



FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME  
'STRENGTHENING CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS (CSO)  
FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE  
GOVERNANCE IN RWANDA

DECEMBER 2017

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

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*Outcome Evaluation of Programme for “Strengthening Civil Society Organisations for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda” that was launched by One UN under some noble compulsions is not an easy task. A programme that was formulated for Institution Strengthening of CSOs 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 Rodriques, UNDP country director, Mrs. Nadine - U. Rugwe, Head of the Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit, Mrs. Kanzayire Theopista Nwaigwe, Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit were of great importance and added value to the report. But for their insights into the conditions under which the project formulated and implemented, the evaluation finding could have been incomplete. I 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 CSO chiefs, and senior functionaries in the Rwanda Governance Board and departments, the donors who have shared their candid opinions about the implementation of the project without any hesitation. The report could have not gone to the root of the project implementation without their keen observation and understanding of the project results.*

*The information shared 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*

## Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	iii
Executive Summary.....	iv
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Overview of Civil Society Organizations in Rwanda.....	1
3. Description of the intervention .....	3
4. Evaluation scope and objectives.....	4
5. Description of the evaluation methodology .....	6
6. Findings and conclusions .....	8
6.1. Programme Relevance .....	8
6.2. Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome .....	8
6.3. Specific Objectives of Evaluation Answered .....	14
6.4. Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	16
6.5. Other findings of evaluation .....	16
6.6. Sustainability of results .....	18
6.7. Conclusions .....	19
7. Recommendations .....	22

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CLADHO	Collectif des Ligues et Associations de Défense des Droits de l' Homme
CCOAIB	Conseil de Concertation des Organisations d'Appui aux initiatives de Base
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DDAG	Deepening Democracy and Accountable Governance
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
FBO	Faith Based Organisations
HMP	Historically Marginalised People
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
ICS	Improved Cooking Stoves
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
RCSP	Rwanda Civil Society Platform
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
RUW	Rwanda Union for Women
RWN	Rwanda Women's Network
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timebound
UN	United Nations
UNDAP	United Nations Development Assistance Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

This reportage is an evaluation of Outcome of a Joint Programme of Government of Rwanda and One UN Rwanda designed to “Strengthening Civil Society Organisations (CSO) for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda”. The desired outcome of this programme is: “Accountable and Responsive Governance Systems entrenched in Rwanda”, that was launched late 2014. CSO programme was jointly launched by Government of Rwanda and One UN in response to Rwanda Government’s Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II). Thus, the programme seeks that the Governance should be accountable, and responsive to the needs of people. To ensure this, programme seeks to engage and strengthen the Civil Society Organisations in Rwanda through different interventions. The programme believes that the Civil Society Organisations, when strengthened will be able to influence the decision making of Government and that leads to overall development. This final external evaluation is conducted by an international expert from 6<sup>th</sup> November to 25<sup>th</sup> December 2017. There was no mid-term evaluation conducted.

### The Programme

Under the national implementation modality, the estimated cost of the programme is USD 8,619,120 where One UN was expected to contribute, USD 2,000,000, UNDP agreed to contribute USD 3,000,000, and Government of Rwanda through RGB agreed to share the cost to the extent of USD 1,500,000 in form of cash and kind.

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Outputs</i>
<i>Accountable and responsive governance system entrenched in Rwanda</i>	Output 1: Capacity of local CSOs to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandate enhanced;
	Output 2: Realisation of human rights, gender equality, social justice and UPR enhanced
	Output 3: Effective citizen engagement and role of CSOs in socio-economic development enhanced.
	Output 4: CSOs including the media to play a watchdog role and effectively monitor service delivery at all levels enhanced
	Output 5: Programme Management properly carried out
	Output 6: The role of RGB as a capacity enabler for CSOs enhanced

### Evaluation Scope & Methodology

The scope of this evaluation is the assessment of outcome which states “Accountable and Responsive Governance System entrenched in Rwanda”. The outcome is very clear as it strongly believes that by strengthening CSOs in Rwanda, the Governance will be responsive and accountable. Programme is clearly designed to obtain this outcome through the outputs, activities, and actions. Therefore, the evaluation limits itself to evaluate outcome and not entire management of programme. The methodology adopted is qualitative and quantitative analysis of data gather through primary and secondary sources, and validating it with programme initiative and further discussion.

### Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations

At the outcome level, the evaluation has found that the programme has helped to bridge the gap between the Government and the Civil Society. Now, the Government systems are ready to invite the representatives of the citizens through Civil Society Organisations, and discuss the issues. Government

systems are also responsive to the needs of people, as explained by the CEOs and members of CSOs interviewed. Political leaders, and Government officials are now focused on more engagement of citizens in development policy planning and implementation. Now, as put by a representative of a CSO, 'it is the time now for CSOs to rise to the occasion and develop themselves to participate in the process of development. CSOs must utilise the opportunities offered by the Government to move fast and keeping with the pace of development. UNDP and One UN programme of capacity development of CSOs is laudable. However more technical and financial support from One UN agencies would definitely enhance CSO participation'. Complaints management system of Government, 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 outcome to a large extent.

The evaluation found that the outputs of the programme are directly linked to the outcome, and achievement of outputs through activities, and actions will result in such achievement. However, the programme suffered from want of funds with only 30% of estimated funds made available, and a major part of this came from UNDP core funds. Despite this challenge, the programme was well received by the Government, and Civil Society Organisations. The minimum number of staff positioned in the UNDP country office have given out their best to lead the programme to its success. Nevertheless, programme was able to achieve only partial results. The evaluator is constrained to state that this partial achievement (The achievement has been partial because funding was partial, and thus activities were not full resulting in partial achievement. In other words, achievement if full to the extent of is engagement) is not due in inherent incapacity either in the Government or with the UNDP, or the design of the programme, it is inadequate funding, and resultant preparedness.

### **Important findings**

- The evaluator again records, at the cost of repetition, 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 & capacity development. The programme, with a view to adhering to the principles, has partnered with CSOs 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 projects, and supported the CSOs technically and financially to the extent possible.
- Grants provided by the programme to 80 CSOs are very small, and some of the grants for not directly related to the outcome or outputs, but were of poverty reduction in nature.
- Some CSOs feel that EDPRS II and other development programmes initiated by Government have not been evaluated by CSOs. If these programmes have been evaluated by CSOs or other agencies, the results might have been different. However, it is seen that CSOs have participated at the formulation stage of EDPRS II
- CSOs expressed that the technical support provided has been inadequate in the area of proposal writing, advocacy, and establishment of strong liaison among all the stakeholders, and on participating in accountability dialogue.
- Umbrella organizations of CSOs are sometimes competing with their own members for funding and for grants thereby frustrating the very purpose of coming under one umbrella for thematic achievement.
- There is a strong feeling among Umbrella organisations, that UNDP should work with them alone, and approach the grassroot level organisations through umbrella organisations.

- Awareness of Rights is a big challenge in Rwanda. Some CSOs are struggling hard to raise awareness among citizens. Poverty and low level of education, cultural barriers are hindering these CSOs to go deep into society and engage illiterate and vulnerable people.
- “There are no strong mechanisms that can address the awareness challenges. One or two meetings or campaigns do not take the message to the people whom it is intended. Continuous campaigning is needed; at the same time, Government machinery should be strengthened to protect the rights and redress grievances” expresses one CSO.
- Awareness of the Rights of women and children is also very weak and requires continuous and constant awareness raising. CSOs feel it very difficult to tackle such situations where women are illiterate, and dependent on the male members of the family who are the perpetrators of violence against women. UNDP is not able to develop skills of CSOs to deal with such situations. So is the case of Human Rights awareness.
- Government has very good programmes, but it too requires support for enhancement of technical and financial capacity. At the same time Government is not giving proper publicity to the available laws that protect the various rights of people.

### **Important conclusions**

- The outcome of the programme has been achieved to a large extent even with all obstacles and low capacity levels, low funding, and low literacy levels in the country.
- There is a very strong trust, faith, and belief on the UN system in general, and UNDP in particular among the implementing partners- Government, and some beneficiaries.
- Programme document is focused, well written, and RRF is SMART. The programme, with a view to adhering to the UN programming principles, has partnered with CSOs 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 CSOs technically and financially to the extent possible.
- Some of the grants given to poverty reduction projects/ activities could have been avoided in the scenario of minimum funding for the programme by diverting the same to awareness raising for achievement of outcome.
- In the absence of direct support to CSOs and their umbrella organisations, they feel the process going through Government channels is very cumbersome, lengthy, frustrating the objective of extending support to their members. CSOs look for direct Support from One UN or UNDP.
- Some CSOs feel that UNDP should help them to organise into thematic working groups- like: Agriculture, Health, Human Rights, Education, and Regional Cooperation. CSOs should be encouraged to participate in Regional Cooperation dialogue, not limiting to one country alone.
- CSOs have limited capacity to write winning proposals, they look at UNDP to provide training support in proposal writing, and also provide technical support in thematic areas.
- Need Assessment of CSOs, at least a few that have a representative character, has not been conducted. CSOs have been taken for support as they are, their capacities and needs are presumed to be adequate. Simply applications have been invited and grants distributed among winning bidders. No effort has been made either by the Government or by UNDP to assess the capacity needs of CSOs, their financial needs, and their outreach;
- CSOs lack expertise in funds mobilisation, advocacy, organisational development, accounts management, communications, and negotiations skills.

### **Important recommendations**

These recommendations are made based on evaluation of information collected through desk review of documents, discussions, and interviews with stakeholders.

- Five-year programme with ambitious budget appears to be impractical in Rwanda context. Instead, a five-year policy/ plan document, and yearly implementation document with budgets, based on monitoring and evaluation reports is suggested. While discussing with Government stakeholders, and CSOs, it is observed that the Government is moving fast, and political economy of the country seeks to engage more with the citizens;
- Donor commitment should be obtained at the beginning of the programme itself, for which a resource mobilisation strategy should be in place;
- Instead of supporting large number of CSOs with one-year grants, select a few strong CSOs after conducting a needs/ capacity assessment of CSOs, support them for longer duration for sustainable results. This could be an experiment. Arguably, smaller CSOs will be betrayed with this approach. However, programme may be gradually extended to whole of the sector after initial results.
- Grants should be focused. Not deviating from the main articulated outcome. It is seen that while outcome is to strengthen CSOs so that they can ensure responsive, and accountable governance, support went to cooking stoves, improving beauty techniques, food security and the like poverty reduction, and vocational skills development. These activities are not bad, but a separate programme with dedicated budgets can be designed and delivered. Furthermore, Government should be encouraged to support such activities instead of UNDP providing funds. This programme is to strengthen advocacy, and participative capacity of CSOs and they should be articulative, critical, and with advanced negotiation skills at the bargaining table.
- A capacity needs assessment of CSOs should be conducted immediately with support of any technically qualified firm that has enough number of persons to conduct the assessment across the country. However, it may require large resources, and time. This will help formulate second phase of programme.
- A thematic area wise CSO data base should be developed. For example, CSOs engaged in one theme, their membership, place of functioning, activities. This data base will help RGB and UNDP to formulate assistance policy and programmes to CSOs. Construction of 'Barometers' would be realising if a sizeable CSOs are inducted into surveys.
- There is no training institute in Rwanda to design and deliver training courses to meet specific training needs of CSOs. Establishment of a training institute with the support of Government and CSOs is recommended. This training institute will design and deliver training courses in Governance, administrative structures, policy making & planning in Government, representative democracy, financial management, CSO management, advocacy, public relations, project formulation, and financial proposal writing, communication, gender mainstreaming, human rights, social protection, psychological counselling, many more capsule courses relevant to different thematic areas. It requires multi stakeholder engagement and commitment.
- Yearly CSO retreats are recommended where both Government representatives and CSO representatives participate and exchange ideas, discuss challenges, and find out mutually agreeable solutions.



## 1. Introduction

This reportage is an evaluation of Outcome of a Joint Programme of Government of Rwanda and One UN Rwanda designed to “Strengthening Civil Society Organisations (CSO) for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda”. The desired outcome of this programme is: “Accountable and Responsive Governance Systems entrenched in Rwanda”. Thus, the programme seeks that the Governance should be accountable, and responsive to the needs of people. To ensure this, programme seeks to engage and strengthen the Civil Society Organisations in Rwanda through different interventions. The programme believes that the Civil Society Organisations, when strengthened will be able to influence the decision making of Government and that leads to overall development.

UNDP defines civil society organizations in its policy of engagement with CSOs (2001) as:

***“CSOs are non-state actors whose aims are neither to generate profits nor to seek governing power. CSOs unite people to advance shared goals and interests. UNDP collaborates with CSOs whose goals, values and development philosophies accord with its own.”***

In general, UNDP engages with CSOs concerned with (inter)national public policy and governance as well as those with expertise in service delivery. In line with this understanding, Government of Rwanda, and One UN Rwanda have designed the programme to strengthen the capacities of CSOs.

Furthermore, Government of Rwanda declares “Civil Society is one of the key features of good governance. Active and independent civil society can provide an important framework for citizens to express and aggregate their needs, concerns, and demands, and offers a channel to engage them into the governance area. More broadly, civil society is universally recognised as one of the key actors to hold public institutions accountable.”<sup>1</sup> This statement further supports and clarifies the role of CSOs in ensuring accountable governance, and the need to make the CSOs stronger to accomplish their noble tasks.

In this background, this evaluation looks at to which/what extent the outcome has been achieved, outcome’s direct relation with the national priorities of creating accountable governance, project design and proposed interventions that help achieve the desired outcome, programme performance and challenges. For the purpose of simplicity and readability, this evaluation report is divided into Seven (7) chapters. Chapter one is a brief introduction, Chapter two is an overview of CSOs in Rwanda, Chapter three describes the proposed interventions in the programme document, Chapter four explains evaluation scope and objectives, Chapter five describes evaluation methodology, Chapter six narrates findings of evaluation with different sub-chapters/ sections, as may be needed as we progress, and concludes the evaluation, and Chapter seven is for recommendations for the future.

## 2. Overview of Civil Society Organizations in Rwanda

Civil Society Organisations in Rwanda, historically, have been rising to the occasion. There were CSOs in colonial Rwanda focusing on charitable activities. In post-colonial period, civil society organisations emerged in the form of cooperatives supporting farm activities. CSOs representing socio economic activities of citizens were however not given desired importance by the state of those days.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer, Rwanda Governance Board, and Transparency International.

Nevertheless, they re-emerged as development oriented NGOs during the 1970s and continued till the 1990s. This period saw mostly umbrella organisations like CLADHO, CCOAIB, and PROFEMME and the like. The new beginning started only after 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, where CSOs have come in a large way representing different thematic areas and interest groups like, Education, Human Rights, Women, Persons with Disabilities, Faith Based CSOs, International NGOs, trade unions, Health, Child Protection, Cooperation, Farmers interests, Protection of Genocide Victims, Media, and the like. To name a few: IBUKA, ASGR- MORE, RCSP, RUW, RWN, etc. Thus, at all times, CSOs wanted to make their presence felt and work along with the government to reach out to the citizens of Rwanda.

All these Civil Society Organisations have a well-defined agenda within their own declared mandates to:

- Participate in Government's decision-making process for development planning
- Influence the decision making by the state
- Represent the vulnerable at different forums
- Fight for the rights of women, youth, children, persons with disabilities, and overall human right
- Work for creation of spaces for the women and the vulnerable
- Partner with the development partners
- Conduct evidence based research that supports policy planning
- Bridge the gap between the Governance and the Governed OR the Government and Citizens.
- Work for the participation of youth in Development
- Work for income generation activities and employment generation
- Function as watch dog for the society

The list goes into many objectives.

Thus, recognising the role and importance in the society, CSOs are strongly recognized by the Government of Rwanda as an important pillar of Good Governance. Therefore, EDPRS II designates specific areas to CSOs where their input is critically important. CSOs' role is emphasised under the theme Accountable Governance in three main functional areas:

- i. monitoring and tracking government actions,
- ii. citizen empowerment and participation in decision making and
- iii. monitoring and ensuring effective service delivery.

EDPRS II is very specific on areas of extensive CSO involvement. Therefore, EDPRS II's following objectives rely mainly on the CSOs' input and expertise:

- Outcome 1.1: Increased citizen participation in planning processes and solving their own problems;
- Outcome 1.2: Enhanced information flows and participation of the population through established and new channels;
- Outcome 1.3: Strengthened accountability.

Other governmental strategies on the topic of inclusion of CSOs into the Good Governance landscape strike similar note.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer, December 2015.

Despite being engaged by Government of Rwanda for policy decision-making, and communicating public decisions to citizens through CSOs, they have inherent incapacities, inadequate preparation to meet the challenges of the time. To identify and enhance this capacity area, the One UN and Government of Rwanda have come together with the programme of strengthening CSOs. Furthermore, The Government Program 2010 - 2017 describes a function to the civil society as a supporter to the development agenda defined by EDPRS II, sector strategies, etc. The monitoring and advocacy is here rather discounted: “The Government will continue to support the civil society for it to work for the public interest, in transparency with a visible participation in the national development.”<sup>3</sup> Civil society will be encouraged to avail action plans basing upon the Government’s Programs, encouraged to carry out income generating activities and support to deliver services of public interest<sup>4</sup>.

Detailed discussion on CSOs engagement in the desired activities, and their strengths and weaknesses will be discussed in the following chapters.

### 3. Description of the intervention

To support the CSOs in Rwanda in accordance with desired goals as described in EDPRSII, Government of Rwanda and One UN have come together with the programme “Strengthening Civil Society Organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda” where Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) will be the principal actors to implement, and RGB is the direct implementer under National Implementation Modality (NIM) of United Nations.

The estimated cost of the programme is USD 8,619,120 where One UN was expected to contribute, USD 2,000,000, UNDP agreed to contribute USD 3,000,000, and Government of Rwanda through RGB agreed to share the cost to the extent of USD 1,500,000 in form of cash and kind.

The programme was designed to contribute to the achievement of UNDAP 2013-2018 ‘s key result area (KRA) 2 on Accountable Governance and thematic priority area of EDPRS II. The programme is designed to conform with Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness (2008), the Accra Agenda for Action (2008), and the Busan Resolutions, that emphasised the importance of engagement of CSOs in development, partnering with them.

The programme identified the key areas where to intervene systematically to achieve desired outcome through defined interventions. The areas are:

- a. *Programmatic and Advocacy capacities* of CSOs which are very weak and in transitions stages from earlier stages of Rwanda development;
- b. *Human Rights Promotion and Monitoring* by CSOs which are directly working with people of the country and bridging the gap between Government and Citizens;
- c. *Public Accountability* enhancement through CSO strengthening which plays an impressive role previously, mainly in the area of Access to Justice (A2J);
- d. *Capacity Development of Rwanda Governance Board (RGB)* was considered as the prime requirement to improve and develop both forward and backward linkages for CSOs to function in accordance with their mandates.
- e. *Mainstreaming Gender and Rights of the people with Disability* has been considered as prime importance for the programme to create equal political, economics, and social opportunities

---

<sup>3</sup> EDPRS II 2013-2018

<sup>4</sup> Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer, December 2015

for men and women, and persons with disabilities, and engagement in nation building, and making part of decision making.

The programme spells out required interventions to work and achieve the objectives of above areas through the following interventions:

- a. *Capacity Development of CSOs.* This is the main intervention that strengthens institutional/organizational and HR capacity of CSOs to enable them to march forward to make inroads in to policy planning, development, advocacy, and accountability. Develop partnerships with development partners, and partner with Government decision making process.
- b. *Evidence Based Policy Advocacy.* This is the second intervention through with the Government decisions will be built on available evidence. CSOs and Government no more need to be confronting agents for want of evidence in decision making, and designing citizen centric policies.
- c. *Grant Making.* Through this intervention, the programme seeks to make CSOs financially sound to function, develop projects, and implement projects on the core areas of CSOs interventions in development. Grant is one that makes a CSO stronger, and productive time of CSOs is saved that otherwise spent of resource mobilization. However, the grants may not fully meet the demands of CSO, at least they support a desired and defined project.
- d. *Capacity Strengthening of RGB.* RGB is the implementing partner. RGB encourages CSOs engagement in sustainable development, and public outreach. RGB is a link between the Government and Civil Society. Therefore, RGB has to have Environmental, Organizational /Institutional, and Individual capacity to play their role and discharge their duties. Through this intervention, the programme seeks to enhance RGB's capacity in all the three areas and develop it into an organic focal point in Government and one stop shop for the CSOs.
- e. *Focus on mainstreaming gender and the rights of the persons with disability:* if required through an approach of positive discrimination, selecting CSOs representing women, and persons with disabilities and strengthening their capacity of participation through tailored projects.

The interventions proposed in the programme document are well researched and well thought after keeping in view the historical, current, future shape democracy in the country. (Annex 1 for matrix)

#### 4. Evaluation scope and objectives

It is understood that the programme of “Strengthening Civil Society Organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda” was started late in 2014 and comes to an end in the month of June 2018. No mid-term evaluation is conducted so far. Therefore, this evaluation will assess the extent of achievement of defined outcome which is “Accountable *and responsive governance system entrenched in Rwanda*” under the programme. The evaluation assesses how the programme mainstreamed the UN programming principles subscribed during the programme 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 establish accountable and responsible governance system through CSO participation.

More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following:

- **Outcome status:** Determine whether the outcome (i.e. entrenching accountable and responsive governance systems) 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. 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 CSO strengthening programme 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 partner needs by offering specific, tailored services to these partners, creating potential added value by responding to partners' needs, mobilising 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 organisations 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 specific objectives of this CSO evaluation are:

- a. To explain to what extent the programme has contributed to achievement of its outcome
- b. To identify key interventions that supported advancement of outcome of this programme
- c. To assess the extent of gender mainstreaming into CSO organisations and thus participating in decision making

- d. To assess the alignment of the programme to national development priorities, UNDP and UNDP’s Strategy 2014 -2017
- e. To delineate to what extent the programme initiatives contributed to achievement of EDPRS II priorities of CSO engagement
- f. 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;

The overall objective of the outcome evaluation is to measure UNDP’s contribution, through the Joint Programme 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 finalised 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 interviews 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 desk reviewed and data re discussed with the stakeholders.

Methodology Table  
Table 1

Evaluation phase	Specific methods	Outputs
<b>Phase I</b> <b>Inception Phase</b>	<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.
<b>Phase II</b> <b>Data collection and evaluation phase</b>	<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 CSO Programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democratic Governance 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</li> <li>• Key implementing partners and national stakeholder informants like representatives from RGB, Ministry of Justice, Parliament, National Election Commission, National Commission for Human Rights, Civil Society</li> </ul>	Filled in questionnaires, raw data, notes from interviews, notes from further desk review of documents, list of interviews conducted, list of documents reviewed.

	<p>organisations will be engaged in discussions on outcome levels and linkages of outputs to outcomes of the programme;</p> <p>A structured survey questionnaire designed and applied. The questionnaire is based on programme outcome, outputs, actions, and activities, in addition to questions to capture overall perspective of the participant in the interview.</p>	
<p><b>Phase III</b></p> <p><b>Data Analysis Report writing phase</b></p>	<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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Redundancies removed from the collected data in relation to the evaluation matrix and programme outcomes</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Factors explaining the operating environment, internal design, implementation approaches and synergies identified</li> <li>• Interdependency of themes, and relevance of cross cutting issues, and extent of their recognition discussed and shortcomings identified with data</li> <li>• Techniques of SWOT applied for analysis of programme implementation and results</li> </ul>	Draft report
<p><b>Phase IV</b></p> <p><b>Presentation of findings</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before submission of draft report, a presentation of findings will be made. A power point presentation capturing the approaches of evaluation and findings is made</li> <li>• An interactive session conducted to seek feedback on the findings and on the structure and style of the report</li> </ul>	<p>PPT and draft report</p> <p>(However, this was not done but copies of draft report shared)</p>
<p><b>Phase V</b></p> <p><b>Finalisation phase</b></p>	<p>After collection of comments and feedback from phase IV, all the information relevant incorporated into the final report and submitted.</p>	<p>Final report and winding up report</p>

## 6. Findings and conclusions

### 6.1. Programme Relevance

If it was said either by Abraham Lincoln or by John Wycliffe (1384) who wrote in the prologue to his translation of the Bible, “The Bible is for the Government of the People, by the People, and for the People”, the Democratic Governments are run by the people elected by themselves, and for their own good. People repose confidence in the leaders elected by them and in the constitution made by them. The leaders thus elected make rules, regulations, policies, and legal framework to deliver services and welfare to the other set of people who voted the leaders into power. However, the responsibility of voting leaders into power does not end with elections. In democratic states, it is the duty of people to be vigilant always, watch what their leaders were doing, and evaluate the progress, and critique the short comings to show them a way and give directions to the elected government. It is here the smaller groups of people- the Civil Society Organisation (CSO) comes into operation.

In Rwanda, as we have seen in earlier pages, CSOs are active in all the three phases of development of Rwanda. In post genocide environment, the CSOs have become furthermore active and started engaging themselves in political economy of the country with an intention to extend problem free service flow to the people, and support and focus the Government’s attention on a number of thematic areas which are of immediate concern for the existence of civil society. Thus, CSOs have a major role to play in making the Government accountable, be transparent in delivery of services, and appreciate citizens’ needs, and reduce poverty and vulnerability. However, it may not be possible for citizens to organise themselves to watch, evaluate, and critique the highly technical, profession, and legally strong Governance. In one word, governance is very complex. It envelopes anything and everything that affects public life. In such an environment of complexity, some external, technical, and professional help is needed for the CSOs to be functional.

Realising the importance of technical, professional, and financial support needed by the CSOs, One UN, and Rwanda Government have come together to formulate a programme of support to strengthen civil society organisations in Rwanda. Thus, comes the UN joint five-year programme of “Strengthening Civil Society Organisations for Responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda” into operation from late 2014. In the background of emerging political economy of Rwanda, and in the background of government’s endeavours to healing process of post genocide Rwanda society, the UN Joint Programme for Civil Society Organisations is not only fully relevant, but also much needed, and sought after by CSOs.

### 6.2. Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome

**Outcome status:** The defined outcome for the programme is “Accountable and responsive Governance system is entrenched in Rwanda”. The programme seeks to reach to this outcome through the following five outputs.

1. Capacity of local CSOs to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandate enhanced
2. Realisation of human rights, gender equality, social justice and UPR enhanced
3. Effective citizen engagement and role of CSOs in socio-economic development enhanced
4. CSOs including the media to play a watchdog role and effectively monitor service delivery at all levels enhanced
5. Programme Management properly carried out
6. The role of RGB as a capacity enabler for CSOs enhanced



At the outcome level, Interviews with RGB, CSOs, and UNDP CSO programme staff reveal that to a large extent CSOs are able to participate in decision making, and also able to question the Government decision. Government has opened its doors for CSOs to come and participate in policy dialogue, policy formulation, and design of development programmes for the welfare and well-being of citizens. There are documented evidences to show that the Government and citizens many a time through CSOs, meet in every village on every last Saturday of the month (*Umuganda*) to review development. Citizens are encouraged to raise their objections, raise their demands, articulate their requirements, and critique Government’s development decisions. This single example gives and ample explanation on Government’s willingness and readiness to engage citizens in development planning. The complaints management system currently available is responsive to the needs of citizens. This could have not been fully possible if capacity development initiatives of the programme were not brought to RGB and CSOs as put it by officials of RGB and some CSOs.

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 the principles, has partnered with CSOs 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 CSOs technically and financially to the extent possible.

Table 2: Programme Results Framework <sup>5</sup>			
			<b>Achievement indicators</b>
<b>Outcome: Accountable and responsive governance system entrenched in Rwanda (CSO)</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% level of adherence to rule of law in Rwanda</li> <li>• 80% Level of respect for political and civil liberties</li> <li>• 80% level of quality service delivery in public institutions</li> </ul>
<b>Output</b>	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>indicators</b>
Capacity of local CSOs to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandate enhanced;	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhance technical, Financial and management capacities of CSO's</li> <li>2. Enhance organisational development and sustainability of CSOs</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide grants to consortia for assessment of capacity building plans and its development within CSOs</li> <li>2. Public project management and financial management manual in English, Kinyarwanda, and French</li> <li>3. Organise policy advocacy training workshops for CSOs</li> <li>4. Organise training workshops PCM, Situational analysis, and SP</li> <li>5. Organise trainings on NGO leadership and Good Governance</li> <li>6. Develop and publish a manual of NGO leadership and GG</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 60% of stakeholders' perception on NGO sustainability</li> <li>2. 76% of CSO organisation</li> <li>3. 70% of stakeholder perception on ability of CSOs to respond to societal needs and interests</li> </ol>
Realisation of human rights, gender equality, social justice and UPR enhanced	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capacity of Human rights and gender equality CSOs enhanced</li> <li>2. Promote Human rights and gender mainstreaming in national priority areas within the context of EDPRS II</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide grants to CSOs to engage in monitoring of human rights and gender mainstreaming</li> <li>2. Extend grant support to CSOs involved in civic education</li> <li>3. Organise training workshops on human rights based approaches (HRBA) and gender mainstreaming to development</li> </ol>	

<sup>5</sup> Results framework re-organised from programme document it is not an evaluator’s assessment.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Publish a manual on HRBA and gender mainstreaming to CSOs</li> <li>5. Publish IEC materials on human rights and gender mainstreaming</li> <li>6. Support a national radio and TV programme on human rights and gender mainstreaming</li> <li>7. Support to CSOs involved in social protection</li> </ol>	
Effective citizen engagement and role of CSOs in socio-economic development enhanced.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enhance capacity of CSOs engagement in decision making process, monitoring of service delivery and accountability</li> <li>2. Enhance role of RGB and policy dialogue interlocutor for civil society</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide grants to CSOs involved in citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning</li> <li>2. Provide grants to CSOs involved in culture promotion, youth and women development, and self-employment in rural areas</li> <li>3. Provide grants to CSOs engaged in voice and accountability</li> <li>4. Provide support to JADF structure at district level to enhance CSO role</li> <li>5. Enhance CSO role in local governance and development through supporting coordination interventions of JADF</li> </ol>	
CSOs including the media to play a watchdog role and effectively monitor service delivery at all levels enhanced	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Institutional strengthening for media associations</li> <li>2. Enhance role of media policy formulation and implementation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide competitive small grants for media houses to produce content on governance</li> <li>2. Provide investigative journalism training</li> <li>3. Support training of media associations in policy advocacy and development communication</li> </ol>	
Programme Management properly carried out	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assured the achievement of programme objectives with quality, on time and within budget</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide reliable technical support to implementation of programme activities</li> <li>2. Conduct quarterly/annual reviews against AWPAs</li> <li>3. Effectively communicate programme results in all appropriate media</li> </ol>	
The role of RGB as a capacity enabler for CSOs enhanced		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support RGB to hold annual NGO week</li> <li>2. Support RGB to publish directory of CSOs biennially</li> <li>3. Support RGB in efficient registration of CSOs</li> <li>4. Support RGB in enhancing delivery and monitoring of CSO activities</li> </ol>	

The programme has supported to strengthen civil society organizations, engaged in different thematic areas including the CSOs working for women, persons with disabilities (PwD), and Human Rights, within its budget limits, to enable them to participate at grass root level Umuganda, Government of Rwanda's planning dialogues, and consultation meetings. Institutional strengthening of CSOs, skills development of CSOs through training and development interventions made it possible for them to participate in development planning of Government of Rwanda. In addition to this, an Annual National Dialogue is conducted which brings together leaders and citizens at all levels (Local Government, Central Government, private sector, FBOs, Civil Society Organisations and the Diaspora). The dialogue is chaired by the president of the Republic and all citizens are given opportunity to call in and express their views on issues that concern their development.

The programme contributed to capacity development of RGB and other implementing partners to effectively participate in this dialogue and encourage citizens of Rwanda participate in the dialogue. CSOs, mainly the Umbrella CSOs like Rwanda Civil Society Platform, Rwanda National Union of Women, Rwanda Union of Blind have been able to reach out to the citizens through their members and encourage participation in Umuganda, and the national dialogue. The media has played a greater role in encouraging and advocating participation of people in the national dialogue.

CSOs functioning with different mandates for different thematic areas have been supported with tailor-made support initiative by UNDP in accordance with their mandate. A full list of support provided by UNDP is annexed (Annexure 2). A deep analysis of this support clearly indicates that the programme has focused on:

- a. Improving the advocacy capacity of CSOs
- b. Improving Women Participation in Decision Making
- c. Institutional Strengthening of CSOs
- d. Skill Development of CSO staff
- e. Engagement on Budgeting
- f. Citizen Participation and Accountability
- g. Women and Gender Mainstreaming in to all activities,
- h. Supporting Umbrella organisations for organisational development.
- i. Strengthen CSO's capacity to raise voice for protection of Human Rights and access to justice for the women and other vulnerable.

A simple example of how CSOs capacity to participate in Government decision making and extending critical support to government can be evidenced from the following sentences from an Umbrella CSO, the CLADHO assessment report.

CLADHO also analysed the Government Budget Framework Paper (2016-2017) and medium-term budget estimates for 2016-2017; 2018-2019. The findings have been shared with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and Parliament for possible consideration in finalisation of 2016-2017 State Finance Law.

- ✓ *As a result of the trainings on citizen participation in budgeting and planning conducted by CLADHO, the recommendations from these trainings have been included in government policies. The planning of next year's budget (2017-2018) has considered citizen's engagement as one of important innovations. In the Planning and Budget Call Circular (PBCC) 2017-2018, MINECOFIN gave instructions to decentralised levels to ensure participation of citizens".*

CLADHO held a national budget dialogue which assessed the results of CLADHO-RGB project including the increase of citizen participation in planning and budgeting in 3 districts: Nyanza, Gicumbi and Nyamasheke. Nyanza and Gicumbi districts were represented by Vice Mayors in charge of economic affairs and development while Nyamasheke was represented by the Mayor of the district. The Head of Decentralization and Governance in RGB was present and encouraged the mayors and vice mayors to consult citizens in all processes including planning and budgeting at district level.<sup>6</sup>

This addresses the outputs which seeks to enhance the capacity of grass root CSOs, umbrella CSOs and RGB to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandates, encourage citizens, and take part in decision making process of the Governance.

The programme under evaluation is, thus, very much in line with its expected outcome. Budget constraints, low capacity of CSOs, disconnect between national level and local level CSOs, Government's reluctance (As expressed by some chiefs of CSOs), sometimes, to partner with CSOs are debatable findings and discussed in the following chapters.

**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 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.

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

#### PROGRAMME SPENDING FROM 2014-2017

Table: 2

Year	Total Expenditures (USD) (As per combined delivery report)	NIM Advance transferred (US\$)	TOTAL
2014	288,586.94		288,586.94
2015	802,344.77		802,344.77
2016	925,812.57		925,812.57
2017 (As of 26 Nov.2017)	473,353.22	181,610.53	654,963.75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,490,097.50</b>	<b>181,610.53</b>	<b>2,671,708.03</b>
UNDP Core:	2,374,019.83 US\$	181,610.53	2,555,630.36
Cost sharing (Swiss):	116,077.67 US\$		116,077.67

#### PROGRAMME BUDGET ASSURANCE

Table :3

GOVERNMENT	UNDP	ONE UN	OTHER DONORS	TOTAL
1,500,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,119,120	8,619,120

<sup>6</sup> CSO annual report 2016-2017

The figures require no comment or elaboration as they speak for themselves and how an ambitious, and important program becomes dysfunctional with financial constraints. The outputs and activities are directly linked to outcome; and implementation of each activity requires budget/ financial support. If planned/ budgeted money is not spent, activities are not taken up resulting in not fully meeting the goals. The programme has been able to spend only 31% of projected budgets for over four years. It is only UNDP that was able to pool up to the extent of 80% of their commitment, while others contributed to the extent of 1.34% of total budget estimates for the project. Pooling up the funds to full extent was beyond the control of UNDP and therefore it suffered a lot on this count alone.

Furthermore, UNDP has contracted about 80 CSOs including umbrella CSOs to strengthen their capacity against a total of over 2000 CSOs operating in the country. This could be mainly due to, funds constraints. Add to this, it is also observed, and many CSOs interviewed complained that one of the CSO was financially supported on long term basis and only Ad Hoc and short duration to the maximum of one-year support was extended. This can also be attributable to the situations beyond UNDP's capacities. In programmes like the one under national implementation modality, dependency on Government for clarity and support on the issues that flow from the international instruments and conventions always leads to slow performance.

Programme is designed in such a way that other donors and One UN contributes to the overall objectives of the programme. However, the direct technical or financial contribution of One UN is not clearly visible in the implementation. As many interviewees pointed out that it takes time to make the approach work and ensure that all actors understand the implications of this approach and adhere to the rules of the game. Some openly expressed that the ONE UN approach is more cumbersome in terms of administration and procedures instead of CSOs directly working with UNDP. Some Government of Rwanda agencies also feel, they perceive ONE UN as more cumbersome since more actors are involved. This view is supported by some umbrella CSOs. This design of delivery of programme certainly influenced the desired outcome. A majority of CSOs feel that budget has been a major constraint that influenced the outcome negatively. Another design issue is non-availability of a resource mobilisation strategy in the programme document.

Other underlying factors that influenced partial achievement of outcome is the internal systems of UNDP, mainly the sections/ departments dealing with CSOs/ Governance are understaffed and require strengthening. Justice, Human Rights, Gender Mainstreaming, Civil Society Engagement in decision making are not the home-grown themes or concepts. They flow from international instruments after prolonged debates and deliberations to extend to the nations across the globe. In such a situation, in addition to national ownership, and national implementation of programmes, additional technical expertise on long term basis should be hired who brings experience and expertise to positively influence the outcome, and develop the capacities of national counterparts. Precisely, that has been inadequate in the programme. Reason could be budget constraints.

**Strategic Positioning of UNDP:** UNDP's CSO strengthening programme is one of its kind in Rwanda. During the evaluation period, the evaluator has not come across any other major players in CSO strengthening. UNDP's capacity to pool technical resources is visible clearly at least to the extent of partial achievement of outcome if not full due to other factors. UNDP has been able to strategically position itself as the leader, and CSOs, and GoR have trust in UNDP sincerity in supporting the vulnerable, develop national capacities, creating ownerships, and helping CSOs to engage in Governance. One of the Chief executive of an Umbrella CSOs very passionately said "*UNDP is the CSO of United Nations, and without UNDP there is no existence to development CSOs in the world.*" This shows how emotionally CSOs are attached to UNDP, and their expectations from UNDP. On the other

hand, it would also reveal, how strategically UNDP is working with CSOs despite its internal challenges, and funds constraints. Furthermore, many CSOs do not recognise the existence of One UN, but UNDP.

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 mobilisation 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.

**Partnership strategy:** UNDPs 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, albeit partly, programme outcome of strengthening civil society organisations to entrench accountable and responsive governance systems in Rwanda.

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 engage civil society organisations in governance processes. UNDP's strategy of engaging CSOs through RGB helped to strengthen RGBs role in recognising and engaging the support of CSOs in development; and CSOs realised 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.

### 6.3. Specific Objectives of Evaluation Answered

**a. To what extent the programme has contributed to achievement of its outcome:** The programme struggled very hard to contribute to achievement of objectives, with only 31% of funds available for implementation of an ambitious agenda of engaging CSOs in establishment of accountable and responsive governance systems in Rwanda in the absence of other development partners coming forward to invest in governance programme, and in the back drop of very sensitive governance area. Government reports, and interviews with CSOs and other stakeholders revealed that the programme has contributed to make the CSOs presence felt very strongly by the Government. To that extent, the programme has been able to contribute to achieve the part of outcome, if not fully. RGB and Transparency International's

assessment which states over 80% participation of citizens suffers from data size considering the population size of the country. For example, only 1178 persons out of a population of over 12,000,000<sup>7</sup>. In terms of percentage, it comes to only 0.009%. Its representative character is arguable. The country has more than 53,000 prisoners whose human rights are topic of discussion across all fora, about six million women, mainstreaming them into all socioeconomics and political activities is an international agenda, over 300,000 people with disabilities, mainstreaming them creating accessible living for them should be in accordance with Biwako Millennium framework of UN. In this background, the RGB report could be a statistical under reporting requiring a larger research on findings. Thus, the programme has been able to contribute to achievement of outcome to the extent possible within its means.

- b. Key interventions that supported advancement of outcome of this programme:** The major interventions that supported advancement of outcome of this programme are (a) bringing the CSOs on to one platform to enable to ventilate their mandates, programmes, purpose of their formation; (b) providing capacity development support through training courses designed after need assessment within CSOs; (c) extending financial support through grants to umbrella CSOs and to the grassroot level CSOs; (d) bridging the gap between the Government and CSOs through dialogue, and deliberations, and supporting CSOs through Government to make its presence felt among CSOs.
- c. The extent of gender mainstreaming into CSO organisations and thus participating in decision making:** This is an area where a tangible achievement is recorded. Almost all the CSOs interviewed revealed that they have perfect gender balance in their membership. Rwanda Union of Blind, and Rwanda Women’s Network are working solely with the women and taking up their problems with the state. Also, they are seeking spaces on the dialogue platform and they are successful. However, as put it by a Chief Executive of CSO representing women “The Government needs to create more spaces for women and women led organisations. We have sufficient number of women in the parliament; that is not sufficient. Stronger synergies between the Government and CSOs should be build; women should be allowed to participate in decision making from the beginning. This is being done by the Government now, but more to be done”
- d. Alignment of the programme to national development priorities, UNDAP and UNDP’s Strategy 2014 -2017:** The programme is fully aligned. The evaluator did not find any gap in alignment. EDPRS II’s priorities have been directly taken to design the programme. The evaluator feels this could be one of the buying point for the implementing Government partners.
- e. To what extent the programme initiatives contributed to achievement of EDPRS II priorities of CSO engagement:** There are three EDPRS II priorities concerning strengthening CSOs

*Outcome 1.1: Increased citizen participation in planning processes and solving their own problems:* A plain look at the programme document reveals how closely it corresponds to this priority, and actions and activities enlisted in the programme document, and implemented actions and activities.

*Outcome 1.2: Enhanced information flows and participation of the population through established and new channels:* Programme fully supports this outcome of EDPRS II. However, RGB has to develop and strengthen systems and procedures to

---

<sup>7</sup> Rwanda National Statistics

communicate with CSOs. Media strengthening activity of the programme helped the media to become communication channel between the citizens and the Government.

*Outcome 1.3: Strengthened accountability:* The very outcome of the programme is to strengthen CSOs to ensure accountability and responsiveness in Rwanda. However, the constraints discussed above hindered desired progress in ensuring this result.

#### 6.4. Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness

##### **Efficiency**

The programme cannot be more efficient than it is now in circumstances it has been operating. A programme winning the hearts of all the stakeholders and showing the results to the extent possible with only 31% of the promised resources is definitely efficient. In addition to non-availability of promised funds, the programme 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 utilised 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 CSOs with more enthusiasm. Furthermore, the approach of grant making adopted by both RGB, and UNDP have been appreciated by participating CSOs for transparency and clarity in grant making. “The procedures of calling for bids, opening the bids in front of bidders, evaluating them by the grants selection committee, and finally declaring who was the winner and who was the loser with supporting facts and evidenced” states the Chief Executive of a women’s CSO in an interview.

#### 6.5. Other findings of evaluation

The other issues that came out during the evaluation cover organisational, programme functional, communication between the government and CSOs, and funds and budget cuts in the middle of programme year. Some of the critical findings are bulleted here under.

- The programme has been very ambitiously designed and promised a lot of support through their activities and actions. However, the funds were abruptly cut in the middle of implementation year. This has sent in wrong signals on UNDP ability to mobilise resources for the programme.
- Despite this challenge, at the cost repetition, the evaluator again 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& capacity development. The programme, with a view to adhering to the principles, has partnered with CSOs 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 CSOs technically and financially to the extent possible.



- There is a requirement of strengthening monitoring and evaluation activity either in the country office or in RGB. Monitoring of implementation, and evaluation of results is the duty of M&E team precisely. Any programme's success is largely depending on strong M&E that is alert, technically sound, communicates on time, develops timely progress reports and shares information to the implementers on time on shortcomings and progress.
- About 80 CSOs were given grants to run projects during the project period. The grants were very small, and was for only a one-year project. Sustainability of any intervention cannot be achieved with a very short duration project particularly when a project does not produce physical assets but engages in dialogue, meetings, and deliberations. To be sustainable in such project like the one under evaluation, long term continued engagement of target CSOs is needed.
- Some of the grants given to CSOs do not match with expected outcome. While the expected outcome is to strengthen CSOs capacity that will entrench accountable, and responsive governance in Rwanda. In pursuance of this, the support could have been directed towards capacity development of CSOs, Institutional Strengthening, Advocacy, engagement with Government and people, exposure to international best practices. However, the evaluator found that that some of the grants went for direct poverty reduction among vulnerable. (Details in other paragraph)
- Some CSOs feel that EDPRS II and other programmes have not been evaluated by CSOs If these programmes have been evaluated by CSOs or other independent agencies, the real challenges would come out.
- Another CEO of a CSO expresses her dissatisfaction on the level technical support provided by the programme in the area of proposal writing, advocacy, and establishment of strong liaison among all the stakeholders, and on participating in accountability dialogue. "The programme limited itself, may be for want of funds, to delivery of only a few training courses. The CSOs wanted strong technical skills, project formulation skills, accounting skills, negotiation skills, development management skills, policy formulation skills, skills in designing and delivering programmes of importance under SDGs".
- Despite the programme being a capacity development programme for CSOs, UNDP struggles with low level of capacity at levels to run the programme with just 30% of projected funding. Partners' capacity is a challenge, inadequate human resources both at UNDP office, and government managing joint programme, reporting systems, particularly reports from IPs, is another challenge for the programme, funds management by the partners is another challenge UNDP faces.
- Gathering evidence in the cases of Human Rights violation of poor is another challenge. In many cases, human rights commission does not get evidences;
- Umbrella organisations of CSOs are sometimes competing with their own members for funding and for grants thereby frustrating the very purpose of coming under one umbrella for thematic achievement.
- Some umbrella organisations strongly feel that there should not be any RGB between UNDP and CSO, neither One UN is properly working for them. Therefore, UNDP should directly design and deliver the programme for CSOs engaging them from the designing phase of the programme. Additionally, they feel, UNDP should work only with umbrella organisations, and channel out the funds to their members through umbrella CSOs, through a system based on transparent procurement principles; and then reporting on progress would become easier. However, this approach has its own risks in terms of reaching out due to possibility of selection of dearer by the umbrella organisation.

- Awareness of Rights is a big challenge in Rwanda. Some CSOs are struggling hard to raise awareness among citizens. Poverty and low level of education, cultural barriers are hindering these CSOs to go deep into society and engage illiterate and vulnerable people.
- “There are no strong mechanisms that can address the awareness challenges. One or two meetings or campaigns do not take the message to the people to whom it is intended. Continuous campaigning is needed; at the same time, Government machinery should be ready to protect the rights and redress grievances” expresses one CSO.
- Awareness of the Rights of women and children is also very weak and requires continuous and constant awareness raising. Particularly in case of illiterate and vulnerable women, husband or male member of the family has to raise the awareness of women on rights, and it never happens as the rights to freedom and seeking legal protection in a majority of situations is against husbands, or male members of the family who abused the female members of the family in many cases. CSOs feel it very difficult to tackle such situations. UNDP is not able to develop skills of CSOs to deal with such situations. So is the case of Human Rights awareness.
- Government has very good programmes, but it too requires support for enhancement of technical and financial capacity
- One Umbrella CSO feels that there are a number of challenges with land acquisition; the right to property is ignored when land is acquired for national interests by the Government. Advance notices are not given to acquire property in rural areas. CSO further goes on saying that intervention of CSOs in such incidents is not favoured by Government, and transparency and accountability principles do not operate in such situations.
- Government has laws, but implementation is again a challenge. National disability policies were formulated way back in the 90s, but they are not considered while formulating national development policies. Government considers that mildest disability is easiest to include. When CSOs like Rwanda Union of Blind has its own demands and problems, it is not able to question the accountability and responsiveness of the Governance system.
- Some donors like SIDA are considering partnering with the CSOs directly instead of going through One UN or RGB. SIDA presumes that direct support to CSOs could be more effective.

#### 6.6. Sustainability of results

The evaluation finds some mixed results with regard to sustainability of results. The major obstacle for sustainability of results under CSO engagement to entrench accountable and responsive governance is disruption of financial flow into programming and continuity of activity. Sustained activity to bridge the gaps between the Government and CSOs is challenged by non-availability of funds and discontinuation of activities. Until the programme and activities of engaging civil society in decision making and strengthening accountability system institutionalised, external support is needed. Neither technical support nor the financial support found to be very strong, therefore, there is a doubt if the results will be sustainable, even after ownership is created. There were no strong efforts to strengthen institutional mechanisms, and establishment of advocacy and communication systems in the Government that link CSOs, however there are still gaps in efforts to strengthen CSOs systems and system sustaining activity in the absence of this it will be difficult to sustain the results. However, there are some exceptions to the rule. Umbrella associations like Rwanda Union for Women have their own internal systems, and led by strong leaders. The sustainable activities are visible in such CSOs.

## SWOT ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The programme is focused and well designed, activities, action, and outputs are well defined and measurable.</li> <li>• No other players are strongly coming into CSO area to support engagement of CSOs for accountability.</li> <li>• UNDP has a comparative advantage as IPs look at UNDP in preference to others in the sector.</li> <li>• UNDP and One UN has adopted a flexible approach that meets the demands of GoR.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• UNDP -RGB relations are very strong, communications modalities adopted by UNDP are strong.</li> <li>• EDPRS II outcomes just match programme outcomes.</li> <li>• National Implementation Modality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only 31% of the budget is released so far.</li> <li>• No resource mobilisation strategy clearly spelt out in the programme document.</li> <li>• Support extended to CSOs so far is Ad Hoc and for short duration. Sustainability not ensured.</li> <li>• Low capacity of implementing partners.</li> <li>• Human resources deployed in the programme unit of UNDP are barest minimum.</li> <li>• Programme advocates for international standards for gender mainstreaming, preserving and protecting Human Rights, rights of PwDs, and Children, however, no international technical expertise is provided on long term basis.</li> <li>• Project formulation and project management skills of a majority of CSOs are rudimentary OR weak.</li> <li>• Reporting and funds management systems of implementing partners are very weak.</li> <li>• No data base on the total number of CSOs in the country, their membership, and activities is available. RGB was not able to provide this data.</li> <li>• No strong inter-linkages between the implementing partners; coordinated efforts to produce result.</li> <li>• Umbrella organisations are competing with their member organisations for project funding and grants.</li> <li>• Other UN partners in development excepting UN WOMEN are not visible on the field.</li> </ul>
OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government gives high priority to citizen engagement in responsive and accountable governance- UMUGANDA is a platform for citizen engagement.</li> <li>• EPDRS II and National Transformation Strategy align with United Nation's priorities.</li> <li>• Government is very fast in introducing reforms, the reform agenda is an opportunity to introduce civil society engagement.</li> <li>• UNDP is preferred for One UN by implementing partners.</li> <li>• Strong political will to engage citizens in policy and decision making.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One UN is losing its recognition by some implementing partners.</li> <li>• Some donors like Sweden wanted to directly partner with implementing partners.</li> <li>• USAID is slowly chipping into A2J with components to CSO engagement.</li> <li>• No signs of pooling up of resources to the extent projected.</li> <li>• Priorities of Government are fast changing, a five-year programme is losing its importance in changing environment.</li> </ul>

### 6.7. Conclusions

Based on the above discussions and based on the interviews held with UNDP team, Government of Rwanda, and Civil Society Organisations, the following conclusions can be drawn.

- At the outcome level, the evaluation has found that the programme has helped to bridge the gap between the Government and the Civil Society. Now, the Government systems are ready to invite the representatives of the citizens through Civil Society Organisations, and discuss the issues. Government systems are also responsive to the needs of people, as explained by the CEOs and members of CSOs interviewed. Political leaders, and Government officials are now focused on more engagement of citizens in development policy planning and implementation. Now, as put by a representative of a CSO, 'it is the time now for CSOs to rise to the occasion and develop themselves to participate in the process of development. CSOs must utilise the opportunities offered by the Government move fast keeping with the pace of development. UNDP and One UN programme of capacity development of CSOs is laudable.

However more technical and financial support from these agencies would definitely enhance CSO participation'. Complaints management system of Government, 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 outcome to a large extent.

- There is a very strong trust, faith, and belief on the UN system in general, and UNDP in particular among the implementing partners- Government, UNDP, and some beneficiaries.
- Programme document is focused, well written, and RRF is SMART. The programme, with a view to adhering to the UN programming principles, has partnered with CSOs 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 CSOs technically and financially to the extent possible.
- The programme is very ambitious and seeks to strengthen systems of responsive and accountable Governance through CSOs, whereas CSOs themselves are formative stage barring a few umbrella organisations.
- If we look at some of the grants/ financial support given to CSOs, they do not reveal any relevance to/connection with the outcome of responsive and accountable governance or strengthening CSOs. For example; Grants for Vocational skills training in hair Dressing and Beauty technics for the social and economic integration of vulnerable youth; Malnutrition Reduction among pregnant women and children under 2 years as a strategy for poverty reduction in rural area; Cultural promotion, Empowering Vulnerable Households to Access to Finance Resources and Food Security in Muhanga District; Improved cooking stoves (ICS) for economic empowerment of historically marginalized Peoples (HMP) and other vulnerable groups of Gisagara District in Southern Province; The Catholic Action Movements, prayers 'groups trigger sustainable and durable social and economic development of their respective adherents; Inspire Change for Family Cohesion Project; Construction of Nyakariro Health Centre Maternity /Rwamagana District. Particularly, when there was short supply of funds, focus could have been more on capacity strengthening towards outcome achievement. Arguably, economic empowerment might result in enhancing participation, however the programme is not poverty reduction project.
- Although an estimated over eight million US dollars have been planned to be mobilised for implementation of the project, only 30 percent could be pooled. Out of which, major share of 70% of (USD 3,000,000) assured contribution is from UNDP; and the programme document does not have any resource mobilisation strategy.
- Fragmented, and Ad Hoc support given to CSOs did not yield any sustainable result conforming desired outcome of the programme. This has been the concern of many CSOs.
- In the absence of direct support to CSOs and their umbrella organisations, they feel the process going through Government channels is very cumbersome, lengthy, frustrating the objective of extending support to their members.
- Some CSOs feel that UNDP should help them to organise into thematic working groups- like: Agriculture, Health, Human Rights, Education, and Regional Cooperation. CSOs should be encouraged to participate in Regional Cooperation dialogue, not limiting to one country alone.
- CSOs do not have capacity to write winning proposals, they look at UNDP to provide training support in proposal writing, and also provide technical support in thematic areas.
- Need Assessment of CSOs, at least a few that have a representative character, has not been conducted. CSOs have been taken for support as they are, their capacities and needs are presumed to be adequate. Simply applications have been invited and grants distributed

among winning bidders. No effort has been made either by the Government or by UNDP to assess the capacity needs of COS, their financial needs, and their outreach;

- CSOs lack expertise in funds mobilisation, advocacy, organisational development, accounts management, communications, and negotiations skills.
- Independent evaluation of EDPRS II has not been conducted and it is felt by many that EDPRS evaluation might show a different picture.

Before making some recommendations, we may some ratings of assessment areas and interventions based on the findings.

<b>Areas of Assessment and Interventions</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Programme Relevance</b>	
<b>Programme concept and rational</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Programme Risk and Assumptions analysis</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Programme Effectiveness</b>	
<b>Key Stakeholders' participation</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Programme implementation arrangements</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Programme Efficiency</b>	
<b>Financial planning and management</b>	Highly Efficient in terms of using the available resources
<b>Programme Planning</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Programme Monitoring and evaluation</b>	Marginally Satisfactory
<b>Programme Results Outputs</b>	
1. <b>Capacity of local CSOs to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandate enhanced;</b>	Satisfactory
2. <b>Realization of human rights, gender equality, social justice and UPR enhanced</b>	Satisfactory
3. <b>Effective citizen engagement and role of CSOs in socio-economic development enhanced.</b>	Marginally Satisfactory
4. <b>CSOs including the media to play a watchdog role and effectively monitor service delivery at all levels enhanced</b>	Satisfactory
5. <b>Programme Management properly carried out</b>	Highly Satisfactory
6. <b>The role of RGB as a capacity enabler for CSOs enhanced</b>	Satisfactory
7. <b>Capacity of local CSOs to effectively and efficiently discharge their mandate enhanced;</b>	Marginally Satisfactory
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<b>Sustainability of Results and actions</b>	Marginally satisfactory

## 7. Recommendations

These recommendations are made based on evaluation of information collected through desk review of documents, discussions, and interviews with stakeholders.

- Five-year programme with ambitious budget appears to be impractical in Rwanda context because the Government is fast moving. Instead, a five-year policy/ plan document, and yearly implementation document with budgets, based on monitoring and evaluation reports is suggested. While discussing with Government stakeholders, and CSOs, it is observed that the Government is fast moving, and political economy of the country seeks to engage more with the citizens;
- Donor commitment should be obtained at the beginning of the programme itself, for which a resource mobilisation strategy should be in place;
- Even though it is programme under national implementation modality, positioning of a long term strong technical advisor is recommended;
- Instead of supporting large number of CSOs with one-year grants, select a few strong CSOs after conducting a needs/ capacity assessment of CSOs, support them for longer duration for sustainable results. This could be on experiment. Arguably, smaller CSOs will be betrayed with this approach. However, programme may be gradually extend to whole of the sector after initial results.
- Grants should be focused. Not deviating from the main articulated outcome. It is seen that while outcome is to strengthen CSOs so that they can ensure responsive, and accountable governance, part of the support went to cooking stoves, improving beauty techniques, food security and the like poverty reduction, and vocational skills development. These activities are not bad, but a separate programme with dedicated budgets can be designed and delivered. Furthermore, Government should be encouraged to support such activities instead of UNDP providing funds. This programme is to strengthen advocacy, and participative capacity of CSOs and they should be articulative, critical, and with advanced negotiation skills at the bargaining table.
- It is recommended that UNDP Governance Unit team should be strengthened with number of people with expertise in M & E, advocacy, project development, financial management, and communications.
- A capacity needs assessment of CSOs should be conducted immediately with support of any technically qualified firm that has enough number of persons to conduct the assessment across the country. However, it may require large resources, and time.
- A thematic area wise CSO data base should be developed. For example, CSOs engaged in one theme, their membership, place of functioning, activities. This data base will help RGB and UNDP to formulate assistance policy and programmes to CSOs. Construction of 'Barometers' would be realising if a sizeable CSOs are inducted into surveys.
- There is no training institute in Rwanda to design and deliver training courses to meet specific training needs of CSOs. Establishment of a training institute with the support of Government and CSOs is recommended. This training institute will design and deliver training courses in Governance, administrative structures, policy making & planning in Government, representative democracy, financial management, CSO management, advocacy, public relations, project formulation, and financial proposal writing, communication, gender mainstreaming, human rights, social protection, psychological counselling, any many more capsule courses relevant to different thematic areas. It requires multi stakeholder engagement and commitment.

- Yearly CSO retreats are recommended where both Government representatives and CSO representatives participate and exchange ideas, discuss challenges, and find out mutually agreeable solutions.

	Implementing Partners	Areas of Intervention	Proposed Interventions
1	Rwanda Governance Board (RGB) Media High Council (MHC) Rwanda Parliament National Forum for Political Organisations (NFPO)	<i>Programmatic and Advocacy capacities</i> of CSOs which are very weak and in transitions stages from earlier stages of Rwanda development;	<i>Capacity Development of CSOs.</i> This is the main intervention that strengthens institutional/organizational and Human Resources capacity of CSOs to enable them to march forward to make inroads in to policy planning, development, advocacy, and accountability. Develop partnerships with development partners, and partner with Government decision making process.
2	National Election Commission(NEC) Umbrella CSOs.	<i>Human Rights Promotion and Monitoring</i> by COSs which are directly working with people of the country and bridging the gap between Government and Citizens;	<i>Evidence Based Policy Advocacy.</i> This is the second intervention through with the Government decisions will be built on available evidence. CSOs and Government no more need to be confronting agents for want of evidence in decision making, and designing citizen centric policies.
3	CSOs engaged in different thematic areas One UN (UNDP, UNV, UNWOMEN, OHCHR)	<i>Public Accountability</i> enhancement through CSO strengthening which played an impressive role previously, mainly in the area of Access to Justice (A2J);	<i>Grant Making.</i> Through this intervention, the programme seeks to make CSOs financially sound to function, develop projects, and implement projects on the core areas of CSOs interventions in development. Grant is one that makes a CSO stronger, and productive time of CSOs is saved that otherwise spent of resource mobilization. However, the grants may not fully meet the demands of CSO, at least they support a desired and defined project.
4		<i>Capacity Development of Rwanda Governance Board(RGB)</i> was considered as the prime requirement to improve and develop both forward and backward linkages for CSOs to function in accordance with their mandates.	<i>Capacity Strengthening of RGB.</i> RGB is the implementing partner. RGB is encouraging CSOs engagement in sustainable development, and public outreach. RGB is a link between the Government and Civil Society. Therefore, RGB has to have Environmental, Organisational /Institutional, and Individual capacity to play their role and discharge their duties. Through this intervention, the programme seeks to enhance RGBs capacity in all the three areas and develop it into an organic focal point in Government and one stop shop for the CSOs.
5		<i>Protection of Rights of the Persons with Disabilities</i>	<i>Engaging PwD organisations:</i> Through this programme seeks to recognize the rights of persons with disabilities, and create space for them to participate in country's decision-making process.
6		<i>Gender Mainstreaming</i>	<i>Creation of equal opportunities for men and women:</i> Programme seeks to not only recognize the rights of women, but also mainstream them into all activities. Where required, the programme adopts an approach of positive discrimination to create more spaces for women, and most vulnerable women in local areas.



LIST OF CSOs SUPPORTED <sup>8</sup>

CSO Programme (2014 - 2015)		Project in the area of Human Rights or gender equality (UNDP direct monitoring)						
Name of organisation	Title of the project	Activity area	Finance Budget (Rwf)	Contract signing date	Grant contract #	Completion date	Duration	
1	Rwanda Civil Society Platform	Capacity building and networking through strengthening the functioning of thematic groups	Umbrella	54,650,684	Nov. 7, 2014	0001/2014/R GB	May 06, 2015	6 months
2	Council of Concertation des Organisations d'Appui aux Initiatives de Base (CCOAIB)	Strengthening CCOAIB internetworks capacity for accountability engagement to sustainable development in Rwanda	Umbrella	54,707,584	Nov. 7, 2014	0003/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
3	Rwanda Women Network	Empowering women grassroots Organisations to promote participatory and Accountable Governance	Umbrella	54,707,440	Nov. 7, 2014	0005/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
4	Transparency International Rwanda (TI-Rw)	Centers for citizen Empowerment and advocacy (CCEA) initiative in Muhanga, Karongi and Gicumbi	Umbrella	54,647,405	Nov. 7, 2014	0007/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
5	Conférence Episcopale du Rwanda	Améliorer la participation citoyenne dans le processus de gouvernance décentralisée	citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	20,515,000	Nov. 7, 2014	0008/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
6	Rwandan League for the Promotion and Defense of Human Rights (LIPRODHOR)	Contribute to the promotion of consultative dialogue between the government and citizens in governance and social accountability related to service delivery	citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0009/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
7	Institute of Research and Dialogue for Peace (IRDP)	Project de renforcement des initiatives de plaidoyer par des femmes leaders au niveau communautaire pour une bonne gouvernance	civic education	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0010/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
8	Association des Volontaires de la Paix (AVP)	Building peaceful cohabitation of the Rwandese population by socio-economic and cultural integration of released prisoners, those who have made the TIG and the survivors of genocide	civic education	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0011/2014/R GB	June 06, 2015	7 months
9	Association Rwandaise des Conseillers en Traumatisme (ARCT-Ruhuka)	Promoting Youth Cohesion, Reconciliation and Empowerment, for Sustainable Peace and Development	culture promotion, youth, and women development and self-employment in rural areas	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0012/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
10	ITUZE Organization	Contribution to promote Gakenke community livelihood through livestock and village Savings and loans scheme	culture promotion, youth, and women development and	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0013/2014/R GB	July 06, 2015	8 months

<sup>8</sup> Data supplied by Governance Unit, UNDP, Rwanda.

11	Imena Cultural Troupe	Projet d'éducation Culturelle artistique de la Jeunesse en Milieux Scolaires ruraux	self-employment in rural areas culture promotion, youth, and women development and self-employment in rural areas	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0014/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
12	MBWIRANDUMVA INITIATIVE	Vocational skills training in hair Dressing and Beauty technics for the social and economic integration of vulnerable youth	self-employment in rural areas culture promotion, youth, and women development and self-employment in rural areas	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0015/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
13	Rwandan Association for the Promotion of the Integrated Development (ARDI)	Malnutrition Reduction among pregnant women and children under 2 years as a strategy for poverty reduction in rural area	social protection	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0016/2014/R GB	Aug. 6, 2015	9 months
14	Organization Nzambazamariya Veneranda	Initiative de réduction et de préventions des violences basées le genre en faveur des femmes vulnérables du milieu rural	social protection	20,427,000	Nov. 7, 2014	0017/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
15	PAX PRESS	Promoting dialogue between citizens and local authorities, citizens participation, public accountability and transparency through the media	Media	20,515,344	Nov. 7, 2014	0018/2014/R GB	Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
16	KANYARWANDA ORGANISATION	Strengthening citizen participation in planning and budgeting process in district of Ruhango	citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	20,525,000	Dec. 11, 2014	0019/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
17	DIOCESE DE BUTARE COMMISSION JUSTICE ET PAIX	Suivi de la mise en œuvre de la politique de décentralisation "mécanismes de suivi de journées porte ouvertes et contrats performance dans les districts Gisagara et Nyaruguru	citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	19,491,120	Dec. 11, 2014	0020/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
18	Initiative Don Bosco	Little Girls Ambassadors (LIGA)	social protection	20,571,120	Dec. 11, 2014	0021/2014/R GB	May 15, 2015	6 months
19	Organisation for Support to the Environment Protection and Climate Change Adaptation (OSEPCCA-NGO)	Projet de promotion des femmes du district de Rutsiro à Travers la production des champignons	culture promotion, youth, and women development and self-employment in rural areas	20,526,000	Dec. 11, 2014	0022/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
20	Jeunesse Ouvrier Chrétien au Rwanda (JOC)	Renforcement de la participation des Jeunes dans la planification, Budgétisation, Suivi et Evaluation des Contrats de Performance Imihigo au Rwanda	citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	20,531,000	Dec. 11, 2014	0023/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
21	Rwanda Scouts Association	Youth by Youth Civic Participation	civic education	20,571,120	Dec. 11, 2014	0024/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
22	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR SUPPORTING PEOPLE LIVING WITH HIV/AIDS (ANSP+)	Improving nutritional status of vulnerable people infected / affected by HIV/aids of rural areas in Nyagatare district	social protection	20,571,000	Dec. 11, 2014	0025/2014/R GB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months

23	Association Bamporeze	Promotion of equal access to profitable TVET for both young women and men	culture promotion, youth, and women development and self-employment in rural areas	20,567,971	Dec. 11, 2014	0026/2014/RGB	Dec. 10, 2015	12 months
24	Rwanda National Union of Deaf	Accelerating Deaf youth's Participation in Disability Rights Awareness Promotion		20,571,000	Nov. 7, 2014		Nov. 6, 2015	12 months
25	Association pour la Défense des Droits, de Développement durable et du bien-être (ADBEF)	Advocacy and capacity building on saving and management for the domestic workers and street children		20,265,400	Nov. 7, 2014		Aug. 6, 2015	9 months
26	Association Rwandaise pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (A.R.D.H.O)	Legal assistance of 900 prisoners and gender equality for pregnant women and women living with children in 3 Rwandan prisons, pilot phase		20,570,871	Nov. 7, 2014		Nov. 6, 2015	12 months

#### CSO Programme (2015 - 2016)

1	Mouvement des Travailleurs Chrétiens au Rwanda (MTCR)	Réinsertion Socioprofessionnelle des Travailleurs Domestiques	Social protection	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	27/2015/RGB		12 months
2	Rural Development Inter-Diocesan Service (RDIS)	Réinsertion Socioprofessionnelle des Travailleurs Domestiques	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	28/2015/RGB		12 months
3	Action des Eglises Evangéliques pour la Promotion de Santé et développement (AESD)	Empowering Community Participation in Budgeting and Development Planning in Kirehe District	Citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	29/2015/RGB		12 months
4	Bureau Social de développement (B.S.D.)	Développement des Compétences en Élaboration et Gestion des Petits Projets par L'Education et Utilisation des Mini Crédits en Faveur de la Population Pauvre	Social protection	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	30/2015/RGB		12 months
5	Collectif des Ligues et Associations de Défense des Droits de l'Homme au Rwanda (CLADHO)	Strengthening the Role of Human Rights' CSOs in Citizen Participation on Economic Governance in 4 Districts of Rwanda	Umbrella CSO	60,080,000	Dec. 16, 2015	31/2015/RGB		12 months
6	Diocese Catholique de Gikongoro	Projet D'Amélioration de la Qualité des Services (Rendus par les Autorités Administratives Locales et Leurs Services Connexes) dans le District de Nyamagabe à Travers L'Éducation aux Droits et Devoirs des Citoyens	Citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	32/2015/RGB		12 months
7	Diocèse de Ruhengeri	Projet de Renforcement de la Responsabilité des Citoyens et de la Transparence dans les Gouvernements Locaux. Cas des Districts de Nyabihu et Burera	Citizen engagement on budgeting and development planning	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	33/2015/RGB		12 months

8	Duharanira Amajyambere Y'Icyaro - Action pour le Developpement Rural Intégré (DUHAMIC - ARDI)	Empowering Vulnerable Households to Access to Finance Resources and Food Security in Muhanga District	Social protection	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	34/2015/RGB	12 months
9	The Future in Our Minds (FIOM-Rwanda)	Community-Based Awareness for Responsive Governance in Kirehe District of Rwanda	Civic education	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	35/2015/RGB	12 months
10	Duhonzanye Organization	Promotion of self-reliance initiatives among widows and young orphans of genocide perpetrated against Tutsi in 1994 grouped in solidarity groups in Gisagara District	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	36/2015/RGB	12 months
11	Francois Xavier Bagnoud (FXB)	Reinforcing Income Generating Activities to Increase Food Security in FXB Rwanda's Existing Programs	Social protection	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	37/2015/RGB	12 months
12	Initiative pour la Promotion de la Famille et du Genre (IPFG)	Economic Empowerment for the Youth and Single Mothers in Rural Areas of Nyamagabe District	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	38/2015/RGB	12 months
13	Rise to Shine organisation	Rural Women Empowerment in Tailoring and Weaving	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	39/2015/RGB	12 months
14	Rwanda Union of Blind	Empowerment of Blind and Visually Impaired Youth and Adults through Individual Capacity Development	Social protection	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	40/2015/RGB	12 months
15	Strive Foundation - Rwanda	Advocacy for Conducive Youth Employment Policy and Implementation Practice	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	41/2015/RGB	12 months
16	Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA)	Feed Rwanda to Feed Future Project	Cultural promotion / youth and women development / self-empowerment in rural area	22,230,000	Dec. 16, 2015	42/2015/RGB	12 months
17	Alarm Ministries		Human Rights and gender mainstreaming		Dec. 16, 2015	Dec. 15, 2016	12 months
18	Tuvuge Twiyubaka	Enhancing accountability and civic participation for the sustainable development in Nyamagabe, Nyaruguru and Huye	Human Rights and gender mainstreaming		Dec. 1, 2015	Dec. 31, 2016	12 months
19	Tubibe Amahoro	The Citizen participation in District Development Plan, formulation, implementation and monitoring	Human Rights and gender mainstreaming		Feb. 9, 2016	Dec. 31, 2016	12 months

### CSO Programme (2016 - 2017)

	Name of organisation	Title of the project	Activity area	Finance Budget (Rwf)	Contract signing date	Grant contract #	Completion date	Duration
1	Association pour la Defense des Droits, de Développement durable et du bien-être familial (ADBEF)	Advocacy and capacity building on saving and management for domestic workers		23,965,400	June 22, 2016		Feb. 28, 2017	8 months
2	Association Rwandaise pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (A.R.D.H.O)	Legal assistance of 250 prisoners and gender equality for pregnant women and women living with children in 3 Rwandan prisons		24,000,000	June 22, 2016		Feb. 28, 2017	8 months

### CSO Programme (2017 - 2018)

	Name of organisation	Title of the project	Activity area	Finance Budget (Rwf)	Contract signing date	Grant contract #	Duration
1	Association Générale des Handicapes du Rwanda	Enhancing the full participation of people with disabilities in local Governance	Citizen participation, accountability and service delivery	24768,444	June 12, 2017	46/2017/RGB	12 months
2	Sabyinyo Community Livelihood Association "SACOLA"	Adduction en eau potable pour la population de la Cellule Nyonirima, Villages Bazizana et Gihisi dans le Secteur KINIGI, District de Musanze, Province du Nord	Social protection and public health	23748,635	June 08, 2017	47/2017/RGB	12 months
3	Rwanda Development Organization "RDO"	Protection of River Muvumba for Sustainable agriculture intensification	Protection of the environment for green growth and climate resilience	25000,000		48/2017/RGB	12 months
4	Rwanda NGOs Forum on HIV/AIDS and Health Promotion (RNGOF on AIDS&HP)	Strengthening Civil Society Organisations for responsive and Accountable Governance in Rwanda	Capacity building of organizations including in media	24994,650	June 12, 2017	49/2017/RGB	12 months
5	Eglise Anglicane au Rwanda Diocèse de Gahini	Improving livelihoods through better agricultural practices	Agriculture and Livestock	25000,000	June 13, 2017	50/2017/RGB	12 months
6	Noyau de Paix - ISOKO RY'AMAHORO	Projet de Promotion de l'éducation civique et électorale à travers la Jeunesse	Civic education and voter's education	25000,000	June 06, 2017	51/2017/RGB	12 months
7	Association des Etudiants et Elèves Rescapes du Génocide (AERG)	Empowering Community and local leaders in legal rights through family (ECLF) Project- Imbere Heza	Legal aid and mediation	25000,000	June 13, 2017	52/2017/RGB	12 months
8	Organization URUMURI RW' URUKUNDO (UBU)	Projet de Construction de 30 Biogaz dans le District de Bugesera, Secteur Ngeruka	Protection of the environment for green growth and climate resilience	23679,600	June 08, 2017	53/2017/RGB	12 months
9	Association de Solidarité des Femmes Rwandaises (ASOFERWA)	Health Care and Social protection awareness raising campaign in Bugesera District	Social protection and public health	24041,000		54/2017/RGB	12 months
10	Hope for Community Development Organization (HCDO)	Improved cooking stoves (ICS) for economic empowerment of historically marginalized Peoples (HMP) and other vulnerable groups of Gisagara District in Southern Province	Social protection and public health	24475,000	June 08, 2017	55/2017/RGB	12 months

11	Kibungo Catholic Diocese / Family Commission	Family Gender Promotion, a base of education and sustainable development	Family cohesion, child protection and anti-SGBV and child abuse Cooperatives development, youth, employment and culture promotion	24983,000	June 06, 2017	56/2017/RGB	12 months
12	Conférence Episcopale du Rwanda / C.EP.R / CEPJ	The Catholic Action Movements, prayers/groups trigger sustainable and durable social and economic development of their respective adherents	Legal aid and mediation	25000,000	June 06, 2017	57/2017/RGB	12 months
13	Diocèse Catholique de Butare Commission Justice & Paix	Participation citoyenne dans le processus du renforcement de la justice par la proximité dans le District de Gisagara	Civic education and voter's education	25,000,000	June 06, 2017	58/2017/RGB	12 months
14	Association des volontaires de la paix (AVP)	Building peaceful cohabitation of the Rwandese population by socio-economic integration of released prisoners, those who have made the TIG and the survivors of 1994 genocide against the TUTSI	Citizen participation, accountability and service delivery	25,000,000	June 07, 2017	59/2017/RGB	12 months
15	Pax Press	Informing and Engaging Rwandan Citizens in Monitoring the Quality of Service Delivery in both the Public and Private Sector for Increased awareness and Accountable Governance	Family cohesion, child protection and anti-SGBV and child abuse	25,000,000	June 12, 2017	60/2017/RGB	12 months
16	Rwanda Women Community Development Network	Inspire Change for Family Cohesion Project	Family cohesion, child protection and anti-SGBV and child abuse	25,000,000	June 09, 2017	61/2017/RGB	12 months
17	Diocèse Catholique de Byumba Commission Justice et Paix	Foyers de Paix pour la prévention et la lutte contre les violences domestiques et basées sur le genre	Social protection and public health	23,417,600	June 08, 2017	62/2017/RGB	12 months
18	Bureau Social de développement (BSD)	Réhabilitation sociale et renforcement du pouvoir économique des communautés riveraines des extractions minières en milieu rural	Capacity building of organizations including in media	24,770,000	June 09, 2017	63/2017/RGB	12 months
19	Rwanda Purpose Driven Ministries (Peace Plan)	Empowering Church Leaders for effective Peacebuilding	Citizen participation, accountability and service delivery	25,000,000	June 08, 2017	64/2017/RGB	12 months
20	Services au développement Associations "SDA IRIBA"	Strengthening Citizen participation and demand for Accountability through strong home-grown initiatives(SCPDA), Umuganda, umugoroba w'ababyeyi, inteko y'abaturatione	Cooperatives development, youth, employment and culture promotion	24,928,759	June 13, 2017	65/2017/RGB	12 months
21	Imena Cultural Troup	Projet d"education des jeunes a la paix par l'art en milieux scolaires	Social protection and public health	25,000,000	June 12, 2017	66/2017/RGB	12 months
22	Association Rwandaise pour le Développement Rural (AIRDRY)	Construction of Nyakariro Health Center Maternity /Rwamagana District	Agriculture and Livestock	25,000,000	June 02, 2017	67/2017/RGB	12 months
23	Imbutu Foundation (IMALI)	IMALI Project	Social protection and public health	25,000,000	June 13, 2017	68/2017/RGB	12 months
24	Initiative Don Bosco (IDB) / LIGA Project	Scaling up Little GIRLS AMBASSADORS (LIGA) Project		24,999,960	June 09, 2017	69/2017/RGB	12 months

	Name of organisation	Title of the project	Activity area	Finance Budget (Rwf)	Contract signing date	Grant contract #	Completion date	Duration
1	Hillside Hope	Blessing School for the visually impaired (BSVI)	Human Rights and gender equality	23,345,538	June 02, 2017		June 01, 2018	12 months
2	Rwanda National Union of the Deaf (RNUD)	Enhancing the effective participation of Deaf and hard of hearing persons in budgeting, consultations and decision-making process in three Districts of Rwanda	Human Rights and gender equality	25,000,000	June 02, 2017		June 01, 2018	12 months
3	Rwanda Union of Blind (RUB)	Engendering the visually impaired women in Rwanda into social services	Human Rights and gender equality	25,000,000	June 02, 2017		June 01, 2018	12 months

