



FINAL EVALUATION OF THE JOINT PROGRAMMES
'DEEPENING DEMOCRACY THROUGH
ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE IN RWANDA' (DDAG)
&
'PROMOTING ACCESS TO JUSTICE,
HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE CONSOLIDATION IN RWANDA'

DECEMBER 2017

P. Madhava Rao Ph.D.
SENIOR INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT
GOVERNANCE AND STATE BUILDING EXPERT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Outcome Evaluation of Programmes for 'Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizen Participation and Accountable Governance, and 'Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation' that were launched by ONE UN/UNDP under some noble compulsions is not an easy task. A programme that was formulated for Institution Strengthening of Governance with the aim of creating an accountable and responsive Governance Systems under National Implementation Modality with limited budget and human resources really needs to be evaluated with sincerity and commitment considering the circumstances and conditions under which it was formulated and launched.

I sincerely, thanks all those who have honestly supported the process to accomplish this otherwise tough task.

The comments offered by Mr. Stephen Anthony Rodrigues, UNDP country director, Mrs. Nadine - U. Rugwe, Head of the Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit, Mrs. Theopista Kanzayire Nwaigwe were of great importance and added value to the report. But for their insights into the conditions under which the programmes formulated and implemented, the evaluation findings could have been incomplete. I as an evaluator thank them from the core of my heart.

The technical, secretarial, and logistical support provided Ms. Chantal Mutavu Programme Assistant, Democratic Governance and Peace consolidation Unit has been immensely helpful, and I as an evaluator take pride placing her name on record and do not hesitate to going to the extent of placing on record the level of maturity she has exhibited in interacting with senior bureaucrats in Government, organising meetings, managing my time, and providing all the information required for me to evaluate. I wish her success in her life and career.

My thanks to all those senior functionaries in the Government Ministries, Government Boards and departments, the donors who have shared their candid opinions about the implementation of the programmes without any hesitation. The report could have not gone to the root of the programme implementation without their keen observation and understanding of the programme results.

The information shared and support provided by Jean de Dieu Kayiranga, Kay Kurimoto, Eugenie Musabyeyezu, Cecile Mupfasoni has been of immense value. I owe them a lot.

Finally, I thank those all who have been instrumental in giving a shape to this evaluation, and requests the pardon of those whose names are not found in this acknowledgement. Non-mention of the names here is a space constraint but not deliberate. Thank you all.

P. Madhava Rao PhD

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iii
Executive Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
2. Overview of Deepening of Democracy, Governance Accountability, Access to Justice, Human and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda	1
2.1. Governance in Rwanda.....	1
2.2. Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizens’ Participation and Accountable Governance....	3
2.3. Promoting Access to Justice, Human, and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda	4
3. Description of the interventions	5
3.1. Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizens’ Participation and Accountable Governance..	5
3.2. Promoting Access to Justice, Human, and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda	5
4. Evaluation scope and objectives	6
5. Description of the evaluation methodology	8
6. Findings and conclusions	9
6.1. Programme Design	9
6.2. Programme Relevance.....	12
6.3. Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome.....	12
6.4. Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	25
6.5. Other findings of evaluation.....	26
6.6. Sustainability of results	28
6.7. Conclusions.....	29
7. Recommendations	32

Tables:

Table 1: Methodology Table

Table 2: DDAG Outputs

Table 3: Programme Results Matrix DDAG

Table 4: Programme Results Matrix A2J

Table 5: Programme Spending DDAG

Table 6: Programme Spending A2J

Table 7: SWOT Analysis

Table 8: Assessment Ratings

Annexures

- I. DDAG Achievement Indicators
- II. A2J Achievement Indicators
- III. Documents Reviewed and Consulted
- IV. Persons Consulted and Interviewed
- V. ToR for Evaluation

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

A2J	Access to Justice
CO	Country Office
CRC	Citizen Report Card
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
DDAG	Deepening Democracy Through Strengthening Citizen participation and Accountable governance
DRG	Development Results Group
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
FBO	Faith Based Organisations
GEWE	Gender Equity and Women Empowerment
GoR	Government of Rwanda
ILPD	Institute for Legal Practice and Development
IP	Implementing Partner
IPG	Inclusive Participation in Governance
JAG	Joint Group Assessment
JGA	Joint Government Assessment
JRLOS	Justice, Reconciliation, Law and Order Sector
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAJ	<i>Maison d'Accès à la Justice</i> (Access to Justice Bureaux)
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MHC	Media High Council
MINIJUST	Ministry of Justice
MSG	Mobile School of Governance
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NEC	National Electoral Commission
NFPO	National Consultative Forum of Political Organizations
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
NIDA	National Identification Agency
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NISR	National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda
NPPA	National Public Prosecution Authority
NURC	National Unity and Reconciliation Commission
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PMSU	Programme Management Support Unit
PSGG	Program for Strengthening Good Governance
RAJ	Rwanda Association of Journalists
RBA	Rwanda Broadcasting Agency
RBM	Results Based Management
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
RGS	Rwanda Governance Score Card
RLRC	Rwanda Law Reforms Commission
RMB	Rwanda Media Barometer
RMC	Rwanda Media Commission
RNP	Rwanda National Police
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SMART	Specific Measurable Realistic Attainable, and Time bound

SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threat
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	UN country Team
UNDAP	United Nations Development Assistance Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children Emergency Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

Executive Summary

Introduction

This is a summary of report presented on an Outcome Evaluation of a Joint programme of Government of Rwanda and One UN Rwanda designed to “Deepening Democracy through citizens participation and Accountable Governance in Rwanda (DDAG); and “Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda (A2J)”. The desired outcomes of these programmes are: “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels*” and “*Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*”. These two programmes are five year- 2013-2018- joint programmes under national implementation modality by Government of Rwanda jointly with One UN Rwanda, with UNDP at programme oversight. These programmes are in operation since 1st July 2013 and end on 30th June 2018. This evaluation is a final external evaluation of outcomes taken up by a senior international independent consultant between 6th November and 25th December 2017.

The Programmes

UN Joint Programmes- The Deepening of Democracy through strengthening citizen participation and accountable Governance(DDAG) and Access to Justice, Human and Peace Consolidation have been in implementation since July 2013 and run up to 30 June 2018. The programmes started with an estimated budget of USD 13,183,503 for DDAG, and USD 13,116,510 for A2J respectively. These programmes seek to establish a Governance system that deepens democracy through creating an environment of accountability at all level, create access to justice, consolidate peace, ensure Gender equality, and protect Human Rights. The programmes have been implemented under National Implementation Modality with the Government of Rwanda in the driver’s seat, and UNDP providing technical and financial support in alignment with national priorities. The programmes have defined outcomes: “Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels” and “Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels”. Each programme has five clearly specified outputs and related actions and activities. The programmes are planned to strengthen the capacity of Government agencies engaged in Governance and Justice sectors over a period of five years.

Evaluation Scope & Methodology

The scope of this evaluation is evaluation of outcomes in the two programmes. The outcomes are very clear as they strongly believe that by strengthening Governance systems in Rwanda, the Government will be responsive, accountable, ensure access to justice, protect Human Rights, mainstream gender, consolidate peace, and take democracy as deep as it required to go. Programmes are systematically designed to obtain these outcomes through the outputs, activities, and action. Therefore, the evaluation limits itself to evaluate outcome and not entire management of programmes. Within this scope, the methodology adopted is qualitative and quantitative analysis of data gathered through primary and secondary sources, and validating it with programme result reports, interviews, and further discussion. The report is formatted in accordance with UNDP evaluation standards customised to the programmes under evaluation.

Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations

At the outcome level, both programmes have been able to support the Government within the limited resources (69.75% of projected and planned funding for DDAG and 50.63% of assured funding for A2J). UNDP has been able to position itself as a UN agency that provided technical and financial support

wherever needed for the Government for the mutually agreed programmes. Furthermore, the national ownership of processes, and implementation has been achieved to a large extent with limited capacities of financial, technical, knowledge and skills at implementation level. The evaluator records, that the programme has been able to mainstream the UN programming principles subscribed during the program elaboration phase with particular focus on Gender Equality and women empowerment (GEWE), human rights, protection of rights of the persons with disabilities, other vulnerable groups, and capacity development. The programme, with a view to adhering to the principles, has partnered with Government agencies specially engaged in Governance, Access to Justice, Parliament, Public Accounts Committee, Rwanda Media High Councils, National Human Rights Commission, CSOs, Rwanda Bar Association, Rwanda National Police, and Rwanda Unity and Reconciliation Commission. The multi-agency engagement approach helped in programmes' outreach to the targeted beneficiaries.

Complaints management system of Government, albeit requires strengthening, the monthly public interaction meetings, and political leaders going to the people in their constituency and inquiring the needs and requirements people is an evidence of achievement of the outcome to a large extent.

Programme Relevance

Under the overall development agenda of Governance strengthening and poverty reduction in Rwanda, deepening of democracy, creating accountable institutions, reaching to people, protect Human Rights, create an environment of access to justice, peace consolidation, and reintegration take prime place. In this background, the programmes are quite relevant and timely. Mainly the programmes are very much relevant in the light of initiative of the Government through EDPRS 2, Vision 2020, and UNDAP1.

Efficiency

Within limited resources, on an average of two programmes delivering with roughly 59% of assured funds itself is an indication of running the programmes efficiently, and funds were utilised judiciously. Evaluation has not found any leakages at any level, on the other hand Government adjusted the activities within the limited resources without compromised the quality of programme delivery or deliverable.

Effectiveness

The programmes are very effective in taking message of deepening of democracy, public accountability to the people to the extent possible. Particularly, the DDAG programme DDAG supported governance surveys that are critical to inform governance performance, gaps and programming. These governance surveys have informed vision 2050, EDPRS II NST and SSP, districts strategies and plans. The programme has been able to institutionalise public perception surveys and use results in programme planning and implementation. Production of various barometers and score cards are an indication of this effectiveness.

The A2J programme has been able to institutionalise case management system in Justice Sector; support national integration, Gender justice, use of traditional justice systems like Gacaca courts, support protection of Human Rights initiatives of Government.

Important findings

- a. Deepening of Democracy as generally understood is reaching out more people and encouraging them to participate in election. One of major achievements towards DDAG programme outcome is the UNDP support to the country to achieve a fair, peaceful and transparent elections. Local, parliamentary and presidential elections were supported and a lot was achieved towards citizen participation under that component. People participation in presidential elections (2017) has been very rate. Out of total registered voters of 6,897,076 the voters turned were 6,769,514 registering a participation of 98.15 % in the elections history of Rwanda. In 2015 referendum the voter turnout was 98.38%. Thus, in all the elections, the voter turnout is more than 95% indicating a real deepening of democracy.
- b. UNDP has been instrumental in design and delivery of capacity development training courses. With the technical and financial support provide by UNDP, the Ministry of Justice has been able to prioritise their activities to provide legal support to Genocide perpetrators to mainstream in to the society. As per Ministry of Justice records, there are more than thrice the number of people in the prisons are in the society, the number of persons in the prisons being 120000. With the programmatic support of UNDP for mobilisation of community support and organization of counselling camps, the NURC is able to make the perpetrators realise the mistakes they had committed and endeavours are on to integrate them into society. This is an achievement of A2J programme that is working for Justice, peace consolidation and human rights.
- c. In 30 Districts of Rwanda A2J is enabled through initiatives of community participation, MAJ Heads, MAJ coordinators, and GBV coordinator.
- d. Outcomes seen through these initiatives are: Change of behaviour; Gender sensitivity; Use of new gender sensitive vocabulary (She or He); drafting Gender mainstreaming strategies etc.
- e. Parliament is the highest body in the country that makes everyone accountable. Now, Ombudsman, NCHR, National Commission for the Fight against Genocide and Rwanda Governance Board are accountable for the Parliament of Rwanda. UNDP support has been helpful in developing capacities of parliamentarians. However, Parliament now foresees, specially designed capacity development trainings in the areas like: Policy Analysis; Budget Analysis; parliamentary processes; Knowledge Management in Parliament; Drafting and standardisation of parliamentary proceedings and processes; International Study Tours for parliamentarians to give inputs on best practices.
- f. In the legal aid system of Rwanda, the Ministry of Justice signed a contract with the Rwanda Bar Association to provide legal aid to the indigents identified by the Government. The indigent gets legal aid from the Government for all civil cases, based on an indigent certificate produced by them from the competent authorities. However, getting such certificate, itself is a great challenge for the vulnerable. Add to this, legal aid is available only in civil cases from the Government appointed legal aid counsels, the criminal cases are referred to Rwanda Bar Association for provision of legal services. Rwanda Bar Association assigns a lawyer if the referred person a) has an indigent certificate; b) if there is any merit in fighting the case and all the evidences are available with the litigant. Thus, Rwanda Bar Association s pre-empting the decision against the litigant even before going to the court.

- g. Engagement of a private lawyer is very expensive in Rwanda, and people with no means or small means are not able to meet the lawyer costs, thereby being thrown into an environment of denial of justice. This reinforces the need for a stronger Access to Justice initiative.
- h. Rwanda Bar Association (RBA) has a concern on the delivery approaches of the programme. UNDP's financial support so far been through to Government, and not directly supported RBA. RBA feels that If, instead of Government, International community and UNDP provides financial support for capacity enhancement, awareness raising, and logistics for the lawyers to take up the cases, the justice will be more accessible.
- i. NHRC and some NGOs are visiting the prisoners, however, general feeling is that the required awareness is not being raised among the prisoners.
- j. After hearing the cases, orders are passed by the courts in a reasonable time, however, the execution of orders is taking a lot of time due to various socio-economic reasons. Particularly, in property disputes, people are not able come out of judgement debt.
- k. Need assessment of the National Human Rights Commission has been done with the help of UNDP. This helped in strengthening the capacity, conduct surveys (Five surveys conducted in the area of Right to work); formulation of policies, and strengthening the capacity of law enforcing institutions and agencies.
- l. Mismatch of Financial Year of UNDP with the Financial Year of Government is sometimes delaying release of funds, as felt by implementing partners. Financial year for the UNDP is January to December, whereas for the Government is July to June. With these dates, IPs are sometimes unaware of the availability of funds. Furthermore, procurement processes at implementing partners level are very lengthy and thereby frustrating the very purpose of procurement.
- m. The fourth edition of the Governance Scorecard indicates that rule of law is the all-time best performer with a cumulative improvement rate of 11.97 per cent for the last five years.
- n. Quality of service delivery (72.93 per cent), investing in human capital (74.88 per cent), and citizen participation and inclusiveness (76.48 per cent) are among the least performers, according to the index.
- o. Governance Score Card indicates that, the performance of judiciary decreased by - 5.24% compared to the previous scorecard. The main challenge is seen where the disposal pace of cases is affected by backlog. The access to Justice sub-indicator decreased by – 3.77%. The scorecard also shows that the Rule of Law indicator score decrease is attributed to the adjustment of some of the sub-indicators as well as the introduction of new ones.
- p. It is apparently understandable that citizens are demanding more involvement especially in the planning and budgeting processes. Noteworthy, is the Civil Society Participation sub-indicator which registered a considerable increase from 63.65% in RGS 2014 to 72.45% in RGS 2016. Similar progress is also recorded in the areas of peace, safety, social cohesion as awareness of elections, and media availability.

Important conclusions

- a. Both programmes have been implemented in their right perspective and the outcomes of both the programmes have been largely achieved with high satisfactory levels.
- b. Funding is not sufficient for the promises made in the programmes. The programmes appear ambitious keeping the Governance and socio-economic situation of Rwanda in view.
- c. Instead of taking the load of too many projects, the programmes should have been focused on one or two issues. For example, strengthening citizens participation- this will fit well within

the CSO strengthening programme. In its stead, DDAG programme could have been focused only on strengthening accountable governance- strengthening of institutions, individuals within the accountable systems, and working on policy and legal framework to create an environment of accountable Governance. Widening the scope of CSO strengthening programme may be required.

- d. Printing and Production of score cards and reports alone do not create an accountable environment. Accountable environment can be created through persistent campaign on Government's openness to public scrutiny, improving the service delivery, developing tools to audit Government programme, systems, and procedures for public participation, civic education, introduction social audit systems, and technically strengthening oversight institutions.
- e. One of the great strength of the programmes is they are demand driven. In demand driven programmes, achievement of objectives becomes easier, and monitoring and evaluation will be timely. This opportunity has been used more judiciously by the programme manager, however, they struggled with less funding support, and donor disinterest in Governance sector in Rwanda.
- f. Programme planning, management, monitoring, and risk analysis is well articulated in the programme documents, and necessary mitigation steps have been taken to lead the programme to its logical conclusion even in the absence of an exit strategy, and funds mobilization strategy.
- g. Partnerships are well created, and National Ownership through National Implementation modality has given desired results.
- h. Access to Justice is very expensive in Rwanda, Governments approach of supporting only criminal cases with legal aid made many indigent litigants lose their cases for want of money to engage a good lawyer.
- i. Execution of judgement is taking a lot time thereby denying the justice offered by court orders
- j. Implementation of programme activities is very good in the programme both the programmes have implemented more than 90% of their activities, and results are as expected at the programme planning stage.
- k. As per governance score card 2015 "Media availability and access to information for citizens" scored 65.8%. This means that while the number of media outlets has increased, citizens still feel they are less involved as news sources. An access to information law was enacted in 2013 and there are ongoing efforts to popularise it, many citizens are yet to know about it and use it.
- l. Finally, it can be concluded that UNDP has a strong presence in the Governance sector, and Government of Rwanda, and its agencies are looking at UNDP and UN agencies for continued support with programmes aligned with national priorities.

Important Lessons Learnt

The implementation of the programmes taught a few lessons during the programme implementation stage. These can be kept in mind while designing future programmes or extension of programmes.

- a. Well-coordinated programme gives desired results. In both the programmes, where coordination levels were high, the programme implementation has shown quick results and activities were of everyone's acceptance.

- b. In national implementation modality assure the Government only what is possible in terms of resources. Do not communicate higher amounts in the beginning itself. If more amounts assured at the beginning of the programme, and the resources are not pooled/mobilised during the course of implementation, the implementation suffers for want of funds and results cannot be achieved.
- c. Do not design very long duration programmes for Rwanda. This country context is different. The issues of support identified at the time of drafting the programme document are becoming irrelevant after three to four years of implementation due fast changes taking place. Sometimes, Government cannot wait for support from funding agencies and postpone immediate programme needs.
- d. More focus on sub-national institutions, and working with local governments could have resulted in better performance in democratization process, upstream policy support alone is not sufficient, decentralization and de-concentration are also important.
- e. Mere institutional strengthening or capacity development of judicial personnel is not sufficient, people should be economically well off to utilize the judicial systems in the country. Poverty denies justice with huge professional fee of lawyers. Arguably, access to justice improves economic empowerment. However, such very access should not be costly.
- f. Illiteracy is the main challenge for women to be aware of their rights. Ignorance is throwing them into misery.
- g. One UN is not as popular as UNDP is. All the participating UN agencies in One UN have to make their presence felt, and should be equally accountable for any technical flaws related to their own thematic capacity in programme implementation. For example, projects on Child rights can be better managed by UNICEF.
- h. Bringing together key stakeholders in democratic governance in the program ¹implementation framework, and holding regular joint discussions with partners, promotes synergy and coherence in implementation. One example is the last media dialogue organised by MHC which also served as a platform for the launch of the media barometer developed by RGB; both activities paved the way for the development of the Journalism Award. Similarly, NFPO benefited from a professional BRIDGE training using NEC experts;
- i. Stakeholder collaboration in implementing program activities helps to achieve substantive results. For example, bringing the Association of Rwanda Female Journalists on board as an organization focused on gender equality promotion in the media sector brought added value for trainings on gender equality and women's rights.

Important recommendations

- a. The first recommendation is continuing with support to Government of Rwanda with second phase of the programmes with clear indication of yearly deliverables, and with provision to revise deliverables in the middle of programme duration;
- b. Include a clearly articulated resource mobilization strategy for clearly identifiable donors and quantum funding expected; clear commitments to fund the programme activities could be more appropriate. If possible, different thematic activities may be assigned to

¹ Annual report of DDAG 2017

different donors, and achievement those outputs to be linked to donor funding/ source of funding. If no fund no achievement in that area of activity.

- c. Explain an exit strategy in the programme document linking to sustainability of results after exit. Agree with the national counterparts with the exit strategy to own the processes after the closure of programme, and obtain commitments at the beginning.
- d. Lobby and work with the Government for Legal Aid in criminal cases as well. The current approach of Government that in criminal cases Government being the party to the litigation, it should not finance against itself is not tenable. Conceptually Democratic states are also welfare states and the states to protect the rights of the citizens. Providing legal aid either in Criminal or Civil cases is support to protection of rights. Therefore, One UN should work with the Government to provide legal aid in all the cases for the indigent. (Indian Legal Aid system is an example; the Legal Aid authority of India has a team of Advocates in every court and they are paid by Legal Aid authority pre-decided fee to each case)
- e. In programmes like Deepening of Democracy, establishment of public accountability clarify in the programme document the approaches of deepening of democracy and creating accountability, and build activities and actions around these approaches. For example, if we mean deepening of democracy is seeing that every adult casts her vote in the election, and participates in the process of democracy; the approaches and activities could be campaigning on democratization of politics, voter rights, value of participation in elections, civic education on democratic rights, lessons to be included in curriculum from High School level on political ideology, democratization of Governance, electoral system, rights of voters, and public administration systems of the country. Support to conduct of model parliaments, and assemblies in school and colleges may take the message of democracy as deep as possible.
- f. Clarify the capacity development initiatives in the programme document itself without just using the term ‘support for capacity development’. Instead say “ *Technical and Financial Support will be provided to draft national policy on gender mainstreaming by middle of 2018; technical and financial support will be provided to draft a legal framework to enforce gender rights by middle of 2018; lobbied with the Government to take up the Gender law in the next session of Parliament’ Short duration programmes on ‘ Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Based budgeting, and on Sexual Harassment at work place, will be designed and training will be imparted in Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, and Ministry of Labour on pilot basis, and 15 such courses will be held by end of 2018.*
- g. Parliament foresees UNDP’s technical support in the areas of :Policy Analysis; Budget Analysis; Training the Staff of Parliament in different aspects of management of Parliamentary affairs; Knowledge Management in Parliament; Drafting and standardisation of parliamentary proceedings and processes; International Study Tours for parliamentarians to give inputs on best practices, and how parliamentary processes are conducted in different countries; and induction courses to new parliamentarians. This can be taken up to strengthen parliament accountability to public.
- h. Laws affecting the lives of people are there, however, continuous awareness raising on available laws, legal rights, legal support, and legal processes is recommended. UNDP can think of a special module in their capacity development only on raising legal awareness at national and sub-national levels;
- i. Rwanda Media High Council looks at having support form UNDP for programme designed in accordance with the mandate of Media High Council; study tours on best practices in

journalisms- both print and electronic media, support to media outreach to rural areas, support for Human Resource Development in media.

- j.* Sending UNDP national staff on brief secondment to other countries is recommended. Sending UNDP national staff, particularly to the countries where large programmes are running with UNDP support, and to the countries where Government systems and procedures are well established will enhance the understanding on various core issues. This will be better than a classroom training.

1. Introduction

This report presents an Outcome of a Joint programme of Government of Rwanda and One UN Rwanda designed to “Deepening Democracy through citizens participation and Accountable Governance in Rwanda(DDAG); and “Promoting Access to Justice, Human and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda (A2J)”. The desired outcome of these programmes are: “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels*” and “*Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*”. These two programmes are five year- 2013-2018- joint programmes under national implementation modality by Government of Rwanda jointly with One UN Rwanda, with UNDP at programme oversight. These programmes are in operation since 1st July 2013 and end on 30th June 2018. This evaluation is a final external evaluation of outcomes taken up by a senior international independent consultant between 6th November and 25th December 2017. The evaluation started with submission of an initial inception report, there after further desk review of earlier mid-term evaluation, progress reports, programme documents, data collection through questionnaires, interviews with different stakeholders, and drafting this final report. This report evaluates two programmes, DDAG and A2J. The findings are consolidated wherever they can be, and put under a different heading wherever there is distinct and programme specific findings, conclusions and recommendations are needed.

The report is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter introducing the evaluation, chapter 2 is an overview of Governance situation and DDAG and A2J programmes as they are; chapter 3 is a description of interventions under these two programmes; chapter 4 is evaluation scope and objectives; chapter 5 briefly describes evaluation methodology; chapter 6 is evaluation findings and conclusion that also discusses the programme document design and its relations to expected outcomes; chapter 7 is some recommendations. The evaluation is an independent evaluation of the consultant, and any findings or comments or conclusions no way attributable to UNDP.

2. Overview of Deepening of Democracy, Governance Accountability, Access to Justice, Human and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda

2.1. Governance in Rwanda

Rwanda is a country with a dark chapter of Genocide against Tutsi in its history. However, it is rapidly progressing with peoples’ participation in Governance and reaching out to the needy with accountable Governance, promoting Human Rights, creating opportunities, peace consolidation, and reintegrating the people into society. Rwanda’s Government is an elected Government with peoples’ participation in elections and women occupying 64% of seats in parliament. The Global concept of a form of government in which power and civic responsibility are exercised by all adult citizens, directly through their freely elected representatives is strictly in practice in Rwanda.

In furtherance of Democratic Governance mandate to meet public needs, the Government of Rwanda is strategizing its approach to poverty reduction, accountability, and peace consolidation. The Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy² (EDPRS²) of 2013 states that ‘During the last ten years Rwanda has experienced one of the most exciting and fastest periods of growth and socio-economic progress in its history. It was tenth fastest growing economy in the

world during the decade 2000 to 2009. At the same time, more than a million people have been lifted out of poverty. Population growth is stabilising and the country is making great strides towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals and middle-income status. A perfect developmental “hat trick” of sustained economic growth (8% average), poverty reduction (12% points) and a reduction in income inequality were achieved over the EDPRS 1 period. There were key lessons learned from the EDPRS 1 Self-assessment Report from both success and shortcomings that have shaped the EDPRS 2 elaboration.² The report further goes to say ‘Remarkable socio-economic progress has been made over the last two decades demonstrated by a 312% increase in per capita GDP from \$206 in 2002 to \$644 in 2012 while resisting any inflationary pressure, majorly attributed to the GoR’s successful management of the economy.’³

On political front, after repeatedly talked about genocide of 1994, Rwanda has grown fast into democracy and created a political stability. Participation of women in decision making process is clearly visible in Rwanda with 64% of Parliament seats occupied by women in September 2013 Parliamentary elections where the Rwandan Patriotic Front maintained an absolute majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

On the social development front, Rwanda has been able to meet most of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the end of 2015. Strong economic growth was accompanied by substantial improvements in living standards, with a two-thirds drop in child mortality and near-universal primary school enrolment. A strong focus on homegrown policies and initiatives has contributed to significant improvement in access to services and human development indicators. The poverty rate dropped from 44% in 2011 to 39% in 2014. According to World Bank, inequality fell in Rwanda as the Gini coefficient, a measurement of inequality, fell from 0.49 to 0.45.⁴

Coming to Access to Justice in Rwanda, the Justice, Reconciliation, Law & Order Sector (JRLOS) Strategy is a key component of the Government of Rwanda’s Economic Development Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS). EDPRS II allocates 6% of total programme budget to this sector. Governance in Rwanda seeks to create a society for the people to have access to justice, lead peaceful life, and citizens Human Rights are protected. Mainstreaming gender into all walks of life is key cross cutting theme of Rwandan development. The JRLOS Strategy defines outputs and priority activities for the Justice Sector as a whole and defines a single Monitoring & Evaluation Framework.⁵

Coming to Human Rights, Government of Rwanda has a National Human Rights commission that hears the cases of Human Rights violation, resolves the disputes affecting Human Rights, rights of the People with Disabilities, and violation of rights of children and women. Rwanda is a signatory to international conventions on Human Rights, and EDPRS II recognises the importance of protection of Human Rights in the country.

For peace consolidation and integrating the victims and perpetrators of Genocide into Rwandan society, the Government has established a National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) that works for reconciliation among the people on the principles of Repenting, Forgiving, and Healing with a view to promoting coexistence, preserving human rights, and preventing any violation.

² EPDPRS2 Government of Rwanda, 2013

³ Brought back from the inception report to the extent required in this chapter

⁴ World Bank, Rwanda

⁵ Justice Sector User Perception and Victimisation Study, Ministry of Justice, Government of Rwanda.

Thus, Governance in Rwanda has strong strategic orientation, directions, vision to provide the people with a Governance environment where the Government is accountable, people have their say in policy making, citizens can access to justice, and peace is always preserved.

2.2. Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizens' Participation and Accountable Governance

This is a five-year programme starting 2013 and ending 2018 with a programme budget commitment of USD 13,183,503 with cost sharing by Government in kind to the extent of 300,000. This budget projection has an unfunded component of USD 3,541,200, roughly 27% of total budget commitment. The programme is expected to benefit the citizens of Rwanda as the defined outcome is expected to deepen democracy, open up political space for dialogue, engagement and ensuring free flow of information that will enhance citizen capacity to participate in decision making process. It is also expected to establish a mechanism for giving feedback on government performance at all levels.

The programme aligns with UNDAP outcome:

“Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels”

This outcome has five outputs which predominantly appear to be results of capacity development initiatives

- i. National and local institutions **have improved capacity for research**, generation and utilisation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation, policy formulation, and planning at all levels;
- ii. Central, decentralised entities and communities **have better capacity to promote** community driven development processes
- iii. National oversight institutions **have strong capacity to promote and demand** for accountability and transparency at all levels
- iv. Citizens, communities and media **have capacity to participate** in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels
- v. Implementing partners **have a better capacity to manage** the programme

The verifiable indicators for achievement of outcome set out are:

- a. 80% of Citizens satisfied with access to public information, the baseline being 57%
- b. 85% of Citizens satisfied with timelines and quality services at the local level, the baseline being 70.4%
- c. 80% of Citizens satisfied with gender parity in leadership, the baseline was 78.9%

A number of actions and activities are identified and proposed to achieve these results. For the purpose of brevity, these actions and activities are not enlisted here.

The supporting partners and implementers of this programme are:

UNDP, UN WOMEN, UNV and OHCHR and the implementers of this programme are:

- the Rwanda Governance Board, which implements components related to generating evidence based research and assessments such as the production of the Rwanda Governance

Score Card (RGS), as well as the Citizen Report Card, the Mobile School of Governance and media reform related activities;

- the Media High Council, which is responsible for media capacity building activities;
- the Rwandan Parliament, which is responsible for legislative and oversight components;
- the National Forum for Political Organizations, which works towards strengthening the political engagement and dialogue among the youth and women;
- National Electoral Commission, which is responsible for delivering free, fair and credible parliamentary, local level and presidential elections.

2.3. Promoting Access to Justice, Human, and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda

This is a five years project started in 2013 and ending in June 2018. The project has a total budget commitment of USD 13,116,510 out of which the unfunded component of USD 2,771,715 constitutes over 21% of overall budget commitments. The programme document says “the direct beneficiaries of this programme are key national institutions from central and local government as well as civil society that are involved in the implementation of the programme. These include but are not limited to Ministry of Justice which also implemented activities supporting the Supreme court and the National Public Prosecution Authority, the National Commission for Human Rights, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, and the Rwanda National Police. Other beneficiaries include districts, the Kigali Bar Association, National identification Agency (NIDA), and members of Civil Society. However, the ultimate beneficiaries of the programme are the citizens of Rwanda, who are the rights holders and end users of service delivery.” With this last sentence in the paragraph, the programme document ropes in citizens as end users as, arguably, any strengthening of the capacity of a public institution benefits the public.

This project has one outcome and five outputs

Outcome; “Justice, Gender Equality a Human Rights: Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels.”

Output 1: Strengthened capacity of the Justice sector(JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for women, children, and the most vulnerable

Output 2: Enhanced National Capacities for promotion, mainstreaming Human Rights and Implementing Treaty Body and UPR recommendations.

Output 3: Fundamental Rights of children promoted through birth registration

Output 4: Enhanced Mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, Unity and reconciliation

Output 5: Project management and oversight functions enhanced

The verifiable indicators for achievement of above outcome are:

- b. 80% of public confident with the Justice System (disaggregated by age and sex) at all levels with a baseline of 60%
- c. 79% of Adult population with confidence in the respect for human rights (political rights and civil liberties) with a baseline of 77.1%

For this project, while UNDP, UNICEF, UN WOMEN, and OHCR are the supporting partners, the implementing partners are:

- Ministry of Justice (MINIJUSTMINIJUST), which implements activities related to access to justice and human rights protection; It also coordinates activities implemented by the

Supreme Court, the National Public Prosecution Authority (NPPA) and the Rwanda Law Reform Commission (RLRC).

- The National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), which implements Human Rights related activities;
- National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which promotes unity and reconciliation among Rwandans; and
- The Rwanda National Police (RNP), which implements activities related to crime prevention through implementation of community policing concepts, amongst others.

3. Description of the interventions

3.1. Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizens' Participation and Accountable Governance

This programme has four clearly articulated strategic interventions that not only guide throughout implementation of the programme, but also shows a direction to the activities and actions to be designed and put in a results framework. However, it is a question of debate if these strategic directions guided the results frame work, which can be taken up later.

Strategic Intervention one looks at supporting the Governance with evidence for decision making and providing a platform for the citizens to participate in Governance decision making. This intervention further feels that the availability of high quality data that is rigorously and systematically collected can identify gaps and inform policy making at central and decentralized levels. Provision of data is strongly considered as making available of evidence for Governance.

Strategic Intervention two deals with facilitating participation and dialogue. Through this intervention the programme seeks to broaden participation of people in political and development processes, including women, and youth. It further supports dialogue between different stakeholders such as government, civil society, political parties, and media. Dialogue is considered a strong tool to enable participatory decision making. In this process, additionally, this strategy aims to contribute strengthening the Public Accounts Committees (PACs) established in the parliament, strengthen District Account Committees through the Mobile School of Governance.

The third Strategic Intervention focuses on strengthening available national mechanisms for oversight and accountability, including addressing the needs of Parliament and the Media.

The final and fourth Strategic Intervention is capacity strengthening at all levels among the implementing partners. Through this intervention, the programme seeks to build strong technical to deal with legal and constitutional mandates of the implementing partners.

Gender and Human Rights are cross cutting interventions and adequate provision mainstreaming these into all activities is made.

3.2. Promoting Access to Justice, Human, and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda

This programme too has very clear strategic interventions to the desired outcome, and focus the activities and actions in the direction of achieving desired outputs. The strategic interventions under this programme identify key areas of capacity gaps and provide support- both technical and financial.

Enhancing of access to Justice is the first strategic intervention where the programme seeks to provide technical support to develop knowledge and skills relevant to key national institutions like Ministry of Justice, Supreme Court, National Prosecution Authority, and Rwanda National Police.

Systematically, the second intervention to strengthen systemic capacity in the area of Human Rights seeks to engage Ministry of Justice, National Human Rights Commission and Civil Society organisations.

The last intervention proposed for establishing social cohesion, crime reduction through capacity development of crime prevention authorities and providing them crime rate survey data support.

4. Evaluation scope and objectives

Both these programmes DDAG and A2J have been in implementation since 1st July 2013 and will end on 30th June 2018. This is a final independent external evaluation of the programmes as requirement articulated in the programme documents. The mid-term evaluations conducted by external evaluators do not deal much with outcomes of these programmes. Therefore, this evaluation assessed the extent of achievement of defined outcomes which are “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels(DDAG)*” and “*Justice, Gender Equality a Human Rights: Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*” under the programmes. The evaluation assessed how the programs mainstreamed the UN programming principles subscribed during the program elaboration phase with particular focus on Gender Equality and women empowerment (GEWE), Human Rights & capacity development; and how the programme has been able to help strengthen accountable governance systems; promote access to justice, human rights and peace consolidation in Rwanda.

More specifically, the evaluation is focused on the following:

- **Outcome status:** Determine whether the outcomes (i.e. “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels*” and “*Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*”.) have been achieved and, if not, whether there has been any progress made towards their achievement, and identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance and adequacy of UNDP outputs to the outcomes. Evaluate if programme strategies and activities were relevant to achieve outcomes and what is their contribution to recorded outcome achievements. Identify democratic governance changes in comprehension, practices, behaviours which could be attributed to programme activities and outputs.
- **Underlying factors:** Analyse the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcomes. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, potential financial constraints, and how processes were managed/carried out.
- **Strategic Positioning of UNDP:** Examine the distinctive characteristics, comparative advantages and features of UNDP’s DDAG and A2J programmes and how it has shaped UNDP’s relevance as a current and potential partner in Rwanda. The Country Office (CO) position is analysed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP’s relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partners needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating potential added value by responding to partners’ needs, mobilizing resources for the benefit of the country, not for UNDP, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP services and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in area of democratic governance.

- **Partnership strategy:** Ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP and how it contributed to support programme activities? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders' participation including of IPs, UN agencies and development partners? Examine the interagency UN collaboration and partnership among development partners in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the environment's outcome to the country's needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in governance. Assess the role pattern and stakeholder's analysis to determine how the partnership benefited the programme outcomes.
- **Lessons learnt:** Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas, in relation to management and implementation of programme activities to achieve related outcome. This will support learning lessons about UNDP's contribution to the governance outcome over the UNDAP cycle to inform an optimal assistance strategy for the programming cycle. Identify cross -learning themes from the programme experimentation captured during the course of programme activities implementation. Identify opportunities that could inform next programme design and programming.

The following specific objectives of this evaluation as per the ToR are many and some of them do not relate to strict outcome evaluation. However, specific answers are provided wherever possible through this evaluation.

2. To assess progress (what and how much) progress has been made towards advancing democratic governance (*including contributing factors and constraints*),
3. to assess whether the programme/project is the appropriate solution to the identified problem(s);
4. To assess the relevance of and progress made in terms of the UNDP outputs and assess sustainability of results and benefits (*including an analysis of both programme/project activities and soft/technical-assistance activities*),
5. To assess the alignment of the democratic governance portfolio to national development priorities, UNDAP and UNDP's Strategy 2014 -2017
6. Evaluate the contribution that UNDP has made/is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome (*including an analysis of the partnership strategy*),
7. to reflect on how efficient the use of available resources has been;
8. to document and provide feedback on lessons learned and best practices generated by the programmes during their implementation;
9. to identify unintended results that emerged during implementation (beyond what had initially been planned for);
10. to ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.
11. to provide feedback and recommendations for subsequent decision making and necessary steps that need to be taken by the national stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the programme's outcomes/results;
12. Assess the level of gender mainstreaming and human rights based approach to programming and progress against gender equality and human rights expected results.
13. Identify possible future intervention strategies and issues.

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution, through the Joint Programmes and beyond, in the following fields of citizen participation in decision making; evidence-based decision-making; timely and high-quality service delivery to citizens; gender parity in leadership at all levels; political space; media development; strengthening of national civil society; access to equitable justice; enjoyment of human rights; building up of sustainable peace.

5. Description of the evaluation methodology

The evaluation is conducted in three phases and finalized in two phases. The methodology used for evaluation is an approach of analysis of primary and secondary data and finding out their interlinkages and developing an evaluative report as per the table below. For primary data collection, structured questionnaires were developed and data collected, interactive interview were conducted for validating the data collected through questionnaires. For collection of secondary data, programme document, progress reports, annual reports, and RGB score card reports, and other documents (List annexed) desk reviewed and data re discussed with the stakeholders.

Methodology Table
Table 1

Evaluation phase	Specific methods	Outputs
Phase I Inception Phase	<i>Preliminary Data collection and review, development of questionnaires in conformity with outcomes and outputs in the programme documents.</i>	Inception report drafted, presented and agreed.
Phase II Data collection and evaluation phase	<p><i>Where in data is collected through further desk review of additional documents, interviews, and field visits. This data and evaluation validated initial findings, correlated with project document assurances and fed into final report;</i></p> <p>Systematic survey of key stakeholder groups responsible for implementation of Programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic Governance Unit, CSO unit, and A2J unit in UNDP office is involved information collection, they formed key informants in addition to independent data collected from stakeholder engagement in discussions and interviews through structured interviews • Key implementing partners and national stakeholder informants like representatives from RGB, Ministry of Justice, Parliament, National Election Commission, National Human Rights Commission, Media High Council, NFPO, Civil Society organizations are engaged in discussions on outcome levels and linkages of outputs to outcomes of the programme; <p>A structured survey questionnaire designed and applied. The questionnaire is based on programme outcome, output,</p>	Filled in questionnaires, raw data, notes from interviews, notes from further desk review of documents, list of interviews conducted, list of documents reviewed.

	actions, and activities, in addition to questions to capture overall perspective of the participant in the interview.	
Phase III Data Analysis Report writing phase	<p><i>This involved final analysis of data and writing a draft report for circulation among the stake holders</i></p> <p>Analytical methods to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both qualitative and quantitative techniques applied to analyse the data collected. The quantification is presented in percentages of achievement where ever possible that relates to expected programme result verification. • Redundancies removed from the collected data in relation to the evaluation matrix and programme outcomes • Interconnection between the programmes identified and established wherever visible and interconnectivities examined in the context of core government assurances to offer accountable and transparent governance. • Factors explaining the operating environment, internal design, implementation approaches and synergies identified • Interdependency of themes, and relevance of cross cutting issues, and extent of their recognition discussed and shortcomings identified with data • Techniques of SWOT applied for analysis of programme implementation and results. 	Draft report
Phase IV Presentation of findings	<p>Before submission of draft report, a presentation of findings is made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A power point presentation capturing the approaches of evaluation and findings is made • An interactive session conducted to seek feedback on the findings and on the structure and style of the report 	This is not done due to time constraints; however, findings are widely circulated well in advance for comments
Phase V Finalization phase	After collection of comments and feedback from phase IV, all the information relevant incorporated into the final report and submitted.	Final report and winding up report

6. Findings and conclusions

6.1. Programme Design

The programmes have been designed with a definite focus on the outcomes that match UNDAP, UNDP strategy 2014-2017, and EDPRS 2. The programme for Access to Justice, Gender Mainstreaming and Human Rights is well structures and outputs are linked to outcome, and activities, and actions produce desired outputs. The language used is SMART, and results are defined and measurable. However, the

programme for Deepening Democracy through strengthening citizens participation and accountable governance(DDAG) has a design challenge.

The programme is for Deepening Democracy. That is expected to be achieved through strengthening (1) Citizens Participation, and (2) Accountable Governance. However, the outputs, activities and actions do not appear to have direct link to attainment of these goals. The document should have been more SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound).

A quick look at one of the outputs will further clarify (All outputs and actions are not reviewed here under for space constraints).

DDAG Outputs: Table 2

<i>Outcome: Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels</i>	Output 1: National and local institutions have improved capacity for research , generation and utilisation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation, policy formulation, and planning at all levels;
	Output 2: Central, decentralised entities and communities have better capacity to promote community driven development processes
	Output 3: National oversight institutions have strong capacity to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels
	Output 4: Citizens, communities and media have capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels
	Output 5: Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme

Output 1 analysis:

National and Local Institutions have improved capacity for:

- a. Research (*It does not clarify research on what?*)
- b. Generation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation;
- c. Utilisation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation;
- d. Policy formulation; and
- e. Planning at all levels

Achievement of this is measured through:

- a. Number of thematic reports generated
- b. Number of districts using sex disaggregated data.

Now let us see the Key Action and activities proposed for this:

A. KEY ACTION: Support the establishment of forums, networks for applied research and policy debate

B. Activities

- a. Support RGB for policy dialogue and strategic engagements
- b. Organise International Conference on Governance and Democracy
- c. Support Media Research for development and capacity building
- d. Support research and produce Rwanda Media Barometer
- e. Conduct Local Governance Monitoring System
- f. Organise Annual National Dialogue on Media.

How do these activities contribute to capacity improvement for Research, Data Generation, Data Utilisation, Policy Formulation, and Planning at all levels?

The fundamental defect in this observed is, activities are presumed to be flowing from pre-decided output, whereas, in fact, output should be result of all activities and actions. Here it is not so.

If the programme foresees improved capacity for research in Governance sector etc, the programme does not work for identification of capacity gaps, level of gaps in the capacity, and in what capacity indeed was there a gap (Skill sets? Knowledge? Organisational? Institutional? Environmental?)?

Furthermore, there is no difference between Key action, and Activities. Both support many things, but how, at what time, for how long, through what inputs, and who are the target population?

If we look at the above output again, the canvass of required capacity is very large. It was presumed to have developed:

- a. Capacity to Research and Capacity for Research
- b. Capacity to generate disaggregated data
- c. Capacity to utilise the data thus generated
- d. Capacity for policy formulation, and
- e. Capacity for planning at all level.

Capacity for participatory and evidenced based legislation making has other dimensions, not touched by the programme.

Instead, the support and activities should have been something like this, if not exactly:

- a. A diagnostic study of available capacities for research, policy formulation, data generation, planning and development, will be conducted with the support of an expert. The exercise will be completed within say- 3 months.;
- b. Research tools will be developed, and a core team of researchers will be identified;
- c. Research areas will be identified, and training courses will be designed;
- d. Core team of researchers will be trained in use of research tools, and their implementation;
- e. Core team will also be trained in conduct or research and research documentation;
- f. Training courses will be designed and delivered in data collection methods
- g. Training courses will be designed and delivered in data analysis.
- h. Standard software packages of data collection and statistical analysis like SPSS, SAS, and MATLAB will be procured and users will be trained in use of these packages;
- i. Necessary hardware will be procured or available hardware will be upgraded.

This is not the only the output that is drafted in this way in the programme document, this is just an example of how the results and resources framework (RRF) was drafted. (All outputs are not re-drafted here. If done so, it will be equal to re-drafting the programme results framework). RRF should lead to drafting work plans and implementation. However, this RRF is confusing and misleading.

In entire document, the HOW part of promised support is largely missing. (For example, support programme implementation unit at RGB- Why? How, with what? When, and who).

The narrative part of the strategic orientation to output is, however, somewhat clear and focused. It reads:

“Key strategies for the above output will consist of strengthening technical and institutional capacity to conduct, analyse, and disseminate key governance related surveys. Focus will be on promoting operational research and policy dialogue which will translate data into valuable information that will help users to take informed and evidence based decisions.

To build capacity of key institutions to undertake regular assessments of public perception on various issues of governance and development, technical and financial support will be provided to the Rwanda Governance Board to conduct the annual Rwanda Governance Scorecard(RGS), which is a comprehensive governance assessment initiative that reflects a commitment to evidence-based policies and objective self-assessment.

Further, RGB will be supported to conduct 2 Joint Governance Assessments (JGA). Since the JGAs are a joint assessment between the GoR and development partners (DPs), the UN will contribute to these assessments together with other Ds. The JGA is an evidence-based, constructive and sustained dialogue on governance issues, between the Government of Rwanda, its Development Partners and broader Rwanda Society. Its aim is to establish a common understanding of the governance context informed by an assessment of progress against agreed indicators and benchmarks.”

A plain reading of above narrative indicates that the activities and actions proposed for achievement of the above output definitely do not fully match the intentions of the programme. However, at implementation stage, the Government has initiated additional actions to ensure accountability, required spaces for youth, women, and the vulnerable to participate in decision making. The traditional system of engaging people in decision making, and consultations have come quite handy to cover up the gaps in programme design.

Such challenge that is seen in DDAG programme document does not appear in the case of A2J and CSO programme documents which simultaneously evaluated. In these documents, outputs, activities, and actions are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time bound to some extent.

6.2. Programme Relevance

The Constitution of Rwanda guarantees the citizens of Rwanda right from the Preamble, Human Rights, Justice, and Peace, and protection of fundamental rights. From these guarantees flows a Governance that is democratic, accountable and participative. The Rwanda’s Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategies 1&2 programmed for accountable, just, and gender mainstreamed governance for overall development of Rwanda. The Government seeks to put in place institutions that are viable and vibrant to protect the rights, ensure participative democracy and be accountable to public scrutiny. In this background, the programmes designed, and delivered that are under evaluation are very much relevant to the country context. They are also relevant in the context of post Genocide Rwanda Reconstruction initiatives where protection of Human Rights, Gender mainstreaming, re-integration of the people affected by Genocide into society, ensuring accountable Governance, deepening of democracy for full people participation, and poverty reduction are on the agenda of change and development. The programmes are also relevant in the global initiatives of supporting good governance, and democratization of governance. Furthermore, Under the overall development agenda of Governance strengthening and poverty reduction in Rwanda, deepening of democracy, creating accountable institutions, reaching to people, protect Human Rights, create an environment of access to justice, peace consolidation, and reintegration take prime place. In this background, the programmes are quite relevant and timely. Mainly the programmes are very much relevant in the light of initiative of the Government through EDPRS 2, Vision 2020, and UNDAF1.

6.3. Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome

Outcome status: The defined outcomes for the programmes are “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels*” and “*Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*”. The programme seeks to reach to this outcome through the following outputs, actions and activities matrixed in table 2.

Furthermore, within the limited resources the programme has been able mainstream the UN programming principles subscribed during the program elaboration phase with particular focus on Gender Equality and women empowerment (GEWE), human rights& capacity development. The programme, with a view to adhering to these principles, has partnered with Government of Rwanda and other state agencies like National Parliament, Rwanda National Police, Rwanda Governance Board, Media High Council, and National Human Rights Commission, specially engaged in the protection of rights of the persons with disabilities, women empowerment, and working for protection of Human Rights. The programme designed and delivered capacity development programmes, and supported the Government Agencies technically and financially to the extent possible.

Table 3: Programme Results Matrix (As per programme documents- not assessed results)			
Outcome: Accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels improved. (DDAG)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens satisfied with access to public information • 85% of citizens satisfied with timelines and quality of services at the local levels • Citizens satisfied with gender parity in leadership 	
Output	Actions	Activities	Achievement indicators
1. National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation, and utilisation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation, policy formulation, programming and planning at all levels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the establishment of forums, networks, for applied research and policy debates 2. Build capacity of key institutions to undertake regular assessments of public perception on various issues of Governance and development 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support RGB's policy dialogue programme and strategic engagements 2. Organise International Conference on Governance and Democracy 3. Support media research for development and capacity building 4. Support research and produce the Rwanda Media Barometer 5. Conduct local Governance Monitoring System 6. Support research to produce the Rwanda Governance Scorecard 7. Contribute Joint Governance Assessment 8. Conduct operational Research for evidence-based planning and programming 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of thematic reports generated 2. Number of districts using sex-disaggregated data for planning
2. Central, decentralised entities and communities have better capacity to promote community driven development processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical and financial support to key governance institutions for inclusive Planning and CSO participation in national and district forums/processes. 2. Promote strategic knowledge generation and documentation of best practices in community development 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support research and produce Citizen Report Card (CRC) 2. Organise Mobile Schools of Governance activities in all 30 districts 3. Document and disseminate Home Grown Institutions(HGI) and establish the Governance Centre of Excellence 4. Document the use of volunteers in elections 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of district development plans implemented in consultations with the community achieving over 80% under imihigo 2. 10 Community driven best practices documented and shared and replicated.
3. National oversight institutions have strong capacity to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical and Financial assistance for capacity development for media professionalism 2. Provide Technical and Financial Assistance for capacity development of Parliament and other oversight institutions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop Training Requirements for the media and conduct trainings 2. Establish and implement a Digital Resource Centre 3. Integrate gender mainstreaming within media organisations 4. Contribute towards organisation of the Development Journalism awards 5. Support media and Journalist Associations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Media self-regulatory mechanism developed and implemented 2. 90% of recommendations of oversight institutions implemented

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Support media reforms including Rwanda Broadcasting Agency 7. Support Capacity Building for self-regulations 8. Support Legislation capacity strengthening and continuous engagement with citizens 9. Support executive oversight capacity strengthening 10. Support to senate's mandate to supervise the application of fundamental principles enshrined in the constitution of Rwanda 11. Support research and citizen inputs on draft legislation 	
4. Citizens, communities and media have capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical and financial support to build capacity for community dialogue and community sensitization in democratic process 2. Provide technical and financial support to political parties and electoral stakeholders with special focus on women and youth to strengthen their capacities to effectively participate in political process 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create awareness on government policies and disseminate research findings 2. Organise conference on Political Philosophy and National Consciousness 3. Support Youth Political Leadership Academy trainings 4. Support NFPO to design and implement political leadership and mid-level trainings 5. Support establishment of and activation of Women Parties Wing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 50% women in key decision-making positions 4. 90% of citizens satisfied with their participation in decision making
5. Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Undertake programme wide capacity assessment 2. Provide technical and management support to the programme 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support to programme Implementation Unit at RGB 2. Programme wide capacity assessment 3. Priority and support capacity building of IPs 4. Programme Management Unit Support (PMSU) 5. Undertaking programme monitoring 6. Undertake Annual Review of the Programme 7. Undertake annual audit, Mid and end term evaluation 8. Support publicity of the programme 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved delivery rate of the programme 2. Timely and quality reporting
Output: Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels. (A2J) (Table 4)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% Public confidence with Justice System • 79% Confident with respect for human rights 	
Output	Actions	Activities	Achievement indicators
1. Strengthened capacity of the Justice sector(JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for women, children, and the most vulnerable	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the justice system to improve case management including setting up national automated well-coordinated system 2. Provide technical and financial support to strengthen capacities for improved service delivery in justice sector 3. Support the justice sector to improve vertical and horizontal coordination of justice 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish an integrated automated case management system in the justice sector; 2. Build the capacities of the justice sector personnel using the automated case management system 3. Provide technical assistance and financial support for the maintenance of the established systems 4. Provide technical support to judges in the higher courts in order to improve quality and timely judgements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Functional integrated case management system 2. % people satisfied with judiciary 3. % people, women and vulnerable, satisfied with police and prosecution

	<p>segments, including monitoring and evaluation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Provide technical support to improve performance of alternative justice mechanisms 5. Facilitate the provision of legal aid to targeted vulnerable groups including women, children, and in-mates 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Train judges of the special chamber and prosecutors and the judiciary on international law (criminal and procedures) 6. Provide technical assistance on research, case investigations, and advocacy on genocide justice 7. Strengthen the operation of the Maison d Access a la Justice (MAJ) in all districts including training of professional and nonprofessional bailiffs 8. Strengthen the Abunzi to mediate conflicts and disputes of people living in different cells but within the same sector 9. Contract a national technical assistant to the JLROS secretariat 10. Capacity support for the establishment of the SPIU within MINUJUST and programme implementation and oversight (1) 11. Provide technical advisory services to the JLROS to efficiently coordinate the justice sector for reform 12. Support the establishment of Justice sector committees in the district 13. Provide crime investigation capacity building for JLROS 14. Implement gender audit report of 2010 to better engender the JLROS strategy 15. Support restorative approach-based responsive justice structures and processes at Village, cell, and sector levels 16. Support the growing justice for children delivery critical mass 17. Support effective coordination and human rights based monitoring for the delivery of justice for children 18. Provide support to validate and disseminate legal aid policy 19. Support legal assistance to children suspected of major crimes, 20. Research and assess legal aid needs specific to women as determined by women and children 21. Support NGO legal aid providers by extending appropriate protection support to vulnerable women and girls 22. Support to CSOs to provide legal aid and representation to inmates 23. Support implementation of awareness raising programmes to ensure enhanced awareness of women of their rights and capacity to claim them 24. Train legal aid providers or new laws and on monitoring and evaluation of their assistance to the most vulnerable. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Enhanced National Capacities for promotion, mainstreaming Human Rights and Implementing Treaty 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support capacity building of CSOs to effectively participate in the preparation of parallel reports on the implementation of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess capacity gaps and needs among local CSOs to participate in the Treaty reporting and UPR 2. Train and provide guidance tools to CSOs to produce parallel 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5 CSOS participating in parallel reporting 2. 90% reports submitted timely by national actors as required of HR obligations

<p>Body and UPR recommendations.</p>	<p>international conventions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Provide technical and financial support to strengthen the capacity of the treaty body reporting task force for effective and timely reporting and oversight on the implementation of recommendations 3. Support capacity building of National Commission for Human Rights and relevant stakeholders to develop and implement human rights related policies 	<p>reports on Treaty Bodies and the UPR stakeholders report</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Support CSOs to produce parallel reports to Treaty bodies and stakeholders report for the 2015 UPR through participatory and coordinated ways 4. Provide technical inputs to CSO's parallel reports on the implementation of international and regional conventions and for the UPR related to children 5. Provide technical inputs to CSOs parallel reports on implementation of international and regional conventions and UPR related to women rights and gender equality 6. Support CSO awareness campaigns about the UPR, the review and follow up process 7. Strengthen CSOs knowledge on collaboration with international and regional systems. 8. Provide technical assistance to the Ministry of Justice and task force to improve coordination and substantive follow up on recommendations 9. Contract a national coordinator for the Treaty Body Task Force for a period of 2 years 10. Strengthen the reporting capacity of institutions in the task force responsible for reporting to Treaty Bodies and in the UPR and implementation of recommendations and prepare national action plan 11. Support to sensitisation campaigns of GoR on Reporting and the UPR 12. Support self- assessment of the NCHR to identify capacity assets and gaps 13. Implement prioritized capacity development strategies identified from the self-assessment of the NCHR 14. Strengthen capacity of commissioners and staff of NCHR on Human Rights Law and Principles 15. Strengthen the human rights monitoring capacity of commissioners and staff of NCHR 16. Strengthen the human rights reporting and policy influencing capacity of NHCR and other oversight institutions 17. Develop Human Rights modules for legal practice degree of ILPD 18. Training of representatives of the legislature on human rights issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. 77% of UPR accepted recommendations implemented by government
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Fundamental Rights of children promoted through birth registration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build capacity of key national institutions to promote children rights for civic registration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a strategic plan for modernisation of civil registration (Birth, Marriage, death) 2. Develop a business model for effective civil registration delivery 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic plan 2. Business model for registration

		3. Provide technical and financial support for piloting effective civil registration 30 districts	
4. Enhanced Mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, Unity and reconciliation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical and financial support to key national and community actors to promote dialogue, mediation, peace, security, unity, and reconciliation processes. 2. Generate and disseminate knowledge products on peace, dialogue, mediation, unity and reconciliation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of Trainers on facilitating community dialogue for reconciliation conducted 2. Capacities of reconciliation forums strengthened through 2-day workshops in districts 3. Support capacity building of RNP to implement community policing mechanism 4. Support the set-up of community service structure in Refugee camps 5. Train police officers on prevention of SGBV and violence against children 6. Support the NURC to conduct and disseminate the Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer and other knowledge products for improved decision making 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 90% of citizens satisfied with reconciliation, social cohesion, and unity mechanisms 2. 3 Reconciliation Barometer Reports 3. 91% personal Security
5. Project management and oversight functions enhanced	1. Provide effective project management and oversight support to project implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TA- Coordination of Access to Justice Programme 2. TA- Capacity building for implementing partners in project management 3. Project oversight including audit, evaluations, communication 	

Coming to the outcome level of DDAG programme where Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels was foreseen, the achievement is clearly visible when we look at the big picture of Governance in Rwanda, and as is evident from citizen's participation is decision making at 63.4% (CRC2017) albeit a bit low. Furthermore, Government has been able to establish and strengthen a system of public scrutiny of service delivery through direct participation in questioning the Government on service standards, and quality of service delivered. The complaints management system, that still requires upgrading and updating, has helped citizens register their displeasure and dissatisfaction of standards of public and private sectors services, or programme implementation.

Some of the key outcome level initiatives and achievements were:

- Imihigo (the performance contracts) system is further strengthened for citizens participation and demand governance accountability. Each year performance contracts are signed between the president of Rwanda and local government institutions and line ministries. These bind respective institutions to targets they set for themselves. Performance contracts are measured against an agreed set of governance, economic and social indicators known as performance indicators. Performance indicators provide a clear framework to establish domestic accountability at a level directly relevant to citizens. Now, the local Government, Imihigo begin from household level to the Village (Umudugudu); and then to the specific Sector and then to the District. When imihigo is not implemented in accordance with the provisions with which it has to be, citizens are encouraged to raise their objections and suggestion. This is directly related to the outcome of the programme.
- Government of Rwanda at all levels observed Public accountability days where local leaders explain what is being done in the implementation of programs meant for community development. This has been systemised and running with sustaining interest of both the Government officials and citizens

- Complaints Management System of Complaints Resolution days (Inteko z'abaturage) are observed where leaders gather together with citizens to respond to the complaints raised by citizens on a number of issues affecting their lives.
- Service Delivery campaigns are other approaches which are aimed at raising awareness of service providers to offer quality services to citizens as well as making citizens aware of their rights in the service chain and to enable them to report poor service or deficiency in service. However, this requires further strengthening. These campaigns further lead to assessment of services delivered where citizens satisfactory levels are alarming; challenges to service delivery and mitigating approaches are collectively discussed.
- Citizen engagements are further encouraged where findings from service delivery assessments are presented in a gathering of citizens and their leaders to discuss service delivery challenges and strategies to address them.
- The Annual National Dialogues (Umushyikirano) are organised which bring together leaders and citizens at all levels (Local Government, Central Government, private Sector, Faith based organisations (FBOs), Civil Society organisations and the Diaspora). The dialogue is chaired by the president of the Republic of Rwanda and all citizens are given opportunity to call in and express their views on issues that concern their development.

These arrangements, achievements, and approaches predominantly subscribe to the expectations of the outcomes of the programme. The programme has been instrumental in providing technical and financial support to above initiatives and programmes of the Government. The programme has created a continuous communication channel between the programme management unit in UNDP office Kigali, and implementing partners in Government who interact almost on daily basis for exchange of ideas, and to discuss implementation challenges. A missionary zeal is visible among the people engaged in delivering under this programme.

It is further seen that the programme has contributed technically to:

- Community mobilisation campaigns conducted regularly by government and other stakeholders
- Raising the level of understanding of citizens with regards to their rights and obligations through continuous campaigns engaging CSOs,
- Creating ownership of citizens of their development process which is growing progressively. The support to people centred leadership, and enhancing the participation capacity of leaders through capacity development initiatives under the programme has increased peoples' understanding of their rights, their confidence and participation in activities to improve their wellbeing.

How the programme support has helped Government of Rwanda in engaging citizens and establishing accountable governance can be understood in their own words:

“The One UN through UNDP has satisfactorily supported the DDAG programme in reference to the set outputs. In the case of RGB, the financial and technical support of UN has enabled RGB to generate evidence based data to influence planning, policy review and the general state of Governance in Rwanda. With the Support of UNDP/One UN, RGB has managed to produce the Citizen Report Card Reports, Rwanda Governance Score Card, Rwanda Media Barometer and Home-grown Solutions Assessment reports just to mention a few.

The DDAG program has also helped RGB to implement activities planned under output 3 and 4 with regard to Media Development in Rwanda and promotion of increased participation of

Citizens in planning and decision making. DDAG has made significant contribution to the improvements indicated in 12 and 16 above. Under Output 3, the DDAG program support has enabled RGB to provide financial and technical support to the Rwanda Association of Journalists (ARJ), the Rwanda Self-Regulatory Body (RMC) and other Media Associations. With this support, there has been a visible improvement in relation to institution and professional capacity of media institutions and Journalists. Such activities as the development and the dissemination of the Access to information law and Annual Development Journalism awards have been satisfactorily implemented and set objectives realised.

Under Output 4, and particularly through the mechanism of Mobile School of Governance, increased participation of Citizens in planning has progressively increased in Local Government since the beginning of the DDAG Programme. This is thanks to regular periodic campaigns organised by RGB and stakeholders in Governance such as annual campaigns popularly known as Governance month that serves to raise awareness of citizens on their rights and responsibilities as well as enabling them to understand the key role they have to play in the governance and development of their households; communities and their country.

The support of the Program has also supported the advocacy and awareness raising of Citizens and leaders on issues of inclusive Governance and accountability. Implementation of key activities has always taken into account the principles of integration of Gender and Human rights concerns. In the advocacy and awareness raising on citizen participation in governance and decision making, RGB with the support of DDAG has been able to work closely with the National Youth Council, Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion, Gender Monitoring Office and National women council, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Justice, the Local government and other stakeholders in the governance sector to promote the role of the Youth and Women in the Governance and development of their Communities and their Country.

Last but not least, through One UN/UNDP DDAG Programme, the Institutional and Professional Capacity of Implementing partners grown significantly. The DDAG technical team has been trained in different areas at different times. The areas include Results Based Management (RBM), planning and reporting on Results, Financial management, Gender, Human Rights and South to South Cooperation approaches. DDAG being a joint program has also contributed to a stronger partnership and close collaboration between IPs, Government, the One UN, Development Partners and Donors. This has been built through regular joint engagement meetings and Joint field visits.” (E&O E)

Thus, DDAG programme has been able to achieve the intended outcomes to the satisfaction of the implementing partners and programme management oversight. However, challenges within the limitations of capacities are visible that can be discussed later in final conclusions about the programme.

Outcome of A2JA2JA2J: *“Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels”*

Achievement of outcome under A2JA2J programme is no way inferior to DDAG programme, on the other hand, the programme document has made the implementation of the programme focused, clear, and SMART. The outcome under the programme has three focus areas: Justice, Gender Equality, and Human Rights. Add to these, peace consolidation emerges in the outputs.

The programme strategically used all the justice systems available in the country to ensure access to justice to anyone in need. The modern, constitutionally established Court system, emerging

alternative justice, and mediation system, and traditional Gacaca systems have been targeted to strengthen their capacity and make them user-friendly. Accessibility is created through environmental, institutional/organisational, and individual capacity development through tailor made capacity development initiatives with in the resource limitations- both physical and financial.

The programme focus has been to establish an integrated automated case management system in the justice sector that has been successfully launched and being used by all systems associated with the justice sector. Lawyers, Judges, Police, Prosecutors, correction services and General public are able to use the system to file cases and access the system for case filing, tracking, and downloading the judgements for executions. However, execution of judgement is not up to the satisfactory levels of the clients or police. This we may discuss later in conclusions. The programme furthermore, focused on developing the capacities of the justice sector personnel in using the automated case management system by provide technical assistance and financial support for the maintenance of the established system. Technical and financial assistance was also provided judges in the higher courts in order to improve quality and timely judgements; technical capacity development of judges of the special chamber and prosecutors and the judiciary on international law (criminal and procedures), to conduct research, case investigations, and advocacy on genocide justice; support to strengthen the operation of the Maison d Access a la Justice (MAJ) in all districts including training of professional and non-professional bailiffs; Abunzi to mediate conflicts and disputes of people living in different cells but within the same sector; assist the JLROS secretariat; capacity development initiatives at all levels of the system. The list of support goes big if narrated every initiative, however support extended to mainstream gender, protection of Human Rights, and legal support to women in need cannot be ignored.

While supporting the Justice Institutions like Supreme Court and other courts, the programme has not ignored capacity requirement of Gacaca, mediation, and alternative dispute resolution.

The support provided to National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) is many fold. The programme worked for peace and reconciliation through NURC. Technical and financial support was provided to NURC to further it's endeavours to integrate Genocide victims, and perpetrators into society on legally, socially, and politically acceptable norms. The programme helped NURC to work closely with Gacaca courts, and to conduct the reconciliation barometer by NURC for evidence based policy making. More particularly, UNDP's help in social Integration of ex-prisoners; development of barometer every five years has been received very well by NURC. Xxx something missing on crime prevention.

As the outcome says "*Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*" The programme implementation has not left any level to provide support, and engage national partners fully in achievement of this outcome. From village level to central level, from CSO level to Government level, from client/ litigant level to Judge level, from Gacaca to Supreme court level, from a prisoner to police officer level, the programme has been able to provide capacity development support in achieving the outcome.

Underlying factors: Here we will analyse the underlying factors beyond UNDP's control that influenced the outcome. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, potential financial constraints, the degree of stakeholders and partners' involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

If the proposed or expected outputs are understood to lead to achievement of desired outcome, and the activities are designed to achieve these outputs, definitely there were underlying factors beyond

UNDP's control. Major such factor that crippled implementation of the programme is the programme finances. Add to this, particularly for A2J, the technical support provided is inadequate with no long-term programme coordinator for this very important initiative. The programme design issues have not affected implementation of programmes. Neither major challenges for implementation of the programme were documented nor voiced during the evaluation interviewed. The programme achievements as documented in the annual reports cannot be challenged. When all the stakeholders are receiving the programme the way it is implemented, only conclusion that can be arrived to notice underlying factors is inadequate budgeting of the programme and inadequate technical support.

DDAG programme delivered its activities with only 69.75 % (see Table 5) of projected funds requirement for the programme, whereas, A2J programme delivered with only 50.63% (see Table 6) of projected programme funding. This is mainly due to non-availability of One Un promised funds.

Let us have a quick look at what is spent from the date of launch of the programme to date:

DDAG PROGRAM ME EXPENDITURE 2013-2017 (Table 5)			
Years	Total Expenditures (USD) (As per combined delivery report)	NIM Advance transferred (US\$)	TOTAL
2013	969,583		969,583
2014	2,998,690		2,998,690
2015	2,033,918		2,033,918
2016	1,661,189		1,661,189
2017 (13.12.17)	1,343,903	189,191	1,533,094
TOTAL	9,007,283	189,191.24	9,196,474
UNDP Core	5,383,509.00	50,235.87	5,433,744.87
Cost Sharing	3,623,775.00	138,955.37	3,762,730.37
TOTAL PROJECTED			13,183,503
% Spent			69.75

A2 J PROGRAMME SPENDING 2013-2017 (Table 6)			
Year	Total Expenditures (USD) (As per combined delivery report)	NIM Advance transferred (US\$)	TOTAL
2013	216,207.67	0	216,207.67
2014	1,394,152.69	0	1,394,152.69
2015	2,239,255.23	0	2,239,255.23
2016	1,057,399.39	407153.65	1,464,553.04
2017 (As of 16 Dec.2017)	821,501.64	505,582.48	1,327,084.12
TOTAL	5,728,516.62	912,736.13	6,641,252.75
UNDP Core:	4,149,068.41	366,897.11	4,515,965.52
Cost sharing (Japan + DRT-F):	1,579,448.21	138,955.37	1,718,403.58
TOTAL PROJECTED			13,116,510
% Spent			50.63

Strategic Positioning of UNDP: UNDP’s Deepening Democracy through accountable governance and combination of access to justice, gender, and human rights into one programme is one of its kind in Rwanda. During the evaluation period, the evaluator has not come across any other major players in Governance strengthening. Recently, USAID through their contractor Tetra Tech ARID has been active to gather data on Access to Justice to launch their programme of support. UNDP’s capacity to pool technical resources is clearly visible through achievement of outcomes of the programme to the extent possible during the programme period. UNDP has been able to strategically position itself as the leader, and GoR have trust in UNDPs sincerity in supporting the vulnerable, develop national capacities, creating ownerships, protecting Human Rights, mainstream Gender, and helping CSOs to engage in Governance. UNDP’s vibrancy is palpable the moment we land in any Government office to get data on programme implementation. The National Implementation Modality has further strengthened the respect of stakeholders towards UNDP. Although, other UN agencies are partners of One UN joint programme, UNDP has its strong footing in developing capacities of Government in accordance with national priorities within the ambit of national development planning.

Coming to UNDP Country Office (CO), It has been able to articulate its position as a development partner, and an agency to implement the mandate of United Nations. UNDPs communication channels were clear and direct. The relations developed with the implementing partners have covered up the deficiencies of funds mobilization strategies. The UNDP Governance team, the Country Director, and the Resident Representative have been able to position UNDP in a strategic platform with the Government, despite very sensitive Governance arena in Rwanda. The approaches of identifying partners’ needs and addressing them on time within the available resources, and timely communicating the inabilities have helped UNDP to hold its position firm, and preserve its respect, and reputation.

The Governance team in UNDP country office deserve a special mention for the team spirit it has demonstrated and extended required support to the implementation of the programmes in their right perspective. The respect to all team members and team leaders is not only clearly audible across

implementing partners, but also well documented at all levels. This clarifies the competitive advantage of UNDP for others in the field.

Partnership strategy: UNDP's Partnership Strategy has been to create ownership of processes and management, and ensure aid effectiveness. It worked closely with the Government and aligned its programmes with national development agenda without losing the ground for gender mainstreaming, and preserving and protecting Human Rights. The interviews with the development partners, and implementing partners revealed that the UNDP's partnership strategy had been very appropriate and effective in current political and economic situation of the country. UNDP entered into agreements through One UN with implementing partners, and agreed on implementation of programme through National Implementation Modality. This partnership strategy helped to engage the Government to share certain level of costs for programme delivery, without keeping entire burden on UNDP/ One UN alone. While technical and financial support provided by UNDP, the implementing partners have implemented the programme under technical directions of UNDP, and in accordance with international instruments, where issues of gender, human rights, and rights of persons with disabilities emerged. UNDP ensured to lead all programme components to achieve, to a large extent, programme outcomes of *“Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels”* and *“Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels”*.

UNDP closely partnered with SIDA, DFID, and other development partners to bring them on to one platform so as to ensure uniformity in approach to different stakeholder in governance processes. UNDP's strategy of creating ownership through national implementation modality, working with different partner departments and agencies in Government, and engaging CSOs through RGB helped to strengthen RGBs role in recognizing and engaging the support of civil society in development, advance programmes of accountability; and the CSOs realized the importance of coordinating with the Government for not only for their existence, but also for pushing their agenda of ensuring public accountability of governance.

The success of partnership strategy is clearer in the words of SIDA “The Fund is an instrument that supports the ONE UN approach in Rwanda. The Fund has been established as a vehicle to pool new resources provided by development partners to support the unfunded portions of the United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP). The UNDAP embodies the One Programme principle and is funded through a combination of existing and to be mobilized core and noncore resources of participating organisations and the Rwanda ONE UN Fund. Previously Sweden funded Rwanda through bilateral support, but the aid suspension in late 2012 provided Sweden with the opportunity to continue its funding through the One UN since it was not affected by such political decisions. By doing so, Sweden also complied with its national policy that ONE UN Funds should be supported. Moreover, some of the priority areas that previously received bilateral funding would be able to enjoy uninterrupted support. Working through the ONE UN Fund is new and Sweden is the largest contributor to the fund after the Netherlands and the UN itself.”

Gender Equality: We will now look at to what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of these two programmes (DDAG & A2J) and the level of gender integration in programme implementation, response from the implementing partners. Gender and Human Rights are two cross cutting issues that need to be followed up with international standards

and agreements, and need to be integral part of national development plans.

In the design, implementation and monitoring of the governance interventions in Rwanda, One UN has demonstrated commitment in ensuring effective inclusion and participation of women. This is reflected in UNDP's Strategic Plan (2014-2017), the UNDAF (2013-2018) and Government's EDPRS 2 (2013-2018). Outcomes of these plans, programme, and strategies have strong elements of gender equality and empowerment sections in their designs. For instance, UNDP Strategic Plan's vision is to eradicate extreme poverty and significant reduction in inequalities and exclusion. These policy imperatives reflect UN's commitment to improving not only the livelihood of women but also empowering them by unlocking opportunities for women and girls in the development of their capacities, social relations, the economy, inter-action with the environment, political participation and leadership, crisis and conflict management, and equal protection of rights under the law, including freedom from violence and discrimination. Furthermore, gender equality and women's empowerment are a UN mandate, a GoR goal, and a programming principle for development assistance within the One UN Programme.

One UN's interventions in these two programs have immensely contributed to positive changes in gender equality in Rwanda and have proven that gender marker data assigned to some projects are representative of reality. For instance, UNDP's support to promoting governance has led to increase in representation of women in national decision making at the institutional level since the end of the Genocide. Country's bureaucracy and legislature is satisfactorily represented with gender balance with 64% of parliament seats occupied by women (in the chamber of deputies). Citizen satisfaction survey on gender equality scores 83.72% against overall governance score of 76.48%.⁶ Furthermore, the country's gender statistics show that 38% of women in the Senate; 45.2% are women members of Districts Consultative Councils; 42.7% are the women members of Sectors Consultative Council.⁷ The country expects more women representation at all levels of the public service with the support of UN Women and One UN programmes. These initiatives have increased the participation of women in national and country affairs and their voices have been leveraged to decision-making levels at all levels. Women led Civil Society Organisations have a special recognition in Rwanda in inviting them Governance deliberations and development planning. However, Gender Based Violence (GBV) in Rural and Urban area; and ensuring that women exercised their rights in rural areas, and at sub-national level is still a challenge due to rampant illiteracy among women and men.

Human Rights: Right to Property, Land Rights, and Gender Based Violence, disputes arising out of petty crimes appear to be leading to violation of Human Rights in Rwanda. The programmes' cross cutting theme is to support Human Rights protection in the country and to engage all institutions in ensuring the protection of Human Rights. Therefore, the programmes worked closely with the Ministry of justice, National Human Rights Commission, the office of the ombudsman, National Media High Commission, and Rwanda National Police, National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, and CSOs. The programmes strong endeavours are visible through programme implementation activities and actions initiated and capacity development activities taken up. However, in Rwanda, Human Rights still poses a challenge and sometimes appears to be a sensitive issue despite Rwanda ratified international conventions on Human Rights. The Annual Report of A2J programme for 2016-2017 puts it "Human Rights are the RNP's main concern. By implementing the rule of law and making the safety

⁶ Rwanda Governance Score Card 2016

⁷ National Gender Statistics Report, September 2016

of every individual their responsibility, the RNP is respecting human rights. Victims of any crime are supported. Criminals are tracked and taken to competent institutions to make sure they are tried and punished. It is also the RNP's responsibility to end GBV violence as well as violence against children. The RNP's efforts to fight crime has given criminals an incentive not to be involved in any kind of crime, inevitably leading to the respect of human rights." The Rwanda Governance Score Card 2016 scores the core International Human Rights Conventions at a satisfactory level of 97.78%, and respect for Human Rights in the country at 85.60%. Civil Society Organisations are working in Rwanda with the support of these programmes, and with another CSO specific programme to ensure that the Human Rights situation is improved in Rwanda.

Despite the challenges of Human Rights in Rwanda, the joint One UN programmes have extended persistent support to improve the situation by training the staff, commissioners, and member National Human Rights Commission, and members of CSOs in human rights indicators and in Economic, Social and cultural rights. December 10 is observed every year to sensitize the stakeholders on human rights - in the frame work of the commemoration of the international Human Rights Day. During 2016 itself, UNDP has printed and distributed two hundred booklets containing the National Action plan of Human Rights among different stakeholders, including institutions and CSOs which are involved in the field of Human rights. The booklets informed the public on the first ever Rwanda National Human Right Action Plan. Additionally, 42 members and staff of the National Human Rights Commission were trained in investigations and reporting on human rights and in training methodology.

The programme's commitment to protection of Human Rights is also demonstrated through conducting and supporting self-assessment of implementation of Universal Periodic Review(UPR) Recommendations. With the support of the programme, the Government of Rwanda department responsible for International Justice and Judicial Cooperation organized a high-level stakeholders meeting with 74 participants on the progress of the UPR recommendations and priorities contained in the adopted National Human Rights Action Plan. During the meeting participants exchanged on the progress of the implementation of the 50 recommendations and discussed the priorities set in the National Human Rights Action Plan adopted in February 2017. Continuous effort of UNDP, One UN, OHCHR are clearly visible in protection Human Rights.

6.4. Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness

Efficiency

The programme cannot be more efficient than it is now in the circumstances it has been operating. A programme winning the hearts of all the stakeholders and showing the results to the extent possible with limited resources is definitely efficient. In addition to non-availability of promised funds to full extent, the programmes struggled to be efficient with a very small team in the country office. The programme is being managed with a skeleton staff, shouldering all the responsibilities. Despite this fact, programme has been able to reach the target beneficiaries in the way it was programmed. The available resources of the programme have been very judiciously and efficiently utilized keeping the unwanted expenditure totally out of the budgets.

Effectiveness

On the effectiveness front, the programme has been able to reach out all the stakeholders and advocate for the implementation of the programme in its right perspective. The programme activities

and actions have been designed to strike at the targets very straight precisely. For example, the capacity development initiatives delivered in the programme have been received by the partners with more enthusiasm. The support provided for development of Governance Score Cards, Citizens Report Cards, Electronic Case Management System, and Self-Assessment of UPR is an example of how effective has been the programme support. Training the parliamentarians, use of score cards in decision making, capacity development of Rwanda National Police, support to Rwanda Media High Commission to advance their agenda of change are all the indications of the programme effectiveness. SIDA feels that despite the aid suspension in late 2012 the programmes have provided Sweden with the opportunity to continue its funding through the UN since it was not affected by such political decisions. By doing so, Sweden also complied with its national policy that ONE UN Funds should be supported. Moreover, some of the priority areas that previously received bilateral funding would be able to enjoy uninterrupted support. Working through the ONE UN Fund is new and Sweden is the largest contributor to the fund after the Netherlands and the UN itself. No more examples needed to show the effectiveness of the programme.

6.5. Other findings of evaluation

- a. Deepening of Democracy as generally understood is reaching out more people and encouraging them to participate in election. One of major achievements towards DDAG programme outcome is the UNDP support to the country to achieve a fair, peaceful and transparent elections. Local, parliamentarians and presidential elections were supported and a lot was achieved towards citizen participation under that component. People participation in presidential elections (2017) has been very rate. Out of total registered voters of 6,897,076 the voters turned were 6,769,514 registering a participation of 98.15 % in the elections history of Rwanda. In 2015 referendum the voter turnout was 98.38%. Thus, in all the elections, the voter turnout is more than 95% indicating a real deepening of democracy.
- b. UNDP has been instrumental in design and delivery of capacity development training courses. With the technical and financial support provide by UNDP, the Ministry of Justice has been able to prioritise their activities to provide legal support to Genocide perpetrators to mainstream in to the society. As per Ministry of Justice records, there are more than thrice the number of people in the prisons are in the society, the number of persons in the prisons being 120000. With the programmatic support of UNDP for mobilisation of community support and organization of counselling camps, the NURC is able to make the perpetrators realise the mistakes they had committed and endeavours are on to integrate them into society. This is an achievement of A2J programme that is working for Justice, peace consolidation and human rights.
- c. In 30 Districts of Rwanda A2J is enabled through initiatives of community participation, MAJ overall coordinator who represents vulnerable people in court, 1 MAJ in charge of GBV and Abunzi (mediators) Committees, and 1 MAJ in charge of Judgement execution.
- d. Outcomes seen through these initiatives are: Change of behaviour; Gender sensitivity; Use of new gender sensitive vocabulary (She or He); drafting Gender mainstreaming strategies etc.
- e. Parliament is the highest body in the country that makes everyone accountable. Now, Ombudsman, NCHR, National Commission for the Fight against Genocide and Rwanda Governance Board are accountable for the Parliament of Rwanda. UNDP support has been helpful in developing capacities of parliamentarians. However, Parliament now foresees,

specially designed capacity development trainings in the areas like: Policy Analysis; Budget Analysis; parliamentary processes; Knowledge Management in Parliament; Drafting and standardisation of parliamentary proceedings and processes; International Study Tours for parliamentarians to give inputs on best practices.

- f. In the legal aid system of Rwanda, the Ministry of Justice signed a contract with the Rwanda Bar Association to provide legal aid to the indigents identified by the Government. The indigent gets legal aid from the Government for all civil cases, based on an indigent certificate produced by them from the competent authorities. However, getting such certificate, itself is a great challenge for the vulnerable. Add to this, legal aid is available only in civil cases, the criminal cases are referred to Rwanda Bar Association for provision of free legal services. Rwanda Bar Association assigns a lawyer if the referred person a) has an indigent certificate; b) if there is any merit in fighting the case and all the evidences are available with the litigant. Thus, Rwanda Bar Association s pre-empting the decision against the litigant even before going to the court.
- g. Engagement of a private lawyer is very expensive in Rwanda, and people with no means or small means are not able to meet the lawyer costs, thereby being thrown into an environment of denial of justice. This reinforces the need for a stronger Access to Justice initiative.
- h. Rwanda Bar Association (RBA) has a concern on the delivery approaches of the programme. UNDP's financial support so far been through to Government, and not directly supported RBA. RBA feels that If, instead of Government, International community and UNDP provides financial support for capacity enhancement, awareness raising, and logistics for the lawyers to take up the cases, the justice will be more accessible.
- i. Many prisoners are still not aware of their rights. There is no awareness programme for the prisoners with the Government. Therefore, many prisoners are spending their life without any relief in prisons. NHRC and some NGOs are visiting the prisoners, however, general feeling is that the required awareness is not being raised among the prisoners.
- j. After hearing the cases, orders are passed by the courts in a reasonable time, however, the execution of orders is taking a lot of time due to various socio-economic reasons. Particularly, in property disputes, people are not able come out of judgement debt.
- k. The National Human Rights Commission mainly formulates policies for protection of human rights and makes recommendations for implementation and sends them to the treaty bodies. After final examination of recommendations, the treaty body sends them to the Government for implementation. However, the implantation depends on the strong political will of the Government either immediately implement the recommendations or to postpone.
- l. Need assessment of the National Human Rights Commission has been done with the help of UNDP. This helped in strengthening the capacity, conduct surveys (Five surveys conducted in the area of Right to work); formulation of policies, and strengthening the capacity of law enforcing institutions and agencies.
- m. Mismatch of Financial Year of UNDP with the Financial Year of Government is sometimes delaying release of funds, as felt by implementing partners. Financial year for the UNDP is January to December, whereas for the Government is July to June. With these dates, IPs are sometimes unaware of the availability of funds. Furthermore, procurement processes at

- implementing partners level are very lengthy and thereby frustrating the very purpose of procurement.
- n. The fourth edition of the Governance Scorecard indicates that rule of law is the all-time best performer with a cumulative improvement rate of 11.97 per cent for the last five years.
 - o. Quality of service delivery (72.93 per cent), investing in human capital (74.88 per cent), and citizen participation and inclusiveness (76.48 per cent) are among the least performers, according to the index.
 - p. Governance Score Card indicates that, the performance of judiciary decreased by - 5.24% compared to the previous scorecard. The main challenge is seen where the disposal pace of cases is affected by backlog. The access to Justice sub-indicator decreased by – 3.77%. The scorecard also shows that the Rule of Law indicator score decrease is attributed to the adjustment of some of the sub-indicators as well as the introduction of new ones.
 - q. It is apparently understandable that citizens are demanding more involvement especially in the planning and budgeting processes. Noteworthy, is the Civil Society Participation sub-indicator which registered a considerable increase from 63.65% in RGS 2014 to 72.45% in RGS 2016. Similar progress is also recorded in the areas of peace, safety, social cohesion as awareness of elections, and media availability.

6.6. Sustainability of results

The results under both programmes show that they are sustainable. Provided, some more support for few more years is ensured through extension of these programmes in the absence of any clearly articulated exit strategy in the programme documents. The programme results induce implementers to carryout system sustaining activities. For example, electronic case management system. It has to be continued and cannot be stopped now. The system is already geared up to catch its full speed. To make it fully functional, few more years of support to enhance technical capacities and updating knowledge is required. So are accountability exercises, and bringing out scorecards. These activities as well are sustainable on their own technical merits. However, as said above, few more years of support with a second phase of programme is an immediate requirement. Furthermore, a resource mobilization strategy, and exit strategy to clarify how the programme could be fully transferred to Government to run with its own budgetary support could have been more appropriate. In the absence of these tow strategies, question of sustainability may raise some concerns. These concerns can be answered with the visible Government systems of strong political will to extend an accountable and participative democracy to the people of the country. Thus, all the results of both the programmes are sustainable, and already showing the signs of sustainability with strong political will to provide accountable governance, access to justice, peace consolidation, gender equality, and protection of Human Rights.

SWOT ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS (Table 7)

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programmes are focused on achievement of outcomes, more specifically, the programme design and outputs, activities, and actions are well defined in A2J Programme. • Programmes are demand driven & NIM modality • No other players are strongly coming into Governance area to Governance for accountability. • UNDP has a comparative advantage IPs look at UNDP in preference to others in the sector • Governance is seen as capacity domain of UNDP • UNDP and One UN have adopted a flexible approach that meets the demands of GoR. • Programme focused on Capacity Development in the first place, that is the greatest strength. Sustainable capacity can be assured, and it will be value for money as well. • UNDP -RGB relations are very strong, communications modalities adopted by UNDP are strong. • EDPRS outcomes just match programme outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No resource mobilization strategy, and no exit strategy clearly spelt out in the programme document • Low capacity of implementing partners, reporting and communication need strengthening • Human resources deployed in the programme unit of UNDP are barest minimum. • Communication and information supply from RGB is very slow • Literacy levels among women at rural level are very low • No strong inter-linkages between the implementing partners; coordinated efforts to produce result • Other UN partners in development excepting UN WOMEN are not visible on the field
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong political will to provide accountable and trouble-free services to citizens; • Commitment of Government to provide transparent and speedy justice delivery mechanisms • Government gives high priority to citizen engagement in responsive and accountable governance- UMUGANDA is a platform for citizen engagement • EPDRS II and National Transformation strategy align with United Nation's priorities • Government is very fast in introducing reforms, the reform agenda is an opportunity to introduce accountability systems • Media is active, and eager to enhance their capacity to meet world reporting standards • UNDP is preferred for One UN by implementing partners • Governance sector is not funded by other development partners and it remains a UN domain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some donors like Sweden wanted to directly partner with implementing partners. • USAID is slowly chipping into A2J with components to strengthen citizen participation in decision making • No signs of pooling up of resources to the extent projected • Priorities of Government are fast changing, a five-year programme is losing its importance in changing environment. (See recommendations on short duration components for a long duration programme)

6.7. Conclusions

Important conclusions

- Both programmes have been implemented in their right perspective and the outcomes of both the programmes have been largely achieved with high satisfactory levels.
- Funding is not sufficient for the promises made in the programmes. The programmes appear ambitious keeping the Governance and socio-economic situation of Rwanda in view.
- Instead of taking the load of too many projects, the programmes should have been focused on one or two issues. For example, strengthening citizens participation- this will fit well within the CSO strengthening programme. In its stead, DDAG programme could have been focused only on strengthening accountable governance- strengthening of institutions, individuals within the accountable systems, and working on policy and legal framework to create an environment of accountable Governance. Widening the scope of CSO programme may be required.
- Printing and Production of score cards and reports alone do not create an accountable environment. Accountable environment can be created through persistent campaign on Government's openness to public scrutiny, improving the service delivery, developing tools to audit Government programme, systems, and procedures for public participation, civic

education, introduction social audit systems, and technically strengthening oversight institutions.

- e. One of the great strength of the programmes is they are demand driven. In demand driven programmes, achievement of objectives becomes easier, and monitoring and evaluation will be timely. This opportunity has been used more judiciously by the programme manager, however, they struggled with less funding support, and donor disinterest in Governance sector in Rwanda.

Areas of Assessment and Interventions (Table 8)	Rating
Programme Relevance	Highly Satisfactory
Programme concept and rational	Highly Satisfactory
Programme Risk and Assumptions analysis	Satisfactory
Programme Effectiveness	Highly Satisfactory
Key Stakeholders' participation	Highly Satisfactory
Programme implementation arrangements	Satisfactory
Programme Efficiency	Highly Efficient
Financial planning and management	Highly Efficient in terms of using the available resources
Programme Planning	Highly Satisfactory
Programme Monitoring and evaluation	Marginally Satisfactory
Programme support provided and output results	Highly Satisfactory
Sustainability	Highly Sustainable
Sustainability of Results and actions	Highly Sustainable

- f. Programme planning, management, monitoring, and risk analysis is well articulated in the programme documents, and necessary mitigation steps have been taken to lead the programme to its logical conclusion even in the absence of an exit strategy, and funds mobilization strategy.
- g. Partnerships are well created, and National Ownership through National Implementation modality has given desired results.
- h. Access to Justice is very expensive in Rwanda, Governments approach of supporting only criminal cases with legal aid made many indigent litigants lose their cases for want of money to engage a good lawyer.
- i. Execution of judgement is taking a lot time thereby denying the justice offered by court orders
- j. Implementation of programme activities is very good in the programme both the programmes have implemented more than 90% of their activities, and results are as expected at the programme planning stage.
- k. As per governance score card 2015 “Media availability and access to information for citizens” scored 65.8%. This means that while the number of media outlets has increased, citizens still feel they are less involved as news sources. An access to information law was enacted in 2013 and there are ongoing efforts to popularise it, many citizens are yet to know about it and use it.
- l. Finally, it can be concluded that UNDP has a strong presence in the Governance sector, and Government of Rwanda, and its agencies are looking at UNDP and UN agencies for continued support with programmes aligned with national priorities.

6.8. Lessons learnt

The implementation of the programmes taught a few lessons during the programme implementation stage. These can be kept in mind while designing future programmes or extension of programmes.

- a. Well-coordinated programme gives desired results. In both the programmes, where coordination levels were high, the programme implementation has shown quick results and activities were of everyone's acceptance.
- b. In national implementation modality assure the Government only what is possible in terms of resources. Do not communicate higher amounts in the beginning itself. If more amounts assured at the beginning of the programme, and the resources are not pooled/mobilised during the course of implementation, the implementation suffers for want of funds and results cannot be achieved.
- c. Do not design very long duration programmes for Rwanda. This country context is different. The issues of support identified at the time of drafting the programme document are becoming irrelevant after three to four years of implementation due fast changes taking place. Sometimes, Government cannot wait for support from funding agencies and postpone immediate programme needs.
- d. More focus on sub-national institutions, and working with local governments could have resulted in better performance in democratization process, upstream policy support alone is not sufficient, decentralization and de-concentration are also important.
- e. Mere institutional strengthening or capacity development of judicial personnel is not sufficient, people should be economically well off to utilize the judicial systems in the country. Poverty denies justice with huge professional fee of lawyers. Arguably, access to justice improves economic empowerment. However, such very access should not be costly.
- f. Illiteracy is the main challenge for women to be aware of their rights. Ignorance is throwing them into misery.
- g. One UN is not as popular as UNDP is. All the participating UN agencies in One UN have to make their presence felt, and should be equally accountable for any technical flaws related to their own thematic capacity in programme implementation. For example, projects on Child rights can be better managed by UNICEF.
- h. Bringing together key stakeholders in democratic governance in the program⁸ implementation framework, and holding regular joint discussions with partners, promotes synergy and coherence in implementation. One example is the last media dialogue organised by MHC which also served as a platform for the launch of the media barometer developed by RGB; both activities paved the way for the development of the Journalism Award. Similarly, NFPO benefited from a professional BRIDGE training using NEC experts;
- i. Stakeholder collaboration in implementing program activities helps to achieve substantive results. For example, bringing the Association of Rwanda Female Journalists on board as an organization focused on gender equality promotion in the media sector brought added value for trainings on gender equality and women's rights.

⁸ Annual report of DDAG 2017

7. Recommendations

These recommendations are made based on evaluation of information collected through desk review of documents, discussions, and interviews with stakeholders. However, recommendations made by midterm evaluators which still hold good are not repeated as they have already been responded to by the management appropriately.

- a. The first recommendation is continuing with support to Government of Rwanda with second phase of the programmes with clear indication of yearly deliverables, and with provision to revise deliverables in the middle of programme duration;
- b. Include a clearly articulated resource mobilization strategy for clearly identifiable donors and quantum funding expected; clear commitments to fund the programme activities could be more appropriate. If possible, different thematic activities may be assigned to different donors, and achievement those outputs to be linked to donor funding/ source of funding. If no fund no achievement in that area of activity.
- c. Explain an exit strategy in the programme document linking to sustainability of results after exit. Agree with the national counterparts with the exit strategy to own the processes after the closure of programme, and obtain commitments at the beginning.
- d. Lobby and work with the Government for Legal Aid in criminal cases as well. The current approach of Government that in criminal cases Government being the party to the litigation, it should not finance against itself is not tenable. Conceptually Democratic states are also welfare states and the states to protect the rights of the citizens. Providing legal aid either in Criminal or Civil cases is support to protection of rights. Therefore, One UN should work with the Government to provide legal aid in all the cases for the indigent. (Indian Legal Aid system is an example; the Legal Aid authority of India has a team of Advocates in every court and they are paid by Legal Aid authority pre-decided fee to each case)
- e. In programmes like Deepening of Democracy, establishment of public accountability clarify in the programme document the approaches of deepening of democracy and creating accountability, and build activities and actions around these approaches. For example, if we mean deepening of democracy is seeing that every adult casts her vote in the election, and participates in the process of democracy; the approaches and activities could be campaigning on democratization of politics, voter rights, value of participation in elections, civic education on democratic rights, lessons to be included in curriculum from High School level on political ideology, democratization of Governance, electoral system, rights of voters, and public administration systems of the country. Support to conduct of model parliaments, and assemblies in school and colleges may take the message of democracy as deep as possible.
- f. Clarify the capacity development initiatives in the programme document itself without just using the term 'support for capacity development'. Instead say “ *Technical and Financial Support will be provided to draft national policy on gender mainstreaming by middle of 2018; technical and financial support will be provided to draft a legal framework to enforce gender rights by middle of 2018; lobbied with the Government to take up the Gender law in the next session of Parliament*’ Short duration programmes on ‘ *Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Based budgeting, and on Sexual Harassment at work place, will be designed and training will be imparted in Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, and Ministry of Labour on pilot basis, and 15 such courses will be held by end of 2018.*
- g. Parliament foresees UNDP’s technical support in the areas of :Policy Analysis; Budget Analysis; Training the Staff of Parliament in different aspects of management of

Parliamentary affairs; Knowledge Management in Parliament; Drafting and standardisation of parliamentary proceedings and processes; International Study Tours for parliamentarians to give inputs on best practices, and how parliamentary processes are conducted in different countries; and induction courses to new parliamentarians. This can be taken up to strengthen parliament accountability to public.

- h.* Laws affecting the lives of people are there, however, they are not in the language of the people, legal awareness is very poor. Therefore, continuous awareness raising on available laws, legal rights, legal support, and legal processes is recommended. UNDP can think of a special module in their capacity development only on raising legal awareness at national and sub-national levels;
- i.* Rwanda media High Commission looks at having support from UNDP for programme designed in accordance with the mandate of Media High Commission; study tours on best practices in journalism- both print and electronic media, support to media outreach to rural areas, support for Human Resource Development in media.
- j.* Sending UNDP national staff on brief secondment to other countries is recommended. Sending UNDP national staff, particularly to the countries where large programmes are running with UNDP support, and to the countries where Government systems and procedures are well established will enhance the understanding on various core issues. This will be better than a classroom training.
- k.* If possible, CSO programme may be combined with Governance programme or CSO component from Governance programme may be transferred to CSO programme. With combining, there will be an integration between accountability and CSO strengthening activities, and synergies between deepening democracy and civil society participation in awareness raising on democracy.

With the above recommendations, the reportage of evaluation rests.

INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT DDAG PROGRAMME

<i>Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels</i>	Output 1: National and local institutions have improved capacity for research , generation and utilisation of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence based legislation, policy formulation, and planning at all levels;
	Output 2: Central, decentralised entities and communities have better capacity to promote community driven development processes
	Output 3: National oversight institutions have strong capacity to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels
	Output 4: Citizens, communities and media have capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels
	Output 5: Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme
1. Under Output One	
a. Number of thematic reports generated, and thematic areas	Number of thematic reports generated: 8 (4CRCs, 4 RGS and 2RMB) Thematic areas: Evidence based research for planning and policy formulation (RGS and RMB); Citizen engagement and increased participation in governance and decision making (CRC); Joint Governance Assessment (JGA) 1
b. Number of districts using sex aggregated data for planning- give the names of the districts and the plans	All the 30 districts main stream Gender based on the guidelines provided by the Gender Monitoring Office. In other words, the districts identify Gender gaps and plan activities for filling those gaps in a document known as the Gender budget statements.
c. Any promulgated laws	Access to information law; Law governing the commemoration of genocide against Tutsi and management of memorials of genocide against Tutsi.
d. Any policy documents	Draft Policy on Service Delivery; Draft Policy on Media Development
a. Number of district development plans implemented in consultation with the community achieving 80% under Imihigo	2015/16 Imihigo – 2 districts (Gasabo and Gicumbi achieved up to 80 % Score in Imihigo (81.6%, 80.3% respectively); and for 2016/17 Imihigo – 5 districts (Rwamagana, Musanze, Huye, Gakenke, Nyarugenge and Gatsibo scored up to 80% and above (with the last 2 districts (Nyarugenge and Gatsibo precisely scoring 79.71% and 79.55% respectively). Note: the 10% score in Imihigo is based on how the district has scored on different indicators of the Citizen report card (Citizen perception survey conducted annually by RGB)
b. Number of community based best practices documented, shared, and replicated (Give details)	Girinka Munyarwanda (One cow per poor family programme) National Umushyikirano Council (National Dialogue); Umwihherero (National Leadership retreat); Performance Contracts, National Unity and Reconciliation programs such as Ndi Umunyarwanda; National Itorero program
c. When was the last Citizen Score Card published? Up to what date the data was collected?	CRC 2017 is at the final draft (Kinyarwanda version disseminated); Data was collected in May 2017
a. Is media self-regulatory mechanism developed and implemented? When?	A media self-regulatory mechanism was established and lunched by journalists during their general assembly in September 2013. The primary mandate of this mechanism is to ensure that media is responsible, accountable and professional in its service to the public and this calls for effective enforcement of ethical standards and respect of journalist's rights and freedoms which are well

	<p>articulated in the current Rwanda Journalists and Media Practitioners Code of Ethics.</p> <p>It is therefore mandated to nurture ethical journalistic practices, protect media consumers against abuse, and speak on behalf of journalists on matters relating to the protection and promotion of their rights which are linked to their profession.</p> <p>This mechanism is now operational with defined structures and handles all media self- regulation related complaints.</p>
b. What were the recommendations of oversight institutions?	<p>According to RMB 2015, the following key recommendations on media self-regulation were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned institutions should continue public awareness on the access to information law. This sensitization should also include educating local leaders of the existence of the access to information law and their responsibility to provide information to journalists as well as citizens. <p>There is a need to continue supporting and strengthening the media self-regulatory body to enable it to build internal capacity and handle media-related complaints more effectively and promote ethical conduct of media practitioners.</p>
c. What percentage of the above implemented?	80% - Awareness on the role of media self-regulation mechanism and access to information law is being done across different districts
d. What are the Monitoring Report recommendations?	<p>Given the broader and vital mandate for the media self-regulation mechanism, there is need to increase its budget.</p> <p>The increase in the budget would facilitate the purchase of stronger and high capacity monitoring equipment used in media monitoring and regulation.</p> <p>Need to increase specialised staff in charge of media monitoring and regulation. This would ease the analysis of media monitoring content and reports</p> <p>There's need to train journalists on their Code of Ethics and all media laws so as to avoid breaching them</p>
a. % of women in decision making positions- give evidence	Parliament (64%), Senate (38%), Judiciary (43%), and Cabinet (40%) among others. Rwanda has taken special measures to improve social welfare of women and men as a strategy to reduce poverty.
b. % of citizens satisfied with their participation in decision making	Information not provided/ not available
a. Are you reporting the progress on time?	Yes
b. What is your human resource structure?	DDAG Coordinator, (Coordinating the Project) DDAG Governance Specialist, DDAG Media M&E Specialist, (Working on the day to day follow up of the implementation of Project activities) Finance Manager, Finance Officer, (in charge of the day to day management of project funds) and DDAG Driver
c. How many people are working in the system?	6
d. Do you feel they are adequate?	Yes

INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT A2J PROGRAMME

<i>Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights, justice, and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels.</i>	Output 1: Strengthened capacity of the Justice sector(JRLO) to increase access to justice, including for women, children, and the most vulnerable
	Output 2: Enhanced National Capacities for promotion, mainstreaming Human Rights and Implementing Treaty Body and UPR recommendations.
	Output 3: Fundamental Rights of children promoted through birth registration
	Output 4: Enhanced Mechanisms for sustainable peace consolidation, Unity and reconciliation
	Output 5: Project management and oversight functions enhanced
e. Is functional integrated case management system available?	<p>Coverage: RNP: 29%; NPPA: 100%; Judiciary: 100%; MINIJUST (CLS/MAJ):100%; RCS: 100%</p> <p>Users trained: RNP: 442/ 684; NPPA: 100%; Judiciary: 100%; MINIJUST (CLS/MAJ):100%; RCS: 100%; RBA: 673/ 1,200; PBA:0/160; Non-PB:0/ 2,564; Military Justice: 0/84. However, as there is a new module for the Judgement execution, there might be a refresher course for the Judges and registrars on this module.</p> <p>Impacts in terms of access to justice: 100% of prosecution and court cases filed and processed online in all prosecution levels and courts. Total Cases filed is 93,590 so far, 54,856 of them pronounced, People make online Follow-up of cases and their current status and next status, Availability of Judgment copies online which originally accounted for 35.72% of the reasons litigants physically went to courts 2014. The 2016 RGS has scored the Use of ICT in the Judiciary at 82.85%, a proof of the use of ICT and in particular the IECMS is highly regarded by the citizens. The ICT has incredibly contributed to the performance of the justice sector in Rwanda since 2015. The Rwanda justice sector's Integrated Electronic Case Management System (IECMS) has received the Top Ten Tech Solutions Award in 2017 for its importance in improving</p>

	access to justice but also the system generates jobs for trained young people at Internet cafes across Rwanda.
f. % of population including women and most vulnerable satisfied with the judiciary, Abunzi, courts	According to RGS 2016, the Abunzi services remain a living testimony of a tremendous pace made by the Rwandan justice system. It has handled at least 91.80% of cases received, while the remaining ones were oriented in other courts. Moreover, the report shows that 79% % of citizens are satisfied with Abunzi performance. In addition, the confidence and trust people have towards Rwandan courts has increased as was proven by the 2015 Citizen Report Card, a study conducted by Rwanda Governance Board, which indicated that people have confidence in courts to the level of 88.2%. It was confirmed by International reports such as World Economic Forum, Global competitiveness Index; 2015-2016. This report indicated that the Rwandan Judiciary is ranked 26th among 140 countries assessed worldwide; the 2nd place in Africa after South Africa and the 1st place in East Africa regarding independence of the judiciary. (Ref: Global competitiveness report 2015-2016, pg 309)
g. % of the population including women and the most vulnerable satisfied with police and prosecution-	The performance of the Prosecution has scored 91.80% in the 2016 Rwanda Governance Scorecard (RGS) while the Police scored 89.78% (CRC, 2015 and RNP/ MININTER, 2015) while overall indicator on Maintaining security scored 94.44%.
h. Other indicators	The UNDP support to Legal Aid has also borne fruits. After the pilot of the MAJ and its scale up to the 30 districts countrywide, citizens satisfaction with Legal Aid in particular with MAJ has scored 86%. Furthermore, as a result of the good work of MAJ, the Ministry of Justice has been awarded with GOLDEN CUP by African Association for Public Administration and Management Secretariat (AAPAM) in November 2017 for excellency in Public Legal Access to Justice services delivery through “Maison d’Accès à la Justice” (MAJ) based in all districts Country Wide.
d. Number of CSOs participating in the parallel reporting- what data source do you have?	25 (LAF) – A coalition of 25 CSOs prepared a parallel report with UNDP support and submitted the report to the Human Rights Council and attended the lobbying events in Geneva during the 2015 UPR review session.

e. % of reports submitted timely by national actors as required of HR obligations	100% - All due reports to the Treaty Bodies are submitted on time as a result strengthened systems at national level (Treaty Body Task Force). There is no overdue report to the Treaty Bodies as of 2017.
f. % of UPR recommendations accepted and implemented by the government- what are the recommendations	94% of 2011 UPR recommendations were implemented by November 2015. Out of 67 accepted recommendations, 63 had been implemented. Out of the 50-accepted recommendation from 2015 session, 50% have been implemented as of today.
g. Any other indicators?	The Government was able to draft and adopt by cabinet the National Human Rights Plan with One UN support
e. Do you have strategic plan for fundamental rights of children? Explain briefly its contents- when it was developed and how is it being implemented?	UNICEF did not implement the activities related to birth registration as planned in the prodoc. However, in partnership with NISR and NIDA, National Strategy for the Modernization of Civil Registration System and the National Strategy for Development of Statistics developed by National Identification Agency (NIDA) and National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR) respectively, to improve the Civil Registration and Vital Statistics (CRVS) system for upholding individual rights and furthering the country's development agenda.
f. What is the business model for registration of births and deaths of children? When was it developed? How is it working?	This is again an activity implemented directly by UNICEF. Important to note that the programme document provide the execution of the programme through two funding modalities: pooled funding where UNDP is implementing and Parallel funding where UNICEF is implementing activities. UNDP had no control over this component.
g. Do you have any awareness campaigns about use of registration of births and deaths?	Same as above
h. Who is the authority to register births and deaths?	The authority to register births and deaths is the local administration (at sector level).
c. % of citizens satisfied with reconciliation, social cohesion, and unity mechanisms- how	The 2015 Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer is commissioned by NURC. The team make a sample of the population and distribute questionnaires and conduct interviews and measure progress based on

do you calculate the percentage?	citizens perception. The methodology is explained in the RRB report for 2015 (released in 2016). The Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer has shown that up to 92.5 per cent of Rwandans today feel that unity and reconciliation has been achieved and that citizens live in harmony, and feel more unified and live harmoniously together. This is a result of continued efforts by NURC and partners conducting community dialogue, social healing initiatives such as joint cooperatives, income generations activities, truth-telling, seeking forgiveness and forgiving, etc.
d. No of Reconciliation Barometers developed every two years. When was it last developed?	Now 3 developed including 2010 (only quantitative); 2012 (2010 version added a qualitative report) and 2015 (most recent).
e. % of citizens expressing a high level of satisfaction of their personal security. How do you measure this?	Rwanda Governance Score Card scores very high on this. The Score card is very comprehensive This is based on citizen perceptions. At the same time, the Level of satisfaction of citizens with personal security remain high at 98.10% (Citizen Report Card 2015)
e. Number of joint field visits organised- who participated in these visits, and when was the last visit.	Two fields visit every year. All members of the program board, all projects coordinators and all donors of the sector, UN Agencies: UNDP, UN Women, UNICEF, Representatives of CSOs of the sector
f. How do you rate the delivery of the programme?	95% - The delivery of the programme is measured by the level of programme delivery against the planned budget. Overall, the delivery was around 95% except for the 1 st year of implementation when delivery was lower compared to other years.
g. What constraints did you face to achieve the target of 'b' above?	Capacity of IPs (reporting, disbursement rate, etc.) - The capacity of IPs has always been a challenge, despite the capacity building efforts. But UNDP has noted great improvements in the reporting (financial and narrative) over the last 2 years. Unfortunately, the programmes also faced the challenge of staff turnover within some institutions which has impacted on the delivery of programme outputs. The level of funding of course was such an issue for delivery.

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND CONSULTED

1. Programme Document Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Accountable Governance
2. Promoting Access to Justice, Human and Peace Consolidation in Rwanda
3. Rwanda Governance Scorecard 2016
4. Rwanda Media Barometer 2016
5. Rwanda Media Barometer 2013
6. Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer 2015
7. Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer 2012
8. National Umushyikirano Council (2003-2014) October 2016
9. Rwanda Citizen Report Card 2010
10. Rwanda Citizen Report Card 2012
11. Rwanda Governance Review- Governance Month 2013- Vol. III
12. Rwanda Governance Review – Governance Month 2015- Vol Vi Special issue Dec 2015
13. Rwanda Governance Review Spl Issue Vol IV, November 2014
14. Documenting Home- Grown Initiatives, assessing the performance of Mediation Committees, Vol. II special issue December 2012
15. Rwanda Reconciliation Barometer- 2015
16. UNDP- 2013-2018
17. Economic Development Poverty Reduction Strategy 2 Rwanda
18. UNEG Evaluation tools
19. DDAG Annual Progress Report
20. A2J Annual Progress Reports
21. DDAG Mid-Term Evaluation(MTE)
22. A2J Mid-Term Evaluation
23. UNOHRC Brochure on Human Rights
24. RNFP Brochure
25. ToR for the consultancy
26. New Times News Reports

Persons Consulted and Interviewed

1. RWANBUYONZA Jean Paul, Coordinator, DDGA Rwanda Governance Board
2. Kalisa Edward, Secretary General, Rwanda Governance Board
3. NDAYISISABA Fidele, Executive Secretary, Rwanda Unity and Reconciliation Commission
4. Sara Haglund, First Secretary/ Programme Manager, Embassy of Sweden
5. SINYIGAYA Silas, Executive Secretary, Rwanda Civil Society Platform
6. Me Laurent NKONGOLI, Legal Representative, Association Rwanda Pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (ARDHO)
7. Georgine, MUKAYIRANGA, Executive Secretary, Legal Representative, Association Rwanda pour la Défense des Droits de l'homme (ARDHO)
8. Me Laurent, Advocate, Cabinet d Avocats S' Yves
9. NABAHIRE Anastase, Justice Sector Secretariat Coordinator, Ministry of Justice
10. JIJUKA Zephyrin, Programme Coordinator, National Consultative Forum of Political Organisations
11. Victor Mugabe, Executive Director, Rwanda Bar Association
12. Stephen RODRIQUES, Country Director UNDP Rwanda
13. Nadine U.R. Sibomana, Head- Governance Unit, UNDP Rwanda
14. Jean Marie Vianney GASHIRABAKE, Human Rights Assistant, One UN Rwanda
15. SP Alex Fata, Director of Projects, Rwanda National Police
16. Emmanuel Macumu, Administrative and Finance Assistant, Rwanda National Police
17. NIWE, Rukundo Claude, National Commission for Human Rights Rwanda
18. RUSANGA Dieudonne, Rwanda National Parliament
19. CecileCecile Mupfasoni, Governance Unit, UNDP Rwanda
20. Eugenie Musabyeyezu, Governance Unit, UNDP Rwanda
21. Theopista Kanzayire, Governance Unit, UNDP Rwanda
22. Jean de Dieu Kayiranga, Governance Unit, UNDP Rwanda
23. Kay Kurimoto, UNDP, Rwanda
24. Peninah (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
25. Innocent M (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
26. Grace (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
27. Yagnesh (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
28. Vipul (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
29. Laxman (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)
30. Karim (People living in Kigali who shared their opinions on Governance and A2J)

TOR FOR EVALUATION CONSULTANCY

THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME-RWANDA

*Empowered Lives.*

Democratic Governance Outcome Evaluation

INTERNATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

Terms of Reference

1. BACKGROUND

Rwanda has made remarkable progress in recent decades following the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsis. This progress is marked by sustained economic growth, poverty reduction, national reconciliation, rule of law, and overall security of the country. However, several challenges remain in certain areas of democratic governance.

In line with UNDP's Strategic Plan 2014- 2017 "*Changing with the world*", inclusive and effective democratic governance remains an important area of work for UNDP globally and UNDP Rwanda particularly. UNDP Rwanda has been engaged in the democratic governance sector for a long time.

The current programming cycle is aligned to the Government of Rwanda's second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II) and the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP), both covering the 2013 -2018 periods.

In September 2015, the UN Member States adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which commits to promoting development in a sustainable way—economically, socially and environmentally—in all countries of the world, leaving no one behind and paying special attention to those people who are poorest or most excluded. It contains 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with associated targets to assess progress.

Given Rwanda's progress in democratic governance, Rwanda was selected to be part of the global piloting phase on SDG 16, as an elaborated system for data collection, including baselines and targets, was already in place to track progress in governance, rule of law and security.⁹

⁹ Final report on illustrative work to pilot governance in the context of SDGs, RGB, Feb 2016

Delivering as One in Rwanda

Having been among the first pilot countries, Rwanda adopted the Delivering as One approach many years ago, the 2013 -2018 UNDAP outlines a common vision, planning, and implementation on how the UN system can support the national needs and priorities as described in Vision 2020 and the 2013-2018 Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy II (EDPRS II).

UNDP Rwanda actively participates in two Sector Working Groups (SWG) of EDPRS II: The Justice and Rule of Law Sector and the Decentralization and Governance sector, including co-Chairing the technical working group on ICT for the first working Group and on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the latter SWG. The evaluation will be conducted at a time when broader development process, such as the elaboration of Vision 2050 and EDPRS III are taking place.

The 2013 -2018 UNDAP is centred around 4 key results areas:

- Inclusive Economic transformation
- Accountable Governance
- Human Development, Humanitarian Response and Disaster Management
- One UN Business Operations

The democratic governance portfolio of UNDP Rwanda is situated in Results Area 2 ('Accountable Governance'). UNDP Rwanda acts as co-Chair of this Development Results Group, jointly with UN WOMEN, and is the overall lead agency in this results area.

The governance programs of UNDP Rwanda contribute to both outcome of this Results Area 2 'Accountable Governance', namely Outcome 2.1. '*Citizen Participation and Empowerment: accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels improved*' and Outcome 2.2. '*Justice, Gender Equality and Human Rights: human rights, justice and gender equality promoted and implemented at all levels*'.

UNDP Rwanda also acts as co-Chair of the Programmes, Policy and Oversight Committee (PPOC) of the One UN Rwanda.

Democratic Governance Portfolio

The Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit (DGPCU) of UNDP Rwanda is one of the two key programmatic units and leads the work in the governance area.

In addition to the roles mentioned above, UNDP Rwanda is also the lead agency for 3 One UN Joint Programmes situated in area of Democratic Governance:

- 1) Deepening Democracy through Strengthening Citizen Participation and Accountable Governance (DDAG);
- 2) Promoting Access to Justice, Human Rights and Peace Consolidation (A2J).
- 3) Strengthening Civil Society organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance (CSOs).

The 3 Joint Programmes have the following UN partners:

- **DDAG:** UNDP, UN WOMEN, UNV and OHCHR

- **A2J:** UNDP, UNICEF, UN WOMEN and OHCHR.
- **CSOs:** UNDP and UN WOMEN (formally joined in 2016)

The implementing partners of these programmes are the following:

- **DDAG:**
 - o the Rwanda Governance Board, which implements components related to generating evidence based research and assessments such as the production of the Rwanda Governance Score Card (RGS), as well as the Citizen Report Card, Mobile School of Governance and media reform activities;
 - o the Media High Council, which is responsible for media capacity building activities;
 - o the Rwandan Parliament, which is responsible for legislative and oversight components;
 - o the National Forum for Political Organizations, which works towards strengthening the political engagement and dialogue among the youth and women;
 - o National Electoral Commission, which is responsible for\ delivering free, fair and credible parliamentary, local level and presidential elections.
- **CSOs:**
 - o Rwanda Governance Board, which is the national authority in charge of registering and monitoring national CSOs.
 - o CSOs working in the area of civic education, citizen engagement, environment protection, Human Rights, gender equality, legal aid, media, mediation, social protection, youth, etc.
- **A2J:**
 - o the Ministry of Justice (MINIUST), which implements activities related to access to justice and human rights protection; It also coordinates activities implemented by the Supreme Court, the National Public Prosecution Authority (NPPA) and the Rwanda law Reform Commission (RLRC).
 - o the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), which implements Human Rights related activities;
 - o the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, which promotes unity and reconciliation among Rwandans; and the
 - o Rwanda National Police (RNP), which implements activities related to crime prevention through implementation of community policing concepts, amongst others.

These three Joint Programme are primarily financed through UNDP core resources. The DDAG programme has received One UN funding, whereas the CSO Programme also received One UN fund as the support from the Government of Switzerland. The A2J Program received additional support from the Fund for Developing Results Together (DRT-F). Detailed mid-term evaluations were conducted regarding the DDAG and A2J Programs (*see list of reference documents*); not regarding the CSO Programme as its implementation only started in May 2014.

In addition to these 3 Joint Programmes, the DGPCU of UNDP Rwanda is also supporting a programme with the Rwanda Peace Academy (RPA), as well as contributing to two other One UN Joint Programs: supporting the National Gender Machinery (NGM, UN WOMEN-led) and the Imbuto Foundation (UNFPA-led).

The DGPCU also hosts regular informal meetings on democratic governance of developments partners.

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, FOCUS AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Rationale and Purpose for an Outcome Evaluation

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts outcome evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level.

These are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the UNDP Rwanda Evaluation Plan, the CSO programme evaluation will be conducted to assess the overall impact of UNDP's development assistance in the Practice Area of accountable governance including the support to civil society organisations.

The area of Democratic Governance is a very dynamic field that brings together many different stakeholders and institutions.

The goal of the outcome evaluation will be to assess how UNDP's governance programme results contributed, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions of democratic governance in Rwanda in collaboration with other key actors in the governance area.

Moreover, emphasis will also be put on the CSOs programme to ensure CSOs programme stands out indicating progress made towards achieving the programme outcomes and outputs. Institutional arrangement and management of the CSOs programme will also be evaluated so as to assess the best practices and how CSOs capacities have been built in engaging with citizens and how the programme results have been sustained.

The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to:

- To assess the overall progress towards achieving the programmes outcomes
- To assess the achievement of programme outcomes, its alignment, contribution to national development goals, as well as the UNDP and UNDP strategic Plan Results.
- The evaluation will also reflect on the overall context of the programme (taking into account the risks and assumptions that guided the AWP), lessons learnt, identify best practices and consider recommendations for the next programming cycle
- To assess CSO's engagement in policy making
- To assess how much the CSO'S capacity have been improved in terms of planning and implementation
- To assess the effectiveness of the RGB regarding their support to the CSOs
- To Assess the sustainability / Measure the impact of the UNDP's support in CSOs and the RGB
- Identify the gap between the outcome of the programme and its aim

- Measure the impact of the UNDP Democratic Governance portfolio and its programmatic strategies.
- Provide substantive input and direction to the formulation of future strategies, including at programmatic level.
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in Rwanda.
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level;
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The outcome evaluation will be conducted in 2017 towards the end of the current programme cycle 2013-2018 with a view to providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the new programming cycle starting from 2018 including the forthcoming new United National Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP) scheduled to start the same year.

3. Objectives of the Outcome Evaluation

The evaluation will assess how UNDP Rwanda's governance programme results contributed to a change in development conditions of democratic governance in Rwanda in collaboration with other key actors in the governance area.

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation is to measure UNDP's contribution, through the Joint Programmes and beyond, in the following fields of democratic governance: citizen participation in decision making; evidence-based decision-making; timely and high-quality service delivery to citizens; gender parity in leadership at all levels; political space; media development; strengthening of national civil society; access to equitable justice; enjoyment of human rights; building up of sustainable peace.

The specific objectives of the programme evaluation are the following:

14. To assess progress (what and how much) progress has been made towards advancing democratic governance (*including contributing factors and constraints*),
15. to assess whether the programme/project is the appropriate solution to the identified problem(s);
16. To assess the relevance of and progress made in terms of the UNDP outputs and assess sustainability of results and benefits (*including an analysis of both programme/project activities and soft/technical-assistance activities*),
17. To assess the alignment of the democratic governance portfolio to national development priorities, UNDAP and UNDP's Strategy 2014 -2017
18. Evaluate the contribution that UNDP has made/is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome (*including an analysis of the partnership strategy*),
19. to reflect on how efficient the use of available resources has been;
20. to document and provide feedback on lessons learned and best practices generated by the programmes during their implementation;
21. to identify unintended results that emerged during implementation (beyond what had initially been planned for);
22. to ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.
23. to provide feedback and recommendations for subsequent decision making and necessary steps that need to be taken by the national stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the programme's outcomes/results;

24. Assess the level of gender mainstreaming and human rights based approach to programming and progress against gender equality and human rights expected results.
25. Identify possible future intervention strategies and issues.

Starting from the current UNDP governance portfolio, the evaluation will be forward looking and outline options for a most optimal future portfolio balance and structure in the next programming cycle.

4. Scope and Focus of the Outcome Evaluation

The evaluation will look at UNDP's intervention in a holistic and comprehensive manner, including SWOT analysis of different approaches and programmes.

The primary scope of evaluation will focus on the contributions made by the DDAG, CSOs and A2J Joint Programmes in advancing democratic governance, while not excluding the other contributions made by the DGPCU as described above.

The evaluation will assess how the programs mainstreamed the UN programming principles subscribed during the program elaboration phase with particular focus on Gender Equality and women empowerment (GEWE), human rights & capacity development.

More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following:

Outcome status: Determine whether the outcome (i.e. advancing democratic governance) has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement, and identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome. Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance and adequacy of UNDP outputs to the outcome. Evaluate if programme strategies and activities were relevant to achieve outcomes and what is their contribution to recorded outcome achievements. Identify democratic governance changes in comprehension, practices, behaviours which could be attributed to programme activities and outputs.

Underlying factors: Analyse the underlying factors beyond UNDP's control that influenced the outcome including SWOT and PESTEL analysis. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, potential financial constraints, the degree of stakeholders and partners' involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

Strategic Positioning of UNDP: Examine the distinctive characteristics, comparative advantages and features of UNDP's governance programme and how it has shaped UNDP's relevance as a current and potential partner in Rwanda. The Country Office (CO) position will be analysed in terms of communication that goes into articulating UNDP's relevance, or how the CO is positioned to meet partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating potential added value by responding to partners' needs, mobilizing resources for the benefit of the country, not for UNDP, demonstrating a clear breakdown of tailored UNDP services and having comparative advantages relative to other development organizations in area of democratic governance.

Partnership strategy: Ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP and how it contributed to support programme activities? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders' participation including of IPs, UN agencies and development partners? Examine the interagency UN collaboration and partnership among development partners in the relevant field. This will also aim at validating the appropriateness and relevance of the environment's outcome to the country's needs and the partnership strategy and hence enhancing development effectiveness and/or decision making on UNDP future role in governance. Assess the role pattern and stakeholder's analysis to determine how the partnership benefited the programme outcomes.

Lessons learnt: Identify lessons learnt and best practices and related innovative ideas, in relation to management and implementation of programme activities to achieve related outcome. This will support learning lessons about UNDP's contribution to the governance outcome over the UNDAP cycle to inform an optimal assistance strategy for the programming cycle. Identify cross-learning themes from the programme experimentation captured during the course of programme activities implementation. Identify opportunities that could inform next programme design and programming.

5. The Evaluations Questions

The consultants will pay consideration to the following:

a) Relevance

- Extent to which UNDP support is relevant to Rwanda's Vision 2020 agenda, EPDRS II, UNDAP and those that are currently being developed (Vision 2050, EDPR III, SDG domestication)?
- Extent of the progress towards advancing democratic governance?
- To which extent does One UN influence the relevance of UNDP support in the governance sector?
- How relevant is UNDP's support for different partners: national authorities of Rwanda, development partners, civil society, and the private sector?
- To what extent did the programme results contribute to the UNDAP and EDPRS II results in the areas of Accountable Governance and the issues related to the Rule of law?
- Were the strategies adopted and the inputs identified, realistic, appropriate and adequate for the achievement of the results? Is there any need to change the focus in view of the next programming?
- Do the programmes continue to be relevant to the GOR priorities in governance?
- How did the programs mainstream the UN programming principles?

b) Efficiency

- How much time, resources, capacities and effort it takes to manage the programmes and, including the entire portfolio, and where are the gaps if any? More specifically, how do UNDP practices, policies, decisions, constraints; capabilities affect the performance of the programmes and Portfolio? Has UNDP's strategy in producing the programme outputs been efficient and cost-effective?
- Extent of M&E contribution to achieve the programme outcome and outputs' indicators

- Roles, engagement and coordination among various stakeholders in the governance sector, One UN Programme in project implementation? Were there any overlaps and duplications?
- Extent of synergies among One UN programming and implementing partners?
- Synergies between national institutions for UNDP support in programming and implementation including between UNDP and development partners?
- Could a different approach have led to better results? What would be those approaches?
- Do the programmes' activities overlap or duplicate interventions?

c) Effectiveness

- Extent of UNDP's effectiveness in producing results at the local levels and at the aggregate national level? Extent of UNDP support towards capacity development of partners, advocacy on governance issues and policy advisory services in Rwanda?
- Assessment of UNDP's work on advocacy to scale up best practices and desired goals; UNDP's role and participation in national debate and ability to influence national policies?
- Extent of UNDP's contribution to human and institutional capacity building of implementing partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions?
- Was the scope of interventions realistic and adequate to achieve results?
- Assess the programmatic approach with other approaches used by UNDP and in the sector (e.g. policy advisory services, technical assistance)?
- Contributing factors and impediments to the achievement of the outcome through related supported project outputs?
- Assessment of the capacity and institutional arrangements for the implementation of the UNDP governance portfolio in view of UNDP support to the GoR and within the context of Delivering as One?
- Extent of UNDP partnership with civil society and private sector in promoting democratic governance in Rwanda?
- Are programmes effective in responding to the needs of beneficiaries, and what are result achieved?
- Extent to which established coordination mechanisms enabled achievements of programme outcomes and outputs?

d) Sustainability

- Extent to which UNDP established mechanisms ensure sustainability of the governance interventions?
- Extent of the viability and effectiveness of partnership strategies in relation to the achievement of the outcome?
- Provide preliminary recommendations on how the governance portfolio can most effectively support appropriate central authorities, local communities and civil society in improving service delivery in a long-term perspective?
- Assess possible areas of partnerships with other national institutions, CSOs, UN Agencies, private sector and development partners in Rwanda?
- Assess how governance studies and available data are used to build the sustainability of the programmes?

- What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the programmes and benefits after the completion of current program cycle?
- What are the main lessons that have emerged from each programme implementation?

However, the evaluation team is expected to add and refine these questions in consultation with key stakeholders.

Based on the above analysis, provide overall and specific recommendations on how UNDP Rwanda Country Office should adjust and orient its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, monitoring and evaluation strategies, working methods, approaches and/or management structures and capacities to ensure that the governance portfolio fully achieves its outcome by the end of the UNDAF period and beyond.

6. METHODOLOGY

An evaluation approach is indicated below, however, the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also approved by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team. The Outcome Evaluation will be carried out in accordance with UNEG Evaluations Norms and Standards for Evaluation and OECD/DAG Principles.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful and must be easily understood by programme partners.

Data will be mainly collected from the existing information sources through a comprehensive desk review that will include the analysis of relevant documents, information, data/statistics, and triangulation of different studies. The key documents to be considered during the desk review are mentioned in Annex under List of Recommended documents.

The in-depth desk review will be followed by:

- Interviews with all key partners and stakeholders
- Questionnaires where appropriate
- Field Visits to selected project sites and partner institutions, considering the geographic location of the participants' beneficiaries and their involvement in the assessment of programmes results.
- Participatory observation, focus group discussions, rapid appraisal techniques
- Validation workshop including all stakeholders, (partners and selected beneficiaries who participated in the programmes)

The evaluation will include a wide participation through interviews, discussions, and consultations of all relevant stakeholders including the UN, the GoR institutions, CSOs as well as development partners, private sector representatives, and beneficiaries.

Briefing and debriefing sessions with UN and the Government officials, and potentially development partners, are envisaged.

Data collected should be disaggregated (by sex, age and location) where possible. Data should especially examine the programmes impact in terms of creating equal opportunities for women and men or addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment issues.

A design matrix approach relating objectives and/or outcomes to indicators, study questions, data required to measure indicators, data sources and collection methods that allow triangulation of data and information often ensure adequate attention is given to all study objectives.

The formulated recommendations should be solution-oriented and as specific as possible.

The evaluation ratings to be used are:

HS	Highly Satisfactory
S	Satisfactory
U	Unsatisfactory
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory
NA	Not applicable

7. Outputs/Deliverables of the Evaluation

1. **Inception Report:** The inception report which details the evaluators understanding of the evaluation and how the evaluation questions will be addressed. This is to ensure that the evaluator and the stakeholders have a shared understanding of the evaluation. The inception report will include the evaluation matrix summarizing the evaluation design, methodology, evaluation questions, key informants, data sources and collection analysis tools for each data source and the measure by which each question will be evaluated, for both the Governance outcome evaluation and the CSO programme evaluation.
2. **Draft Governance Outcome Evaluation Report** to be put forward during pre-validation workshop (30 -50 pages). The report will be reviewed by all stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation meet quality criteria.
3. **Draft CSO programme evaluation report**, assessing the programme outcomes and output results.
4. **Final Governance Outcome Evaluation Report**, integrating feedback voiced during pre-validation workshop 10 days after receiving the draft report.
5. **Final CSO programme evaluation report**, integrating feedback voiced during pre-validation workshop 10 days after receiving the draft report.

The deliverables will be drafted in English.

8. Duty Station

The duty station of the work is Kigali, Rwanda. However, the consultant (s) may be required to travel to project sites outside Kigali but in Rwanda.

9. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The individual consultants shall be paid the consultancy fee upon completion of the following milestones.

- 30% after adoption of the inception reports
- 50% after presentation and approval of the draft reports
- 20% after the approval of the final reports

The consultancy fee instalments will be paid as Lump Sum Amounts inclusive of expenses related to the consultancy. The contract price will be fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

10. Required expertise and qualifications of the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation will be composed of an individual international consultant who will take the lead and one national consultant who are knowledgeable and experienced in conducting outcome evaluations and have strong background on governance issues.

Gender balance considerations will be considered throughout the evaluation process.

Specific Qualifications:

The International consultant will:

- Will be assigned as the team leader in support with a national consultant
- Have a strong background in participatory evaluation of development programmes;
- Hold a Master's Degree in political science, governance, law, international development, or other related areas and at least 10 years' experience in conducting and leading evaluations/researches.
- Have sound knowledge and practical experience in programme development, formulation, monitoring and evaluation, including experience in the UN development cooperation system;
- Have several years' experience in working in developing countries, preferably including in Rwanda.
- Have extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance, inclusive participation, access to justice, human rights promotion, conflict prevention and peace building and support to democratic governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections;
- Have experience in evaluating similar programmes.
- Have strong communication, facilitation and management skills.
- Have good team work experience and skills.
- Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as human rights-based approaches will be an added advantage.

- Have excellent reading and writing skills in English. Knowledge of French is an asset.
- Be fully acquainted with UNDP's Results-Based Management orientation and practices development.

Management Arrangements for the Evaluation

- UNDP will contract the 1 international consultant as a team leader working with the support of the national consultant.
- UNDP as the focal point for the evaluation will facilitate the logistical requirements for consultant including setting up interviews, field visits, and payments for the consultant.
- An Evaluation Committee will be set up, comprised of UNDP staff as well representatives of implementing partners. The head of the UNDP's DGPCU will provide overall oversight with the Head of UNDP's Management Support Unit technical oversight, quality assurance and guidance to the evaluation to ensure that it meets the UNEG evaluation quality criteria.

11. Duration and Work Schedule of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be conducted starting in September 2017 for an estimated 42 working days.

Upon signing of the contract, the consultant will be given the necessary working documents for reference and all necessary information.

Activity	Deliverable	Time allocated
Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan	Inception report	5 days
Inception Meeting Initial briefing		
Documents review and stakeholder consultations	Draft evaluation report	30 days
Field Visits		
Data analysis, debriefing and presentation of draft governance Evaluation Report and CSO report		
Validation Workshop		
Finalization of Evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by all stakeholders and submission to UNDP and GoR	Final evaluation report	7 days

Selection Criteria

Interested candidates should apply by presenting the following documents:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by

- UNDP;
- b. **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all experience from similar evaluations, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
 - c. **Brief description** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a methodology, if applicable, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
 - d. **Financial and Technical Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided.

Submissions will be evaluated in consideration of the Evaluation Criteria as stated below:

1. The offer will be evaluated by using the Best value for money approach (combined scoring method). Technical proposal will be evaluated on 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated on 30%.
2. A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and compared. Only proposals that achieve above the minimum of 49 points (i.e. at least 70% of the total 70 points) on the technical proposal shall have their financial proposals reviewed.
3. Evaluation of Financial proposal (30 points)
4. If the technical proposal achieves the minimum of 49 points, the competitiveness of the financial proposal will be considered in the following manner:
5. The total amount of points for the fees component is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among the applicants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g.
6. $[30 \text{ Points}] \times [\text{US\$ lowest}] / [\text{US\$ other}] = \text{points for other proposer's fees.}$

Below is the breakdown of technical proposal on 100% which will be brought to 70%:

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Max. Point</i>
<u>Technical</u>		
At least Master's Degree in political science, governance, law, international development, or other related areas	10 %	10
Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of Governance, inclusive participation, support to democratic	20 %	20

governance initiatives with focus on citizen participation and empowerment, media development and elections; rule of law, access to justice, human rights and conflict prevention;		
Overall Methodology	40%	40
Experience of programme formulation, monitoring and evaluation; experience in evaluating similar programmes; experience in gender and human rights mainstreaming.	20%	20
At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors; and demonstrable experience working for the United Nations System	5%	5
Fluency in English and a working knowledge of one of the other language	5%	5
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100</i>

12. Format of the final evaluation report

The key product expected from this programme evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents but could adjusted with the approval of UNDP:

- Title and opening pages
 - Name of the evaluation intervention
 - Names and organizations of evaluators
 - Acknowledgements
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Description of the evaluation methodology
 - Findings and conclusions
 - Programme Relevance
 - Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome
 - Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness
 - Internal programme efficiency
 - Partnership strategy
 - Changes in context and outside of programme control
 - Sustainability of results
 -
- Recommendations
 - Lessons Learned (including good practices and lessons learned)
 - Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

Annex - List of Recommended Documents

1. Republic of Rwanda, Constitution
2. Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Vision 2020
3. Republic of Rwanda, Economic Development & Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013 – 2018), September 2013
4. United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018
5. Common Country Document Rwanda 2013 -2018
6. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms and Standards for Evaluation
7. Project documents: DDAG, CSOs and A2J
8. Annual progress reports of DDAG, CSO and A2J (2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016) and quarterly progress reports
9. Overview of financial expenditure of DDAG, CSO and A2J from the start till present
10. Annual reports of the Sector Working Groups JRLS and Decentralization and Governance
11. 2015 UPR report for Rwanda (CSO, NCHR, UN Compilation, GoR) and subsequent action plan
12. Gender Audit Documentation of 20 years of Reconciliation (NURC)
13. 2015 UPR reports (GoR, CSO coalition, NCHR, UN Compilation).

Studies, Surveys and Evaluations

14. 2012 Governance Outcome Evaluation -UNDP Rwanda
15. United Nations Rwanda, Mid-Term Evaluation of UNDAP 2013-2018
16. Mid-term evaluations of DDAG and A2J
17. Rwanda Reconciliation Barometers (2010 -2016)
18. Citizen report cards
19. Media barometer
20. Rwanda Governance Score Cards (2010-2016)
21. Gender Audit JRLS Final Report 2015
22. Civil Society Development Barometer 2015
23. Piloting Post 2015 SDG on Governance and Rule of Law

All interested applicants should submit: a recent CV; a brief outline of the evaluation approach and methodology; period of availability, a proposed budget for the assignment implementation to: UNDP Rwanda, KIGALI; Email: procurement.rw@undp.org; **Application deadline: TBC.**