwandan system of government has historically been highly centralized, undemocratic and characterized by:

- The exclusion of the majority of the population from decision-making processes that concern their lives and livelihoods
- The accumulation of political and economic power in the centre
- The concentration of power in one person at local and national levels
- The absence of transparency and accountability
- Passivity, lack of initiative and dependency among the majority of the population, due to the excessive centralization of power and exclusion from participation

- Little participation by women or youth in the running of political, economic and administrative affairs

The post genocide government of Rwanda has resolved to address these issues. Its efforts to promote good governance through decentralization and democratization, for example, are seen as means to reconcile the Rwandan people while fighting poverty.

3.3.1 RWANDA'S PRIORITIES FOR CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY

The government has enacted reforms and established institutions to help prevent future crises. Measures have included improvement of the justice system in the country through establishment of the Gacaca courts, as well as establishment of the Commission of Human Rights and the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission.

3.3.2 GACACA COURTS

The Gacaca courts are believed to be solving more cases than the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda or the ordinary courts in the country. The Gacaca jurisdiction was established with support from various partners, with UNDP support starting in 2005. The Gacaca judicial system is a modified form of traditional justice being applied to suit the current situation facing Rwandan society. Gacaca courts are modelled on traditional dispute settlement methods used by Rwandans in the past.

After the genocide, the government of Rwanda was faced with more than 120,000 genocide suspects in detention, crowded into prisons that had been built to house about a quarter of that number; the prisons did not have adequate space or sanitation facilities. At the same time, the judicial system was in disarray with a considerable number of lawyers killed and others having fled the country during the genocide. One study noted that, at the pace cases were moving in the classical judiciary in Rwanda, "it would take at least a hundred years to try all suspects."⁴²

42 Ballabola, Stella, 'Perceptions about the Gacaca Law in Rwanda,' Centre for Conflict Management, Butare, Rwanda.

Another way was needed for dealing with these cases, plus there was a desire to allow communities affected by the genocide to actively participate in the justice process. This gave birth to the Gacaca judicial system. It is supposed to speed up the process of justice and combine two elements in a way that they are not usually combined in the formal judicial system: punitive measures and reconciliation. While the highest priority genocide suspects are still tried by the classic judicial system, the Gacaca system tries others accused of lesser crimes. Gacaca emphasizes community participation, revealing the truth, confession and seeking forgiveness. The Gacaca tribunals are therefore seen as a community-level truth and reconciliation process that enhance unity at local and national levels. They have also sped up the process of bringing genocide suspects to justice. Gacaca, as it was conceived, represented a potentially effective means of dealing with the tremendous backlog of cases.

3.3.3 UNDP SUPPORT TO GACACA COURTS

UNDP support to the National Secretariat for the Gacaca Jurisdictions has involved:

- Training and sensitization for Gacaca judges on various new laws
- Training on the use of an electronic data collection system, the 'Village Area Network', with the objective of collecting and disseminating information from trials throughout the country

In light of concerns raised prior to, during and after the evaluation mission,⁴³ UNDP may want to conduct an independent assessment of the effectiveness of its support to Gacaca and examine the possibility of providing support to the GoR to rectify some of the issues that have been raised. Concerns that have been identified include, *inter alia*, the fairness of the proceedings, the objectivity and consistency of sentencing, the

extent to which the process contributes to reconciliation, the adequacy of witness protection, the level of public motivation, and allegations of complicity of Gacaca judges in the genocide. If such anomalies exist, then they could lead to a perception that UNDP Rwanda support is contributing to a miscarriage of justice rather than its strengthening.

3.3.4 NATIONAL UNITY AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (NURC)

NURC was established to deal with conflict within Rwandan society and to lead national efforts to promote the unity and reconciliation that are considered essential for sustainable human development and lasting peace. The civil war and genocide vastly increased mistrust and divisions in Rwandan society. Many victims of genocide now live in the same area as the perpetrators and suspected perpetrators of genocide and do not trust them. The GoR realized that a national unity dialogue had to be encouraged in Rwanda's communities. Thus NURC was established and tasked with the responsibility to promote dialogue among Rwandan society. Its mandate includes:

- Prepare and coordinate the national programme for the promotion of national unity and reconciliation.
- Develop and enact ways to restore and consolidate unity and reconciliation among Rwandans.
- Educate and mobilize the population on matters relating to national unity and reconciliation.
- Carry out research, organize debates, disseminate ideas and make publications relating to peace, national unity and reconciliation.
- Make proposals on measures that can eradicate divisions among Rwandans and reinforce national unity and reconciliation.
- Denounce and fight against acts, writings, and utterances that promote any kind of discrimination, intolerance or xenophobia.

43 For example: Human Rights Watch, 'Rwanda Gacaca Trial Condemns Activist to Prison', Human Rights News, 30 May 2007, available online at <http://www.hrw.org/english/docs/2007/05/30/rwanda16024.htm> and Human Rights Watch, 'Human Rights Watch World Report 2006 – Rwanda', 18 January 2006, available online at: <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/textis/vtx/refworld/rwmain?docid=43cfaea611>.

- Produce an annual report, and other reports as necessary, on the situation of national unity and reconciliation.

After the recovery phase, reconciliation is now a key feature of the GoR's agenda. All national institutions are required to include reconciliation activities in their strategies and development plans. Peace and reconciliation are now integrated in most sector policies.

NURC has participated in the poverty assessment process to mainstream reconciliation and unity in the EDPRS. The process has helped to sharpen stakeholders' focus on linkages between the different challenges faced by the country and to build consensus about the strategies and actions needed and how to monitor and evaluate their results. NURC has also been involved in integrating returning refugees. Between 1999 and 2000, NURC integrated 300,000⁴⁴ orphans with extended families and well-wishers country-wide. The integration of orphans is a means to advance unity and reconciliation, as many of the children had no direct surviving relatives.

NURC also closely monitors Gacaca courts. It has organized meetings between released perpetrators, including released prisoners, and survivors. It has also hosted national summits on unity and reconciliation. Community-based reconciliation associations are being created and supported. It is also developing a new history curriculum for schools together with the National Museum of Rwanda and the National University of Rwanda and other stakeholders.

3.3.5 UNDP SUPPORT TO NURC

UNDP has helped NURC organize successful training programmes, seminars and workshops aimed at promoting unity and reconciliation. The Evaluation and Assessment of NURC⁴⁵ recommends that NURC provide more direct support to practical activities that promote

coexistence and shared values to guarantee better results, such as community-based income generating activities, community-based reconciliation associations, clubs and support groups. NURC has invested substantially in seminars and consultations. While these are useful, it is not easy to measure their impact and it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which the ideas discussed are internalized, applied or adapted.

The evaluation further recommends that more effort be made to involve young people in the reconciliation agenda, to empower them to shape it and to become peace managers in their own right.

The evaluation report questioned the sustainability of the results of current programmes. UNDP must help NURC enhance the sustainability and broader ownership of support for unity and reconciliation. In other words, support needs to extend beyond seminars.

UNDP is now supporting NURC to ensure appropriate and effective integration of peace and reconciliation in the EDPRS 2008-2012. The project is meant to raise awareness of the role of peace and reconciliation in Rwanda's development and foster a common understanding on key issues.

3.3.6 RWANDAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION (RHRC)

The Rwandan Human Rights Commission (RHRC) was established by law in 1999 with a mandate to ensure that all citizens of Rwanda enjoy their fundamental human rights as described in the constitution. The Commission is tasked with sensitization of Rwandans about their rights to justice. It receives complaints from the population and investigates breaches of law, then takes necessary action. It also monitors issues related to good governance like the Gacaca judiciary, among other things.

44 UNDP, 'Strengthening Capacities of the Rwandan Human Rights Commission', Project Document, Kigali, Rwanda, July 2005.

45 National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, 'Evaluation and Impact Assessment Report', December 2005.

From this evaluation, it is clear that RHRC has achieved much and its capacity has improved immensely. It has created widespread awareness of human rights issues in the country largely through seminars and consultations at different levels and offices at provincial and district levels. However, despite these achievements, RHRC needs to be further strengthened.

3.3.7 UNDP SUPPORT TO RHRC

UNDP has helped the RHRC efficiently promote and protect human rights in line with the UN Paris Principles for establishing National Human Rights Institutions. The objective of this support was to increase the capacity of a national system to promote and protect human rights by creating a coordination framework for human rights activities in the country, in collaboration with civil society organizations and development partners. The objective of this coordination was to provide a mechanism for dialogue and exchange of information and to develop synergy in joint promotional activities. Joint activities have included capacity building, UN Treaty Body reporting, human rights awareness campaigns, elaboration of a National Human Rights Action Plan, and mobilization of funds. UNDP is represented in a committee mandated by the broader Coordination Framework to encourage the coordination and harmonization agenda.

The most recent UN support to the RHRC was implemented under an agreement between the Office of the High Commission for Human Rights and UNDP Rwanda in 2002-2003. UNDP acted as the in-country implementing agency for the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC). This project was followed with two other projects that were implemented jointly by Office of the High Commission and UNDP.

An evaluation⁴⁶ of the first phase of the project criticized the project for being too ambitious in scope. The evaluation noted RHRC's project management problems. It also found that a high

turnover of project staff was adversely affecting project implementation, that the timeframe for project implementation was unrealistic, and that UNDP was unable to properly monitor its implementation. Finally, it commented on UNDP inability to mobilize resources for the project, which caused a shortfall in the funding of the project. These critiques were taken into consideration in designing the second and third phases of support.

In summary, UNDP results in this challenging, critical area have been mixed. Its activities are not without risk and these risks need to be carefully assessed. Nevertheless, it is also one of the areas where a neutral UN organization like UNDP has its greatest comparative advantage. UNDP could usefully continue to help the GoR address ongoing challenges related to the promotion and protection of human rights. This could be done, for example, with support for proactive campaigns to promote human rights and support for human rights protection mechanisms. Similarly, UNDP could play a valuable role in helping RHRC develop its partnerships with civil society and programmes of support to other actors such as the media, police, judiciary, military and prison services.

3.4 HIV/AIDS

3.4.1 RWANDA'S RESPONSE TO HIV/AIDS

In response to the regional pandemic, the government is implementing a multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS plan of action that involves various agencies from the private and public sectors and civil society. National AIDS control programmes include specific activities targeting persons infected with HIV or affected by HIV/AIDS, as well as high risk populations. The government's strategy includes an aggressive programme of information, education and communication, testing and counselling, promotion of protective devices, treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, prevention of mother-to-child transmission, care

⁴⁶ Maina, Chris and Edith Kibalama (editors), 'Searching for Sense and Humanity for a Better Rwanda: A Report of the Fact Finding Mission Organized under the Auspices of Kitu Cha Kaba', Undated.

of people with HIV/AIDS, research and development, and regional collaboration in the campaign against HIV/AIDS.

3.4.2 UNDP SUPPORT TO HIV/AIDS

Since 2000, UNDP has supported the GoR in fighting HIV/AIDS. The evaluation of Rwanda's Multi-Country HIV/AIDS Program⁴⁷ found that UNDP supports activities that have been prioritized by the government and where UNDP has comparative advantages. These include:

- Establishment, equipment, capacity development and policy development support for the National AIDS Control Commission
- Support for decentralized HIV/AIDS responses at provincial, district, and local government levels
- Strengthening capacities of associations of HIV/AIDS infected or affected people
- Support for the elaboration of HIV/AIDS related policies and mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into EDPRS
- Coordination and development of partnerships, this included planning reporting, data analysis, mapping of interventions for the improvement of information systems, harmonization and standardization of trainings, coordination of the national response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and elaboration of a coordination mechanism
- Alleviation of socio-economic impact among HIV/AIDS infected people
- Support to civil society organizations (for example faith based organizations) in their response to HIV/AIDS

3.4.3 KEY RESULTS OF UNDP ENGAGEMENT IN HIV/AIDS

UNDP has made significant contributions to a number of outcomes, including moving HIV/

AIDS from a health issue to a development issue. Although this shift was part of a global change, UNDP is credited with advocating and helping to mainstream the county's response to the pandemic into the national development agenda. For example, it is now included in the EDPRS. Because HIV/AIDS deepens poverty and widens inequalities at every level, mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in the PRS is a significant contribution. But there are also new risks. For example, the recent growth in external financial resources and resulting prominence of treatment enhance the danger that preventive approaches to combating the epidemic may receive less attention.

UNDP has also contributed to a greater commitment among partners towards promoting policies, strategies, structures and processes that shape the national response. The following outcomes stand out: changing national policies and strategic framework for managing HIV/AIDS; decentralizing HIV/AIDS institutions; and increasing the voice of civil society organizations and vulnerable groups in advocacy, participation and improving their socio-economic status through income generation activities.

The strong relationship UNDP enjoys with the government helped influence their approach to AIDS related governance issues.

Gender and HIV/AIDS are inextricably linked. Gender inequity is a key factor in the HIV/AIDS epidemics among women and young girls in particular. Several UNDP initiatives have positive influences on gender dynamics. It was difficult to establish the extent to which UNDP initiatives have influenced gender-related issues concerning HIV/AIDS, but there appears to be a lack of systematic attention to gender issues in the implementation of UNDP projects.⁴⁸ However some UNDP initiatives have promoted

47 World Bank, 'Monitoring and Evaluation Support to Rwanda's Multi-Country HIV/AIDS Program Report', November 2006.

48 Discussions with local leaders in Butare, for example, revealed that while these projects cited impressive sounding results, there was clearly a lack of attention to gender issue. One project, for example, run by a local NGO supported by UNDP Rwanabubu, (Youth Association), did not have a single woman working on the project. This may have been an exception, but it created an impression that there is lack of attention to implementation of some of UNDP projects.

recognition of the roles and rights of women, of people living with HIV/AIDS and of civil society organizations in governance and in multi-sectoral responses.

In summary, total UNDP spending in this sector is not large in relation to needs and there is a lack of reliable data on results. Nevertheless a substantial portion of UNDP's relatively modest core resources has been devoted to Rwanda's HIV/AIDS response and additional funds have been mobilized from the African Development Bank. If UNDP remains active in this area, then it should develop a coherent approach to leveraging partners' resources with the goal of achieving the scale of investment required if the various projects are to achieve their targeted outcomes. UNDP comparative advantage in this area *vis-à-vis* other UN organizations will also need to be more clearly elaborated.

3.5 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

3.5.1 RWANDA'S ENVIRONMENTAL PRIORITIES

The reconstruction of post-war Rwanda's capacity for environmental governance began with the creation of the Ministry of Land, Environment, Forestry, Water and Natural Resources⁴⁹ (MINITERE) in 1999. Much of MINITERE's operational responsibilities have now been transferred to the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority, which has a mandate to oversee management of the country's land, environment, water and forests. The Rwanda Environmental Management Authority has grown from an office of four people to several dozen staff in the past several years. However, it remains understaffed and under-skilled in relation to the country's evolving needs and the emerging regulatory and policy framework.

Rwanda's Vision 2020 strategy recognizes the imperative to ensure the environmental sustain-

ability of development. This imperative did not emerge as clearly in the country's first PRSP where environment was treated as a cross-cutting issue but marginalized *de facto*. During the first PRS, environmental issues were not priorities, for example, little analysis was done of the critical links between rural environmental degradation and rural poverty. As a result, environmental management received less than 1 percent of the government's budget under the first PRSP.

However, environmental sustainability concerns are emerging more clearly in the succeeding strategy—the EDPRS that is currently being developed. Rwanda's decision makers are more aware of the economic costs of different forms of environmental degradation, water and energy inefficient technologies, poor soil and water management, water pollution, etc. Environmental management has emerged as a real development issue for decision makers and, from the perspective of the MINITERE at least, increasing numbers of senior management understand the complex dynamic relationship between environmental degradation and economic performance.

There has been progress in capacity development, particularly with the creation of environmental and land use laws and regulations.⁵⁰ The country also recently launched an ambitious process of developing decentralized environmental management capacities. A powerful indicator of the commitment to developing this local capacity is in the engagements made to the President of Rwanda by each district political head. In 30 districts, the district heads have committed to specific environmental management targets and actions, such as soil conservation measures, tree planting, improved stoves and so on. Each district budget will now include at least 100 million francs (roughly \$180,000) for soil conservation as well as reforestation budgets. However, many local governments will be hard pressed to mobilize the human resources necessary to deliver effectively on these commitments.

49 Recently renamed the Ministry of Land, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines.

50 Including, Organic Law Defining the Modalities of the Protection and Management of the Environment, Law on Urban Development, the Draft National Policy of Urbanization, and the Kigali Industrial Environmental Management Framework.

3.5.2 UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Growing support from UNDP Rwanda for different types of environmental management activities is a good example of the agency's rapidly evolving relationship with the GoR. Environment did not appear in either the first or second CCFs, nor does it appear in the 2002-2006 UNDAF. Yet environment now figures prominently in the draft UNDAF for the period 2008-2011.

Support for refugees and returnees during the first CCF, mostly support to the MINALOC for resettling displaced populations, continued during the second CCF, when it was eventually encompassed within an emerging environment portfolio. These activities were a continuation of earlier work in resettling and providing sustainable livelihoods for returnees in the late 1990s. These projects contributed significantly to UNDP Rwanda's targeted development outcome of "Comprehensive and sustainable reintegration programmes for IDPs [internally displaced persons], returning refugees and ex-combatants elaborated and in place at national and local levels."⁵¹

Support for resettlement and reintegration in Gisenyi and Kibuye provinces (now both within the newly formed Western Province) under the second CCF assisted returning populations in achieving long-term socio-economic integration. Development of new communities included construction of permanent residences with water and energy supply, environmental management protection activities such as hillside terracing, provision of basic social infrastructure including health and education services, and income-generation opportunities.

In Gisenyi, 3,500 families were resettled into permanent communities; 625 families were resettled in Kibuye. These people had been living in primitive temporary camps for years, with support from the World Food Programme

(WFP). This earlier generation of 'sustainable livelihood' projects met the priority needs of marginal populations, but there are concerns about the longer-term sustainability of new communities. For example, one of two settlements supported in Kibuye still didn't have a potable water supply at the time of this evaluation. Local government bodies trained to support these new communities have been assigned to new jurisdictions with the latest decentralization.

Major components of these resettlement projects were focused on energy, including household woodlots to provide alternate energy sources and protect forest resources, especially the natural forests of protected areas. They introduced improved wood stoves and supported experiments in solar energy and household level rainwater harvesting. They also supported improved soil management practices such as different forms of terracing and anti-erosion hedges.

3.5.3 NEW FORMS OF SUPPORT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN THE SECOND CCF

UNDP support in environmental management has evolved since 2002 in response to evolving national priorities and increased demand from the GoR. UNDP Rwanda has been able to make substantive contributions to development outcomes in large part as a result of strong government leadership and strong support from United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) partners, as well as from UNDP regional technical advisors in Nairobi.

While UNDP Rwanda is not currently recognized as being a major contributor to Rwandan environment efforts, the GoR clearly values UNDP's recent support in this area. MINITERE particularly values UNDP contributions to identifying and highlighting problems and to helping develop a conceptual framework that helped mobilizing resources from the African Development Bank and the Netherlands.

51 UNDP Rwanda, 'Annual Report 2005', Kigali, 2006.

Since 2002, UNDP support has diversified into a range of activities in environmental and resource management. UNDP support was instrumental, for example, in developing the country's new Environmental Law in 2005, as well as the national environmental impact assessment regulation and guidelines and Land Use Law. UNDP also helped the GoR define their policy for developing decentralized environmental management capacities and capacities of central government institutions.

Limited UNDP Rwanda support in these latter areas gave rise to a larger initiative, the Decentralized Environmental Management Project supported through UNDP and an institutional capacity development programme, mostly in awareness building for improved environmental and natural resource management, financed directly by African Development Bank.

The Decentralized Environmental Management Project, with Dutch and Swedish financial support supplementing UNDP seed money, has supported district governments in the western province to mainstream environmental issues into their plans. It also funds projects by local governments and other groups. The project has supported community-based pilot projects to promote more energy efficient cooking stoves, agro-forestry and improved soil management in three districts of the western province. The improved stoves are in use in 95 percent of households in these districts, where they have resulted in 50 percent reductions in fuel wood consumption.

The Decentralized Environmental Management Project suffered from weak management and problems with procurement issues early in the project. Unlike the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) discussed below, the project has had little technical backup from the UNDP regional resource centre in Nairobi. It was originally hoped the Decentralized Environmental Management Project would focus its work around protected areas in order to directly complement a GEF project, but this hasn't transpired. There has been talk of an evaluation of the project, but this has not yet taken place.

The PEI aims to enhance sound environmental management in poverty reduction efforts, sustainable economic growth and Rwanda's achievement of the MDGs. With strong UNEP support, PEI has helped the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority promote the mainstreaming of environment into the country's new EDPRS (Box 2).

All government agencies and partners will be obliged to align their work with the EDPRS, so it is critical to have solid, tangible environmental objectives in the EDPRS, both as a cross-cutting issue (see section 4.4) and as a 'sector' with its own EDPRS programme. Environment is now lodged within one of the 12 EDPRS sector working groups. Environmental analysis in support of the EDPRS process also includes a range of studies on the economic costs of environmental degradation, a review of the poverty and environment nexus within the EDPRS, the development

Box 2. Environmental objectives in Rwanda's EDPRS

"There are several environmental targets in the EDPRS. Five critically degraded ecosystems will be mapped, assessed and rehabilitated from the current 50% to 80% in 2012 as part of the Integrated Management of Critical Ecosystems (IMCE) project. Rehabilitated ecosystems will contribute to an increase in hydro-electric power generation as in the case of the Ntaruka station which is presently operating below capacity due to a drastic decline in water levels within the Rugezi wetland. Restored wetlands will provide water for irrigation, and both wetlands and protected forest areas, such as Nyungwe, will promote income generation from tourism. Moreover, a land use and management master plan will be developed by 2008.

It is planned to increase the proportion of protected areas for biodiversity preservation from 8% to 10% in 2012. Forest and agro-forest coverage is scheduled to increase from 20% to 23% of total surface land area, and annual wood consumption is due to be reduced by 30% from the 2002 figure. Soil erosion and soil fertility decline will be reduced by 24% over the EDPRS period...."

Source: Government of Rwanda, 'Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy, 2008-2012', Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Kigali, September 2007.

of advocacy tools and a pilot ‘integrated ecosystem assessment’ in Bugesera district.⁵²

UNDP Rwanda has not been a source of policy advice in the PEI’s work with the EDPRS. This advice is provided by UNEP. GoR partners described UNDP’s role—apart from giving UNEP an operational capacity in the country that it otherwise lacks—as helping the Rwandans to translate this emerging policy into practice and to make sure the policy will have a concrete impact.

UNEP has secured financing from the Irish government for a second phase of PEI, to begin in 2007. This will focus on developing national and local capacities for sustainable environmental management within the framework of the EDPRS. As mentioned, it has been proposed that PEI work closely with the Decentralized Environmental Management Project at local levels, building on their respective experience. Both would need to carefully take stock of this experience before launching into such a venture.

After a long planning and approval process, a project titled ‘Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in Forest Protected Area System of Rwanda’ started in early 2007 with GEF financing. The project will focus on Virunga and Nyungwe Parks and will complement earlier work done in the western province to reduce the pressure of returning refugee populations on biodiversity resources.

Support from UNDP channelled through UN HABITAT to the MININFRA has supported formulation of Rwanda’s Urban Development Policy, where environmental management concerns figure throughout, as well as limited capacity development at the district level.

Finally, UNDP is the official co-chair of the Environment and Land Use sub-group within the Agriculture and Natural Resources cluster—the structure used in Rwanda to promote more

effective government coordination of donor initiatives. The development partners did not find UNDP played a very visible role in this forum, from which UNDP was often absent.

In summary, recent UNDP support has made modest contributions to its targeted outcome in this area.⁵³ As this support is recent, there is a lack of evaluation information. Based on the primary information reviewed and extensive interviews, this evaluation can confirm UNDP contribution to the elaboration of strategies, most notably through UNDP contribution to the EDPRS process, but not to their adoption or implementation.

The Rwanda Environmental Management Authority has a very extensive mandate as Rwanda’s implementing agency for environmental initiatives and environmental advisor to national and local governments. It needs more support if it is to deliver effectively on this mandate. The GoR feels that UNDP has helped them make environmental concerns more visible. But they also believe that if UNDP is to have environment as one of its core areas of focus, then it will need to be a stronger advocate and provide more substantial support from its own core resources.

Environment figures prominently in the new UNDAF where UNDP is slated to take the lead in two of five focal areas: governance and environment. Yet UNDP Rwanda’s internal capacity to provide technical support and have an authoritative voice in environment related policy dialogue remains limited. The country office has not invested in the human resources needed to play a consistently prominent role in the national dialogue on environment and, at the time of the evaluation, was not giving substantive technical support to the environment portfolio. This may explain, for example, the weak linkages between the Decentralized Environmental Management Project and the first phase of PEI, and UNDP’s low profile as co-chair of the Environment Cluster.

52 Government of Rwanda, ‘Pilot Integrated Ecosystem Assessment Bugesera’, Draft Final Report Prepared for the UNEP/UNDP/GOR Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) Project, Rwanda Environment Management Authority, Kigali, Rwanda, 2006.

53 “National strategies and programmes for sustainable development, integrating economic, social and environmental issues as well as access to water and energy, elaborated, adopted and effectively implemented.” In: UNDP Rwanda, *Annual Report 2005*, Kigali, 2006.