



**FINAL EVALUATION OF THE “JOINT PROGRAM ON SUPPORT TO MINISTRY OF  
DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND REFUGEE (MIDIMAR)”**



**Mr MUJYANAMA PIO**  
**INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT**

Kigali December, 2017

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation report is a product of different stakeholders. I would like to thank them for their contribution during the final evaluation of the “joint program on support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugees (MIDIMAR)”.

I would like to express the profound appreciation and thanks to Mr. Nicolas SCHMIDS, UNDP Programme Analyst, Poverty and Environment unit for his incomparable role played during this evaluation.

My thanks are directly addressed to Ms. Veneranda INGABIRE, MIDIMAR SPIU Coordinator and Mr. Gilbert URAMUTSE, Disaster Manager for their support and dedicated time and efforts that have resulted into this report; you make me enjoying the work.

**LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS**

AAP	Annual Action Plans
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCPD	Common Country Programme Document
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CFW	Cash For Work
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAP	Development Assistance Programme
DDMC	District Disaster Management Committee
DDMO	District Disaster Management Officer
DDP	District Development Plan
DHS	Demographic Health Survey
DIDIMAC	District Disaster Management Committees
DM	Disaster Management
DRAMS	Disaster Risk Assessment and Monitoring System
DRG4	Development Results Groups 4
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EAC	East African Community
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
EW	Early Warning
EWM	Early Warning Mechanisms
EWS	Early Warning System
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FE	Final Evaluation

FFW	Food For Work
GHG	Green House Gases
GoR	Government of Rwanda
GoR	Government of Rwanda
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MC	Management Committee
Meteo	Meteorgy
MIDIMAR	Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugees Affairs <del>Affairs</del>
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MoH	Ministry of Health
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NDRMP	National Disaster Risk Management
NEOC	National Emergency Disaster Operations Center
NPDRR	National Platform Disaster Risk Reduction
NST	National Strategy for Transformation
One UN	One United Nations Rwanda
PDNA	Post-Disaster Needs Assessment
PSC	Project Steering Committee

REMA	Rwanda Environment Management Agency
RHA	Rwandan Housing Authority
RRC	Rwanda Red Cross
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEDIMAC	Sector Disaster Management Committees
SOP	Standards Operating Procedures
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unity
TV	Television
UN	United Nations
UN Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNDAP	Rwanda United Nations Development Assistance Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
UNTFHS	UN Trust Fund for Human Security
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
USD	United States Dollars
VSLAs	Village Savings and Loan Associations
WASAC	Water and Sanitation Corporation
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organizations

**TABLE OF CONTENT**

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENT.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>GLOSSARY OF THE TERMS .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Objectives of this work .....	3
1.3. Scope of the work.....	4
<b>II. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Documents review .....	5
2.2. Portfolio Analysis.....	8
2.3. Outcomes map.....	8
2.4. Semi-structured interviews .....	8
2.5. Triangulation .....	8
2.6. Observation .....	9
<b>III. KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1. National and Local capacity building for Disaster Risk Management in Rwanda .....	10
3.2. Interventions in Gakenke district.....	13
3.2.1 Construction and/or Rehabilitation of houses in Gakenke District.....	15
3.2.2. Construction and rehabilitation of bridges affected by disasters .....	16
3.2.3. Provision of Cash for work opportunities .....	16
3.2.4. Provision of assistance for replacement of productive assets .....	17
3.2.5. Supplies and commodities (agricultural inputs).....	17
3.2.6. Strengthening material and sexual and reproductive health services in Gakenke District .....	18
3.2.7. Emergency food assistance to people affected by landslide and floods .....	18
3.2.8. Provision of emergency start-up cash grant to most vulnerable population .....	19
3.2.9. Provision of emergency shelter and Non-Food Items .....	21

3.2.10. FAO Safety net intervention program.....	21
3.2.11. Rehabilitation of water supply system .....	21
3.3. Interventions in Ngororero district .....	23
3.3.1. Resilient housing constructed .....	23
3.3.2. Construction of a bridge .....	24
3.3.3. Upgrading a health post to a health center .....	25
3.3.4. Vocational trainings.....	25
3.4. Summary of findings based on the evaluation criteria .....	26
3.4.1. Relevance .....	26
3.4.2. Effectiveness.....	30
3.4.3. Efficiency.....	32
3.4.4. Sustainability.....	33
3.4.5. Impact.....	34
<b>IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1. Conclusion.....	36
4.2. Recommendations.....	40
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>a</b>

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: National and Local capacities building for Disaster Risk Management in Rwanda ..	11
Table 2: Funds mobilized by UNDP/One UN .....	33

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1: Destroyed house in Gakenke in 2016 .....	15
Figure 2: Constructed houses in Gakenke District .....	15
Figure 3: Destroyed bridges connecting Gakenke, Muhanga and Nyabihu Districts in 2016.	16
Figure 4: Constructed bridge connecting Gakenke and Mataba Sectors .....	16
Figure 5: Training of cash grant beneficiaries.....	19
Figure 6: Farming activity through cash grant.....	20
Figure 7: Rehabilitated water supply in Rukarankaya II.....	22
Figure 8: Constructed houses in Ngororero District.....	24
Figure 9: Upgrade health center .....	25



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the years, Rwanda has been witnessing an increasing number of disasters due to its geographical characteristics which are highly vulnerable to human-induced natural hazards. They have caused a large number of losses in human life, economy, infrastructures, etc. The prevailing hazards in Rwanda are mostly droughts, floods, earthquakes, landslides, various storms (i.e. windstorms, lightning, rainstorms and thunderstorms), forest fire, diseases, etc.

Over the last decade, the frequency and severity of disasters, particularly caused by floods, landslides and droughts, have significantly increased with increasing toll of human casualties as well as economic and environmental losses. Floods and landslides have been amongst the major disasters in Rwanda and have had a great impact on human development, properties, infrastructures, as well as environment<sup>1</sup>. The most prominent are droughts that occurred in 2014 and 2016 in the eastern province of Rwanda and the landslides that occurred in 2016 mainly in the Gakenke, Ngororero and Muhanga Districts. These affected the community in all aspects including death of 54 people where 34 were Gakenke residents, 38 injuries, 2,317 houses and other economical and infrastructures properties destroyed<sup>2</sup>.

It is in this regard, that UNDP has supported the government of Rwanda via MIDIMAR to initiate some projects related to disaster management to enhance the national and local capacities to strengthen the expertise of the staff to cope with disaster matters<sup>3</sup>. During the project implementation period, the interventions were mainly focused on capacity building.

In order to support the National response to the affected population of Gakenke District, the One UN in Rwanda through 7 UN agencies (FAO, IOM, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP, WHO) mobilized more than USD 4.7 Million through the Central Emergency Response

---

<sup>1</sup>MIDIMAR (2015), National Risks Atlas of Rwanda

<sup>2</sup> UNDP (2017), Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Final Progress Report, Rwanda

<sup>3</sup>MIDIMAR(2012), National Disaster Management Policy

Fund (CERF) to provide a comprehensive emergency response support to the affected populations as follow<sup>4</sup>:

- FAO: Safety Net Intervention Program (Rehabilitation of cropland sites including provision of seeds) (USD 941,127);
- IOM: Provision of Emergency Shelter and NFI Support (USD 1,000,780);
- UNDP: support the restoration of critical community infrastructure and emergency off-farm livelihoods (USD 728,135);
- UNFPA: Strengthening Maternal and Sexual and Reproductive health services (USD 107,300);
- UNICEF: restoration of water supply infrastructure (USD 447,795);
- WFP: Emergency food assistance (USD 880,645);
- WHO: Health emergency response (USD 175,725).

This evaluation, conducted to assess the project performance against the set outcomes and outputs, has discovered that the achievement is high on capacity building, disaster response in Gakenke District and preparedness and resilience in Ngororero District as indicated in table.

---

<sup>4</sup> One UN (2017), Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), Final Progress Report Country: Rwanda

**GLOSSARY OF THE TERMS <sup>5</sup>**

**Disaster:** A serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources.

**Climate change:** A change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.

**Disaster risk management:** The systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster.

**Early warning:** The set of capacities needed to generate and disseminate timely and meaningful warning information to enable individuals, communities and organizations threatened by a hazard to prepare and to act appropriately and in sufficient time to reduce the possibility of harm or loss.

**Hazard:** A dangerous phenomenon, substance, human activity or condition that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage.

**Preparedness:** The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, professional response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to, and recover from, the impacts of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions.

**Prevention:** The outright avoidance of adverse impacts of hazards and related disasters.

---

<sup>5</sup> Law N° 41/2015 of 29/08/2015 relating to disaster management

**Recovery:** The restoration, and improvement where appropriate, of facilities, livelihoods and living conditions of disaster-affected communities, including efforts to reduce disaster risk factors.

**Resilience:** The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions.

**Emergency:** organization and management of resources and responsibilities for addressing all aspects of emergencies, in particular preparedness, response and initial recovery steps.

**Response:** provision of emergency services and public assistance during or immediately after a disaster in order to save lives, reduce health impacts, ensure public safety and meet the basic subsistence needs of the people affected.

**Hazard:** dangerous phenomenon, substance, human activity or condition that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage.

## I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background

Disaster is a serious disruption of the functioning of a community involving loss and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community to cope using its own resources<sup>6</sup>. Its causes are many and differ from one region to another. The main causes of disaster are rapid urbanization, growing population, deforestation, and the escalating impacts of climate change evidenced by extreme weather events and erratic climatic conditions, etc. The main observed cases of disasters are floods, landslides, severe storms, drought, fires, thunder, storms, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions that can trigger other widespread related risks and devastations. In Rwanda, disaster management is cross cutting, as indicated in EDPRS II, and special attention is paid to mainstreaming environmental sustainability and reducing vulnerability to climate change<sup>7</sup> and disasters. The process of developing NST has considered disaster risk reduction under cross cutting issues with emphasis on disaster management.

Disaster occurrence and related risks are high. In previous years, floods and landslides occurred in Rwanda with heavy negative impact. The vulnerability to disasters depends on many reasons such as soil, topography, urbanization or/and agglomeration, etc<sup>8</sup>. The country is vulnerable to a wide range of natural hazards such as floods, flash floods, landslides/mudslides, droughts, storms, lightning, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, fires and epidemics. The most vulnerable Districts with high to very high susceptibility are Gakenke, Karongi, Muhanga, Ngororero, Nyabihu, Nyamagabe, Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru, Rusizi, Rubavu, and Rutsiro<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Law N° 41/2015 of 29/08/2015 relating to disaster management

<sup>7</sup> MINECOFIN (2013), Economic Development and Poverty Reduction strategy II 2013-2018

<sup>8</sup> RPA and MIDIMAR (2011), Field visit report conducted

<sup>9</sup> MIDIMAR (2015), The National Risk Atlas of Rwanda, Kigali

However, there is now international acknowledgement that efforts to reduce disaster risks is being systematically integrated into policies, plans and programs for sustainable development and poverty reduction, and supported through bilateral, regional and international cooperation, including partnerships<sup>10</sup>. To cope with the disasters, all involved stakeholders have to be trained and prepared. It is against this background that UNDP has been supporting MIDIMAR to build national and local capacities for Disaster Management through “joint program on support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs MIDIMAR”. The project implementation started in June 2013 and is ending on June 30, 2018. The joint programme, “Support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management related issues (2014-2018)” aims to Build National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda. This involved (i) Technical assistance and financial assistance for capacity development of central and local bodies dealing with disaster management, early warning and monitoring; (ii) Research and assessment including undertaking comprehensive risk and vulnerability assessment; (iii) Policy and strategy formulation, including disaster management and preparedness; and (iv) Public awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction to the communities, reduced community vulnerabilities/enhance resilience and strengthen human security in selected high risk districts; and (v) Technical and/or financial support to respond to disasters.

In all these interventions, cross-cutting issues related to gender will involve establishing gender specific data and statistics on vulnerabilities, risk, capacities, differential impact of disasters on females compared to males of different age groups; developing gender-sensitive indicators to monitor and measure progress, in order to inform planning and response to disaster and humanitarian crisis; and strengthening coordination and collaboration between Ministries responsible for disaster and gender issues in line with the national Gender

---

<sup>10</sup> UNISDR (2005), Hyogo framework for action 2005-2015

Monitoring Framework. Importantly, sustainability and human rights will also be mainstreamed in all the planned interventions.

This Final Evaluation (FE) is an independent external evaluation of the MIDIMAR and UNDP/One UN's project achievements. It is focused on examining the achievements of the outputs and outcomes in the implementation of the project. The findings from the FE will inform decision-makers on how to strengthen the role and contribution of the UN system to support national policies and strategies towards achieving development results. The results will be shared to the Government of Rwanda especially public institutions involved in disaster management, UNDP and other UN agencies involved in disaster management, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), academia, researchers, etc for future interventions. Key questions, as indicated in the Terms of Reference, are focused on the relevance of the project, effectiveness of the project, its efficiency, sustainability of the project and the impact.

### **1.2. Objectives of this work**

The main objective of this FE was to assess the project implementation level compared to set outputs and outcomes. Specifically, this focused on:

- Assess the programme's initiation and financing;
- Assess the Programme's implementation strategy;
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions;
- Assess the Programme's processes, including budgetary efficiency;
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs have been achieved;
- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the programme's activities;
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
- Assess the exit strategies;
- Document lessons learnt;

- Make recommendations for the next project cycle.

### **1.3. Scope of the work**

This evaluation considered the period from July 2013 up to September 2017. It focused on specific UNDP/One UN funded interventions of the One UN Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The scope of the final evaluation covered all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments to document lessons learnt.
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the program.



## II. METHODOLOGY

The key questions were formulated under the following themes:

- Relevance of the project;
- Effectiveness of the project;
- Its efficiency;
- Sustainability of the project;
- Impact of the project based on the targeted outcomes on disaster management in Rwanda for the period 2013-2018.

### 2.1. Documents review

The desk review focused on programme documents. Below is the list of some of reviewed documents:

- International frameworks for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management, including the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2015-2030;
- DRG4 Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management;
- Rwanda Outlook State of the Environment – 2015;
- Mid-term evaluation of the UNDP funded activities of the DRG4 Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management in Rwanda;
- MINAGRI/UN: Comprehensive Vulnerability and Food Security Analysis;
- CERF project document Restoration of critical community infrastructure and emergency off farm livelihoods for landslides affected population in Gakenke District;
- UNDP Global Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and UNDP Delivering the Post-2015;
- UN Plan of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction;
- Government of Rwanda Vision 2020 and Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) II, 2013-2018;
- Human Development Report – Rwanda 2015;

- UNDP Rwanda United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP) 2013-2018 and related monitoring indicators and targets;
- United Trust Fund for Human Security proposal “Strengthening Human Security by enhancing resilience to natural disasters and climate-related threats in Ngororero District;
- Japan-funded project “Preparedness for resilient Recovery” in Rwanda;
- Project Initiation Plan for National Capacity Building for Disaster Risk management Programme, 2011;
- “Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” Project document, 2013;
- Annual report “Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” Project, 2013-2014;
- Quarterly Progress report “Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” Project, 2013-2015;
- Project Steering Committee Meetings minutes, “Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” Project , 2013-2015;
- Report on Lessons learned on disaster recovery ;
- Rwanda National Preparedness Plan;
- National Disaster Management Policy, MIDIMAR, 2014;
- Disaster Management Law, MIDIMAR;
- MIDIMAR 5 year Strategic Plan (2012-2017);
- National Disaster Risk Management Plan (NDRMP), MIDIMAR;
- Hyogo Framework for Action;
- Sendai Framework for DRR 2015-2030;
- Rwanda National Progress Report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (Monitoring report 2011-2013);

- Minutes National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction quarterly meetings, 2013-2015;
- District Plans (the ones where DRR is mainstreamed);
- DRR Mainstreaming to EDPRS Sectors document;
- “Development of comprehensive disaster risk profiles for enhancing disaster management in Rwanda” project document;
- Rwanda Comprehensive Disaster Risk profile (Disaster Risk Atlas);
- Republic of Rwanda, EDPRS 2;
- Republic of Rwanda, Vision 2020;
- United Nations Rwanda, UNDP Programme Rwanda, CCPD 2013-2018;
- United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018;
- UNEG, ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’;
- UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation;
- UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluations for Development Results (2009);
- UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ 2005;
- Addendum June 2011 Evaluation: Updated guidance on Evaluation in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009);
- Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Disaster Prevention and Recovery, UNDP 2010;
- <http://www.oecd.org/derec/undp/47871337.pdf>;
- <http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/manageevaluation/viewevaluationdetail.html?evaluationid=4782>;
- Evaluation of the Government of Uganda and UNDP Crisis Management and Recovery Program (CMR), 2011;
- <https://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=5296>.

## **2.2. Portfolio Analysis**

This was used to assess how the project results match with the resources as indicated in the implementation matrix. It looked at indicators and set targets as stated in the Common Country Programme Document (CCPD) and other project interventions. This included the review of specific products produced so far, including datasets, Atlas records, quarterly reports, action plans, annual progress reports, its financial reports, and issue logs, monitoring reports (such as minutes of LPAC meeting, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, mid-term evaluation report, Program annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including financial reports).

## **2.3. Outcomes map**

The outcomes map was centered around changes in the behavior of the people or/and organizations due to the influences brought by the project implementation. It facilitated to evaluate the expected outputs and outcomes against the achievements. The focus was on the real change brought by the project and provides a visual map of UNDP/One UN program to MIDIMAR.

## **2.4. Semi-structured interviews**

This was conducted to key stakeholders. It involved relevant stakeholders such as central government, agencies, Districts, UNDP and project beneficiaries. The focus was on the level of the implementation, challenges and lessons learnt. The semi structured interviews focused on the project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

## **2.5. Triangulation**

During this evaluation, cross-verification of the data from UNDP, MIDIMAR and beneficiaries was done. This considered qualitative and quantitative data. Here primary and secondary data were cross-checked to ensure the reliability and validity of results.

## 2.6. Observation

The observation helped to see the reality on the ground including physical contribution of UNDP such as rehabilitation of the houses and constructed bridge. This activity was done in Gakenke and Ngororero Districts.

### **III. KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION**

This evaluation focused on three main interventions of the project which are the development of national and local capacities for disaster risk management in Rwanda, aftermath of disaster in Gakenke District and resilience in Ngororero District.

#### **3.1. National and Local capacity building for Disaster Risk Management in Rwanda**

The project evaluation was focusing on the following outputs:

- Output 1: Enhanced capacities of national and local institutions to manage disaster risks and recover from disaster events; including improved national and local coordination mechanisms
- Output 2: DRR mainstreamed into national/district/sectorial plans and policies; and capacities on DRM Planning enhanced.
- Output 3: A functioning national disaster risk assessment and monitoring system (DRAMS) established.
- Output 4: End-to-end early warning systems established and operational.
- Output 5: Reduced community vulnerabilities and increased household resilience in selected high-risk districts and increased public awareness on DRR.

Table 1: National and Local capacities building for Disaster Risk Management in Rwanda

Overall targets	Achievement
<b>Output 1: Enhanced capacities of national and local institutions to manage disaster risks and recover from disaster events; including improved national and local coordination mechanisms</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Risk Management in DRR capacity assessment of MIDIMAR; District Disaster Management Committees (DIDIMAC), Sector Disaster Management Committees (SEDIMAC) and National Platform Disaster Risk Reduction (NPDMRR);</li> <li>- Disaster Risk Reduction Specialist based at the Ministry providing capacity building support</li> <li>- Development of capacity development strategy and plan and support its roll-out and implementation;</li> <li>- Strengthening the national and local coordination mechanisms for DRR and recovery, including through capacity building support for the National Platform for DRR;</li> <li>- Development of Districts DRM Plans;</li> <li>- Programmatic and progressive capacity building/training of MIDIMAR Staff, DDMCs and SDMCs on a range of DRR and recovery technical capacities including community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) and post-disaster needs assessment (PDNA);</li> <li>- Provision of technical advisory services and programme support. Also include: setting up and strengthening the National Emergency Disaster Operations Center (NEOC) where the EW and other systems are integrated and coordinated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (NPDRR) has been established and it provides inter-agency and multi-sectorial technical support to MIDIMAR on disaster management, disaster risk management and risk reduction issues and concerns. This platform has been very useful in disaster response. Here we can mention the case of Gakenke District in 2016 where the platform played key role in recovery process. Currently, the platform is working of preparedness of volcanic eruption in Musanze District.</li> <li>- Establishment of District Disaster Management Committees (DDMCs established by law ) in 28 Districts and Sector Disaster Management Committees (SDMC) in all sectors of Rwanda who are in charge of coordinating and implementing disaster management activities at the District and Sector levels.</li> <li>- Strengthened disaster management capacities of 10 Districts through capacity building support and deployment of District Disaster Management Officers (DDMOs) in 10 most disaster risk prone Districts which are the Districts of Gakenke, Rubavu, Nyabihu, Ngororero, Nyamagabe, Muhanga, Rwamagana, Nyagatare, Kayonza and Rutsiro.</li> </ul> <p>Disaster management capacities of over than 638 officials, authorities, staff and professionals at national and District/Sector levels developed. 217 (34.5%) of the trained people where women while 418 (65.5%) were men. The trainings targeted different groups such as members of NPDRR, DDMCs, SDMCs and local community. The trainings topics were many such as Post Disaster Needs Assessment, better management of disaster at community level, use of EWS Early warning system where all 30 Districts have been trained two times, simulation exercises related disaster management, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparedness for resilient recovery. Developed and produced the Training Manual on Disaster Management for DDMCs and SDMCs</li> <li>- Promoted and supported Rwanda's participation and visibility in global and regional platforms for disaster</li> </ul>

	<p>risk reduction including the most recently held Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Sendai, Japan where the new Sendai Framework for DRR was adopted and approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical advisory and assistance provided in policy and strategy development i.e. DM Law, Contingency Plans and National Recovery and Response Strategy</li> </ul>
<b>Output 2: DRR mainstreamed into national/district/sectorial plans and policies; and capacities on DRM Planning enhanced</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify entry points for DRR mainstreaming based on UNDP's Framework for DRR/CCA Mainstreaming, including identification of priority sectors for DRR mainstreaming;</li> <li>- Development of DRR Mainstreaming Planning module;</li> <li>- DRR mainstreaming into district development plans;</li> <li>- Mainstreaming of DRR in selected sectorial development plans and relevant policies i.e. in school curriculum, land use plans, building codes, agriculture, infrastructure, health, etc;</li> <li>- Development of DRR mainstreaming guidelines where the document is available online (MIDIMAR website) and training; provision of technical advisory and programme support was provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DRR mainstreamed in Annual Action Plans (AAPs) and policies of sectorial Ministries (Infrastructure, Agriculture, Environment, Education, ICT, Youth Employment and Productivity, housing and settlement, Urbanization, Transport, Water and sanitation, Health, Education), and in 28 District Development Plans (DDPs); only Gasabo and Ngoma Districts are remaining.</li> </ul>
<b>Output 3: A functioning National Disaster Risk Assessment and Monitoring System (DRAMS) established</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of the National Risk Assessment Framework,</li> <li>- Development of evidence-based national hazard risk profile and national risk assessment, establishment of the damage and loss data base/</li> <li>- Establishment of National Disaster Observatory,</li> <li>- Enhancing national capacities for undertaking risks assessments</li> <li>- Establishment of a national coordination and governance mechanisms for the effective functioning of the integrated national disaster assessment and monitoring system in Rwanda.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The National Risk Atlas of Rwanda, the first ever comprehensive risk profile in Africa has been developed and launched on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The Atlas includes hazard assessment and mapping of the 5 Major natural hazards prevailing in Rwanda namely droughts, floods, landslides, earthquakes and windstorms. It includes as well a detailed exposure and vulnerability assessment, estimating the potential loss/damages per hazard scenario</li> <li>- The National Risk Atlas is used in policy planning, infrastructure development including urban planning for settlement, agriculture, etc. This is also informing investors especially those in the field of agriculture and other sectors</li> </ul>
<b>Output 4: End-to-end early warning systems established and operational</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resource mobilization to support establishment of EWS;</li> <li>- Comprehensive and systematic inventory of EWS in Rwanda i.e. Assessment of EWS;</li> <li>- Support to capacity building of RMA on warning monitoring (prediction), analysis and forecasting to include upgrade of both software and hardware</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supported the disaster communication system of MIDIMAR which feeds into the national disaster database – daily reports of disaster data are compiled and disseminated to decision makers and technical units appropriate and corresponding actions. This enhanced the disaster response capacities of the government as demonstrated by provision of timely</li> </ul>



<p>components of existing hydro-meteorological equipment and facilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set up institutional arrangements specifying roles and responsibilities and chain of protocols for early warning,</li> <li>- Development of an EW SOPs at all levels,</li> <li>- Establish specific warning criteria for each type of hazards (i.e. rainfall-induced floods, flash floods and landslides), develop the communication/ Information protocols, procedures and flow chart for early warning messages.</li> </ul>	<p>and more effective and appropriate response actions to disaster or emergency situations in different parts of the country.</p>
<p><b>Output 5: Reduced community vulnerabilities and increased household resilience in selected high-risk districts and increased public awareness on DRR</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for the implementation of disaster preparedness and vulnerability reduction measures in selected high-risk districts/areas (i.e. research on cost-effective community based mitigation measures;</li> <li>- Retrofitting of community infrastructures in high-risk zones and promote household resilience through CfW/FfW scheme and other incentive mechanisms;</li> <li>- Promote a culture of disaster preparedness and prevention through sustained support to building public awareness on DRM.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A sustained public awareness building on disasters, DRM and DRR supported. Public dialogues and meetings organized. From 2013 up 2017, weekly disaster management topics were aired on TV.</li> <li>- 209 schools clubs were created and supported.</li> </ul>

Source: UNDP report 2017

### 3.2. Interventions in Gakenke district

Gakenke District is one of the most disaster-prone areas in Rwanda. The District is located generally is slopes and high inclined hills separated by rivers and marshlands. The area is made of high altitude area and an area characterized by lowly inclined hills of 1,700m. Its geographical characteristics is one of the main causes of disasters in that area.

This area is made of slopes where the occurrence of landslide and flooding is high. In May 2016, this District faced disaster caused by landslide and heavy rains. This affected the District in various aspects of life. Out of 19 administrative sectors of Gakenke District, only one sector was not affected, other 18 sectors were affected by the disaster. The assessment

revealed that the District was affected in all aspects of life such as agriculture sector, housing, health, transportation and economic sectors. 34 people lost their lives, one was a pregnant woman who was about to deliver. 1,425 houses and 24 bridges were destroyed and a big number of crops were heavily affected. The damaged hectare of crops are 1,102.3 of beans, 11 of maize, 168 of rice, 5 of cassava, 72 of sugar cane, 208 of bananas, 1.5 of pineapple, 7 of coffee, 3.8 of geranium and 53 of forests. The number of livestock lost was 12 cows, 27 goats, 6 pigs, 10 sheep, 713 chickens and 9 rabbits<sup>11</sup>.

Since then, rapid assessment was conducted and recovery measures were taken with the support of the One UN in Rwanda . The interventions were made through Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). The development of this project was carried out by MIDIMAR / UN Joint Intervention Management Committee (JIMC), each partner made a commitment to achieve different objectives according to its intervention field, such as:

- **MIDIMAR/UNDP Project:** Restoration of critical community infrastructure and emergency off-farm livelihoods for landslide-affected population (USD 728,135);
- **UNFPA Project:** Strengthening material and sexual and reproductive health services (USD 107,300);
- **WHO Project:** Health emergency response to population affected by landslides and floods (USD 175,725);
- **WFP Project:** Emergency food assistance to people affected by landslide and floods (USD 880,645);
- **IOM Project:** Provision of emergency shelter and NFI support to communities affected by floods and landslides (USD 1,000,780);
- **FAO Project:** FAO Safety net intervention program in support of vulnerable landslides and floods affected households in Rwanda (USD 941,127);
- **UNICEF PROJECT:** Rehabilitation of water supply system (USD 447,795).

---

<sup>11</sup> MIDIMAR (2016), Post disaster needs assessment for Gakenke District

### 3.2.1 Construction and/or Rehabilitation of houses in Gakenke District

During the 2016 disasters, many houses were destroyed. Most of them were in high risks zone and others were constructed with poor materials. Through Central Emergency Response Fund, 1,333 houses were constructed for the victims to recover their living conditions.



**Figure 1: Destroyed house in Gakenke in 2016**



**Figure 2: Constructed houses in Gakenke District**

Rwanda House Authority and Gakenke district played a major role of selecting adequate sites responding to district land use master plan which is very crucial to reduce the probability of disaster occurrence. After the disasters, it was necessary for building back, and houses were offered to people without shelter. Project beneficiaries mentioned that they have been very satisfied because they received decent houses with durable materials. They said that many were so poor that they could not afford to construct such modern houses which are so different from previous ones with mostly wooden materials and other poor materials. The construction was supervised by engineers' technical team endowed with sound construction skills. This emphasizes the appropriate decency for house received which standing out obviously when comparing to previous shelters.

### 3.2.2. Construction and rehabilitation of bridges affected by disasters

After the disasters in Gakenke, the damaged bridges paralyzed movements of people, goods and services and limited trades. After a rapid assessment, 29 bridges were found affected. Out of 24 bridges strongly damaged, 18 were selected for reconstruction.



**Figure 3: Destroyed bridges connecting Gakenke, Muhanga and Nyabihu Districts in 2016**



**Figure 4: Constructed bridge connecting Gakenke and Mataba Sectors**

The evaluation showed that 19 bridges were reconstructed throughout affected areas to enable a smoother transition to long-term recovery, to restore livelihoods, and to allow free trading within Gakenke sectors and neighboring areas. The above photos show the reconstructed bridges which can resist to heavy rain and all water movement. The new constructed bridges are strong compared to the old ones due to different materials used and experts who rebuilt them.

### 3.2.3. Provision of Cash for work opportunities

During the recovery process following the aftermath of disasters, members of the affected communities were employed to rehabilitate and construct houses for casual labor, which provided them with temporary income. The number of people who benefited from cash for

work was 749 where 349 were women-headed households and 400 were men, most of those vulnerable households being organized in saving and loan groups<sup>12</sup>.

Cash for work has been given out as daily compensation. 1,000 Rwf were paid for casual laborers per day, 2,000 Rwf for capitas (supervisors), 2500 Rwf for technicians and 10,000 Rwf for engineers. In addition to the payment of money, casual laborers were paid food (maize, beans, vegetable oil and salts). 7,314 disaster victims participated in the rehabilitation activities of 184 ha of Kagoma marshland, maintenance of 33 km of roads, plantation of 16,000 trees and progressive terracing of 101,4 Ha; this was tremendous contribution for households income generation. Some cash for work beneficiaries confirmed that they started small business where currently they are generating some incomes.

#### **3.2.4. Provision of assistance for replacement of productive assets**

Disasters were cause the loss of household assets. When the disasters happened, many households had lost many items such blankets, utensils, etc. To restore normal life, the project provided assistance for replacement of productive assets for 300 individuals at \$100 per each. The transfer was made to their account number opened in Umurenge SACCOs. The beneficiaries were selected from five sectors of Karambo, Gakenke, Muzo and Mataba. The cash helped them to get new productive assets used for daily life in the households.

#### **3.2.5. Supplies and commodities (agricultural inputs)**

Disasters cause considerable damages to physical agricultural assets such as standing crops, irrigation systems, and post-production infrastructure. The decline in output from crop triggers considerable economic losses to farmers and often have a domino effect on the food value chain and sector growth. Because enhancing the resilience of agriculture-based livelihoods in the face of disasters was at the core of the project commitment to tackle hunger food insecurity, agriculture inputs were provided such fertilizers and seedlings to boost a rapid recovery.

---

<sup>12</sup> MIDIMAR (2016), Quarterly progress report for UNDP Project: October -December 2016

### **3.2.6. Strengthening material and sexual and reproductive health services in Gakenke District**

After protracted disaster effects, the priority was the provision of humanitarian relief. For the health sector in affected areas, the focus was on life saving actions and activities to strengthen the health system. The following items were provided:

- Dignity kits for 1,500 Affected pregnant women, lactating mothers and adolescent girl;
- Lifesaving maternal health commodities and others supplies for the 3 health facilities;
- Material health equipment for Mataba health centre maternity ward;
- Two Inter-Agency Emergency Health kit - IEHK 2006 – Complete Kit – to the health facilities in Gakenke and Muhanga;
- Three DDK kits to health facilities located in Gakenke, Muhanga and Ngororero;

The dignity kits and health equipment were provided by UNFPA in three health centers of Mataba (200 dignity kits), Naganzo (250 dignity kits) and Minazi (150 dignity Kits). The provided kits were bucket of 16 liters, 600 basins, 600 towels with UNFPA logo, 600, 2 pieces in 1 of African fabric (Kitenge) JAVA, 600 baby tissue (flannel/Ikigoma), 1,200 hygienic Pads (Cotex), 1,800 maternity sanitary pads, 1200 soaps, 1,200 baby body lotion (Vaseline of 500 mg), 600 women underwear, 1200 blankets, 600 baby pajamas (6 months), and 600 bag with UNFPA Logo 600<sup>13</sup>.

### **3.2.7. Emergency food assistance to people affected by landslide and floods**

During Disasters recovery, food assistance were also focused to reduce hunger and malnutrition using all available means to respond quickly in emergencies and ensure that people affected by crises have access to sufficient, nutritious food. After the disaster, many people worked to provide project services, and they received food in return.

Food was provided by WFP to 11,517 households victims of disasters through food for work program. The number of people who participated in food for work are 11,157 able bodied

<sup>13</sup> MIDIMAR (2017), Report of CERF rapid-response project in Gakenke district

plus 358 vulnerable people which total 11,517. The following are the provided food commodities in tons: maize: 708.30, beans: 207.31, vegetable oil: 51.83, salt: 8. 64 total: 976.07<sup>14</sup>.

### **3.2.8. Provision of emergency start-up cash grant to most vulnerable population**

Cash grant of 100,000 Rwf was provided to 749 people, most of whom were women head of households. People were organized into 37 groups from different sectors of Gakenke District. They were trained and sensitized on how to use the emergency start-up cash grant efficiently and advised on developing a small business plan.



**Figure 5: Training of cash grant beneficiaries**

The total amount of money for cash grant was 74,900,000 Rwf. This was transferred to their accounts opened by Umurenge SACCO. The cash grant was used to start farming .

---

<sup>14</sup> MIDIMAR (2017), Report of CERF rapid-response project in Gakenke district





**Figure 6: Farming activity through cash grant**

People who benefited from start-up cash grant are now gradually improving their socio-economic status. From the emergency start-up cash grant provided especially to head of households women (most vulnerable population), VSLAs were formed. Majority of them started farming activities such as livestock. From the interviews with project beneficiaries, some of them have cows, pigs, sheep and goats. “Through start-up cash grant, I started farming activity with only two pigs, now I have 17. I’m able to feed my family and to pay education fees of my children” said project beneficiary. “I got 100,000 Rwf from UNDP/One UN, as my children were facing malnutrition problem, I decided to buy a cow, today I have free manure to fertilize my farm and I expect soon to get milk from my cow” said a respondents during the meeting with project beneficiaries.



### **3.2.9. Provision of emergency shelter and Non-Food Items**

The Shelter and Non-Food Items were needed by every affected individual. District partner organizations worked to provide life-saving households items and shelter materials to disaster affected people in Gakenke district. 1,139 out of 1,264 destroyed houses have been rehabilitated. The provided materials are as follow: 2,528 doors, 5,056 windows , 2,128 kilos of nails, 12640 cement bags, 19,125 iron sheets, 1,000 truck full of sand , 2,528 jerrycans , 3,792 soaps , were given to beneficiaries while 2400 iron sheets and 3600 tube were provided for schools rehabilitation<sup>15</sup>.

### **3.2.10. FAO Safety net intervention program**

Safety net interventions had been availed to mitigate the effects of poverty and other risks on vulnerable households. Various safety nets actions tackled divers risks facing households and support them through hard times with cash, food, or labor. This was done through project activities run by humanitarian community aiming to provide additional income or in-kind help to vulnerable households.

Through contractual services, beneficiaries were organized into groups able to provide services, and received cash for work produced agricultural inputs. To reduce disaster risk, 497 hectares of marshland and mountain from Karambo, Gashenyi and Nemba sectors were protected and restored by adjacent communities where they worked for cash, household assets and other commodities. 4, 317 disasters victims received cash for work and received food for work, 4317 disaster victims received 192.9 tons of fertilizer such as: DAP 142.9 tons, UREA: 50 tons.

### **3.2.11. Rehabilitation of water supply system**

Water is the most important resources needed by all the community around the world. Once it is not available or dirty, the human health is affected. The 2016 disaster in Gakenke District affected entire life of residing community including water-supply. The occurred disaster in Gakenke District destroyed water sources such as Water tape/ WASAC, dug well,

---

<sup>15</sup> MIDIMAR (2017), Report of CERF rapid-response project in Gakenke district

spring, hand pump/borehole/tube well, etc. During the Post Disaster Needs Assessment, water was a priority. During the recovery period, water supply was rehabilitated.



**Figure 7: Rehabilitated water supply in Rukarankaya II**

This task concerns the restoration of water supply service which had been damaged and stopped when disaster struck the water supply system in Gakenke district. Stable and safe water supply have been essential to the improvement of people's living and economic activities. Therefore, restoration and reconstruction of water facilities had been paramount to prevent people from unhygienic living conditions and health problems. In Gakenke District, 22 water supply systems were rehabilitated from Karambo, Nemba Gakenke, Muzo, Mugunga, Janja, Muhondo, Muyongwe and Ruli. The rehabilitation of water supply systems

was satisfactory to the project beneficiaries. *“We are very happy with the rehabilitated water sources which are better than the previous ones. We are now enjoying to use it for drinking, cooking and bathing as it is very clean and safe”* said respondents.

### **3.3. Interventions in Ngororero district**

Ngororero District is among disaster prone area at national level. During the project implementation through United Nations, the interventions were focused on strengthening human security, enhancing resilience and improving disaster risk management of high-risk communities and most vulnerable populations. The interventions focused on disaster preparedness in Ngororero district. The interventions were mainly the construction of houses to poor people in high risk zones, vocational trainings, bridge construction, upgrading a health post to health center, construction of maternity and water supply for 27 kilometers.

#### **3.3.1. Resilient housing constructed**

For preparedness and resilience purpose, among 21 houses which are supposed to be built, eleven (11) resilient houses were constructed to relocate people in high risks zone where 8 houses were given to single female parents. The constructed followed housing regulations in Rwanda starting by selecting adequate sites and land use master plan of the District. This was also supervised by qualified engineers from District and Rwanda Housing Authority with necessary skills and technologies in housing. Various risks based on geographic areas were taken in account as indicated in National Risk Atlas.

The completed 11 houses were equipped with solar panel, water tank, TV and decoder. Ten out of twenty-one (21) houses to host people who will move out from high risk zones are still under construction; it is expected that other remaining ten (10) will be completed by March 2018. The selection of beneficiaries was carried out by local communities under the

supervision of district council and man power was also selected from neighboring community focusing on poor people.



**Figure 8: Constructed houses in Ngororero District**

High risk zones prone to landslide and floods were identified for effective disaster prevention, preparedness and planning. Ngororero district did show the dangerous zone, and identified difficulties from the community to cope with natural disasters. Thereafter, beneficiaries were identified to receive decent houses with improved quality of housing in the owner-occupied. “Privately owned home beneficiaries in Ngororero district which for many people is their most valuable asset, safer, healthier and more durable, will be protected”, said one of the beneficiaries.

### **3.3.2. Construction of a bridge**

It has been emphasized that a bridge to connect two sectors which are Sovu and Bwira is very crucial for Ngororero District. This bridge is under construction for a total expense cost of 70,000,000 Rwf. The procurement process has been completed and it is supposed to be completed by the end of May 2018.

### 3.3.3. Upgrading a health post to a health center

Through the project intervention of One UN, a health post has been upgraded to a health center for a total cost of 48,000,000 Rwf.



**Figure 9: Upgrade health center**

The construction of this health center increased accessibility to health care facilities. The health center surrounding community are happy to access health services. As the health post has been upgraded into health center that will satisfy women needs related to pregnancy, childbirth, and children immunization. Current, a maternity ward is under construction process. This will facilitate women to deliver without getting long distance.

### 3.3.4. Vocational trainings

Many people have been empowered in vocational skills where 220 people benefited various skills from vocational trainings. 120 women and 100 men learned various skills in 8 different fields namely welding, construction, food processing (juices and breads), mechanics, tailoring, knitting, catering and shoes making. The trainees earned tool kits useful in their respective activities, and have been grouped in cooperatives that Ngororero district have supported financially. Based on the information from the vocational trainings graduates, some of them started working and they are earning some income; meaning that the acquired skills are contributing to the improvement of living conditions of project beneficiaries.

### 3.4. Summary of findings based on the evaluation criteria

#### 3.4.1. Relevance

##### **Alignment with national priorities**

Among EDPRS II priorities, there is building a “disaster resilient nation” related to mainstreaming across a wide expanse of priority sectors ranging from agriculture to education to environment and natural resources, and infrastructure, among others<sup>16</sup>. The National Disaster Management Policy priority is also to build the resilience of communities, infrastructures and service providers to disasters by reducing their vulnerability and increasing their ability to withstand and minimize the effects of disasters and complex emergencies through adaptation to climate change by enhancing preparedness<sup>17</sup>. The policy aimed at ensuring timely recovery from disasters and complex emergencies, and leaving communities and families in a better position to withstand future hazards as well as building back better. This means that the project interventions were aligned with national priorities.

##### **Alignment with global priorities:**

Climate change and disaster management are among key priorities of SDGs to be taken into consideration as people and animals rely on environment. It focuses on combating climate change where every country in the world should take it as a priority<sup>18</sup>. This is followed by The Hyogo Framework where Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and preparedness for emergency response are underlined<sup>19</sup>. For the case of Sendai framework, the project interventions fall under its priorities. The Sendai framework denotes that it is urgent and critical to anticipate, plan for and reduce disaster risk in order to more effectively protect persons, communities and countries, their livelihoods, health, cultural heritage, socio-economic assets and ecosystems, and thus strengthen their resilience<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> Government of Rwanda/MINECOFIN (2013), Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy II

<sup>17</sup> MIDIMAR (2012), National Disaster Management Policy

<sup>18</sup> UNDP (2015) Sustainable Development Goals 2030

<sup>19</sup> UNDP (2012), Hyogo framework for action, Japan

<sup>20</sup> UN (2015), Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015-2030

**UNDP global mandate**

The project interventions are linked with UNDP mandate. This is focused on building community resilience to face disaster effects and support to early recovery. UNDP stressed that the Early recovery is a vital element of an effective humanitarian crisis response as a foundation for building resilience in post-crisis settings<sup>21</sup>. The project interventions were centered to build the national and local capacities to disaster management.

**Gender equality and women empowerment**

During project design, gender was not clearly considered. However, in the project implementation, gender sensitivity has been observed whereby women were participating in the project activities generating incomes and benefiting from the produced products (constructed houses) based on the most vulnerable and women headed households. In eleven constructed houses in Ngororero district, eight were handed to women headed household. This is followed by large number women who benefited from cash grant in Gakenke District.

**Providing normative policy support**

Building Local and National Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction project which has been operated and implemented by the Government of Rwanda through MIDIMAR, has provided normative policy support in the implementation of global agreements, norms and standards, such as the Hyogo Framework for Action, MDGs with target to implement the indicators of Sendai framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. As main partner of government, UNDP has become fully involved in climate change and put resilience and human protection at the heart of the development program.

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/climate-and-disaster-resilience/disaster-risk-reduction.html>

**Consideration of vulnerable groups**

The project interventions were based on socio-economic status such as people who received houses and vocation skills in Ngororero District were from vulnerable groups. In Gakenke district, the socio-economic status was selected as criteria to get cash grant, cash for work, replacement of productive assets, etc. The assistance targeted people in class 1 and 2 of socio-economic status (Ubudehe).

**Balance of upstream/downstream activities**

The said project was implemented through the synergies across the development and humanitarian partners. The disaster risk reduction was focused on building community resilience, sustaining and preventing the reversal of development gains. This was done through provided support at national and decentralized levels. The upstream activities are conducted at national level especially by MIDIMAR and National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction while downstream activities are the initiatives from decentralized levels. The disaster management was mainstreamed in 28 districts.

**Assimilated Rwanda's "homegrown solutions"**

Homegrown solutions are a current slogan in Rwanda. It has been identified among the best channels to resolve Rwanda's problems. During the project implementation period, three homegrown solutions were applied such as community works (Umuganda), performance contract (Imihigo) and Ubudehe (socio-economic status). Umuganda played multipurpose roles in the implementation of the project. It has been used for public awareness, and it also played a key role in the construction of houses for poor and vulnerability people especially those with limited physical capacities. For the case of Imihigo, the development project



results were incorporated into the performance plans of key government stakeholders held personally responsible for their accomplishment to drive the process<sup>22</sup>.

During the project implementation period, Ubudehe categories were considered. Here we can mention the cases of providing cash grants, construction of houses for people in high risk zones, cash for work, food for water, vocational trainings, etc. only people of categories one and two were benefiting from those services as they are the ones with high vulnerability.

### **Child protection consideration**

Child protection refers to preventing and responding to violence, exploitation and abuse against children including commercial sexual exploitation, trafficking, child labour and harmful traditional practices, such as female genital mutilation/cutting and child marriage. Child Protection addresses every child's right not to be subjected to harm and it complements other rights that, inter alia, ensure that children receive that which they need in order to survive, develop and thrive<sup>23</sup>. In Rwanda, child protection policy states that a working age is sixteen (16) old and is prohibited to use people under sixteen at work. Measures to avoid using child under working age were taken. All of them were paid through bank account and a child under 16 years old cannot access bank services.

### **Human-rights based approach**

During project design and implementation, there was no clear strategies for human rights approach. Here we can mention lack of strategies to involve people with disabilities to access some work which match with physical fitness and capabilities as well as women lactating and other vulnerability groups of people to meet their rights.

---

<sup>22</sup> UNDP and MIDIMAR (2017), Mid-term evaluation of "building national and local capacities for disaster management in Rwanda" project for MIDIMAR

<sup>23</sup> Rwanda National Human Rights Commission, 2010 conference report of National human Rights commissions in EAC

**Theory of change**

Theory of Change is essentially a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused particularly on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a program or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved<sup>24</sup>. In this project, theory of change was not so much considered as community participation and involvement were not worthy to provoke a change. This was verified through implementation of the project whereby the community was not involved in the decision making and project design. However, currently the community ownership is increasing. Here we can mention the case of some created clubs at secondary schools and a strong commitment of local and opinion leaders in disaster management.

**Relevance of indicators and means of verification**

From the project design, the outputs were formulated. However, some indicators were not clear enough to facilitate performance evaluation. The project objectives were fully achieved as indicated in the annex 1 of evaluation matrix. The factors influencing the achievements are many including synergy of the stakeholders.

**3.4.2. Effectiveness**

Based on the information from desk review and interviews with UNDP and all other partners including local community, the project objectives were highly achieved as indicated in annex 1. The major factors influencing the achievement are many including strong partnership in disaster management from Government institutions and development partners; and the existing institutional framework such as the disaster committees from

---

<sup>24</sup> Kieran Rose (2012), Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC), **Center for Theory of Change**

national to decentralized levels. The implementation of planned activities contributed to the achievement of the planned outputs and outcomes.

The capacity building was provided by highly qualified technical team. This is the case of advisor hired to provide technical support to the Ministry and other consultants. The capacity building contributed in having:

- The National Risk Atlas of Rwanda, which is the first risk profile in Africa;
- The establishment of National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (NPDRR);
- The establishment of District Disaster Management Committees (DDMCs established by law);
- Strengthening disaster management capacities of 10 Districts which are the Districts of Gakenke, Rubavu, Nyabihu, Ngororero, Nyamagabe, Muhanga, Rwamagana, Nyagatare, Kayonza and Rutsiro;
- Technical advisory and assistance provided in policy and strategy development i.e. DM Law, Contingency Plans and National Recovery and Response Strategy;
- Conducting post disaster needs assessment;
- Etc.

Based on the project performance as indicated by information from the ground, it is clear that project has been implemented as planned. The planned activities were implemented a part from some activities which are still ongoing and others with no funds. The ongoing activities are 10 houses under construction, one (1) bridge and maternity ward in Ngororero District. Other activities were not implemented due to lack of funds including capacity gap assessment at national and local levels, establishment of National Disaster Observatory, evidence-based research on suitable and cost effective disaster mitigation measures, etc.

**3.4.3. Efficiency**

The project efficiency was observed especially in financial and human resources management. The budget has been used as budgeted, the timeframe was respected and the cost was efficient. The efficiency has been observed in the project implementation period as clearly indicated in annex 1. This has been facilitated by the existing Rwandan laws and policies on financial management especially Rwanda Public Procurement laws. Purchase and other provisions were made through procurement procedures which is most transparent. The rate of available budget execution is very high at 100%. The funds were used efficiently; this is evidenced by the houses built in Ngororero District costing 6,000,000Rwf (a house with TV, water tank, solar and decoder) based on market price.

**UNDP has been successful in recruiting and position high caliber technical staff**

Since the establishment of MIDIMAR, there was a need to build the capacity of the staff in place to tackle the assigned mission and mandate of the ministry. UNDP hired an expert in Disaster Risk technical adviser who provided technical support in capacity building (institutional, organizational and individual) and in funds mobilization. UNDP provided other staff with high caliber and skills on disaster management component.

**Level of funds raised**

UNDP/ The One UN managed to mobilize the total funds of USD 10,081,350. This facilitated the implementation of planned activities. The available funds covered the planned key activities including capacity development, disaster response in Gakenke District and preparedness and resilience in Ngororero District. The funds were mobilized as follow:

**Table 2: Funds mobilized by UNDP/One UN**

YEAR	AMOUNT	SOURCE	PROJECT
2013	USD 2,400,000	UNDP TRAC	Building National and local capacities for DRM
		CERF	
2013	USD 581,350	European Union-ACP, World Bank GFDRR	Development of comprehensive disaster risk profiles in Rwanda (National Risk Atlas)
2014	USD 300,000	Government of Japan	Support national disaster recovery
2015	USD 2,000,000	UNTFHS	Strengthening human security by enhancing resilience to natural disasters and climate-related threats in Ngororero District
2016	USD 100,000	TRAC113	for the coordination of the response in the landslides in Gakenke
2016	USD 4,700,000 (Among which USD 728,135 for UNDP/One UN )	CERF	Support the National response to the affected population of Gakenke District, (For UNDP/One UN: Support the restoration of critical community infrastructure and emergency off-farm livelihoods in Gakenke.)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>USD 10,081,350</b>		

**Source:** UNDP/One UN reports (2013-2016)

### **Project implementation sequence**

The sequence of project implementation was not respected as planned. As the main part of this project was centered around capacity building, capacity needs assessment was supposed to be conducted before all project implementation. The interventions were done without baseline indicators and the needs were not clearly known.

#### **3.4.4. Sustainability**

The project supports are very crucial to the project beneficiaries. Much has been done where some of them are likely to be sustainable after the project phase out as evidenced by high level political will to support the existing initiatives. The project follows under Government agenda (disaster management, environment protection, creating and supporting VSLAs, etc). From the interviews with local leaders and local community, it is clear that many activities

will sustain. This is the case of the created committees to manage rehabilitated water supply systems, the community willing to adhere the VSLAs, local leaders and local community determination to protect and maintain constructed bridges, the management of cash grant where project beneficiaries started small business especially farming (livestock), etc.

The case of the formed and trained VSLAs and cooperatives through cash grant provided to Gakenke District disaster victims and the formed cooperatives for people who benefited from vocational skills in Ngororero District are also some of the examples influencing the sustainability. In all Districts, community-based organizations were trained in disaster resilience. At institutional level, key disaster management committees were established and supported. This is the case of National Platform for Disaster Management, District disaster management committees and Sector disaster management committees.

#### **3.4.5. Impact**

During the Project implementation, the project beneficiaries were mainly MIDIMAR which benefited technical support especially capacity building, Gakenke and Gororero Districts residents. After the disaster of 2016, Gakenke and Ngororero Districts were affected where they lose lives of people, houses, infrastructure, farm, livestock, etc were destroyed. In Gakenke District, the project beneficiaries were victims of disasters while in Ngororero District, the project beneficiaries were poorer people located in high risk zones who benefited houses and poorer people who benefited vocational skills.

This project positively impacted the beneficiaries such as MIDIMAR capacity, Gakenke and Ngororero Districts as indicated in annex 1. This has been confirmed by the respondents during the final evaluation as follow:

- Currently, the housing conditions were improved as they are living in durable houses. All the house confirmed that the existing houses are bigger and good than the destroyed ones;

- Through cash grant, all of them started small business where the living conditions are improving;
- The cash for work was also used to start some income generating activities such as farming (livestock) and small business;
- The vocational skills benefited are now used to generate some incomes where some graduates can earn 40,000 per month;
- The surrounding communities are now accessing clean water through rehabilitated water sources which were destroyed. This is one of key achievements of project implementation;
- Currently they victims of disasters have improved saving culture as they are groups into village saving and loan association.

At institutional level, MIDIMAR and the decentralized authorities are now able to deal with disasters. Staff at national level is able to conduct a deep and detailed post disaster needs assessment with clear recommendations and the increment of response capacity in general. Here we can mention also the availability of Risk Atlas which is used in planning activities such as agriculture, policy planning, infrastructure development, investment, etc.

## IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1. Conclusion

This assignment was all about evaluating the “joint program on support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee (MIDIMAR)” for the period between July 2013 and September 2017 compared to set goals. The evaluation centered around the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and the impact of the project during its implementation period.

The techniques and methods for data collection used are documents review, portfolio analysis, the outcome mapping, the semi-structured interviews, triangulation (cross-verification of the data) and observation.

The following outputs were the project focus:

- Output 1: Enhanced capacities of national and local institutions to manage disaster risks and recover from disaster events; including improved national and local coordination mechanisms;
- Output 2: DRR mainstreamed into national/district/sectorial plans and policies; and capacities on DRM Planning enhanced;
- Output 3: A functioning national disaster risk assessment and monitoring system (DRAMS) established;
- Output 4: End-to-end early warning systems established and operational;
- Output 5: Reduced community vulnerabilities and increased household resilience in selected high-risk districts and increased public awareness on DRR.

During the five-year implementation period, efforts have been concentrated on capacity building, interventions to Gakenke district disaster management focusing on response and recovery, and Ngororero District focusing on preparedness and resilience. The evaluation findings confirmed that the level of achievement is very high. This is evidenced by the situation whereby in Gakenke District, 1,333 houses and 18 bridges were constructed, cash for work was provided to disaster victims, productive asset of USD 100 per each victim for 300



individuals was provided, agriculture inputs were given to rescue the life of the community, start-up cash grant was given to 749 people (100,000Rwf per person), etc.

For the case of Ngororero District, resilient measures were taken by United Nations. This is the case of strengthening human security, enhancing resilience and improving disaster risk management of high-risk communities and most vulnerable populations. The conducted activities are construction of 11 houses to poor people in high risk zones and other 10 houses under construction (total houses have to be 21), vocational trainings for 220 people, construction of one bridge which is under process, upgrading a health post to health center, maternity ward under construction and water supply for 27 kilometers which is supplying water to a big number people. This contributed to improve and recover the living conditions of project beneficiaries. This is confirmed by various stakeholders including MIDIMAR, project beneficiaries in Gakenke and Ngororero Districts and other stakeholders.

### **Lessons learnt**

During Gakenke and Ngororero districts disaster of 7-8/5/2016, the response mechanisms which have been put in place were unfair and the readiness part was low. There were no response and recovery strategy and plans to guide the interveners on the ground. The coordination mechanisms were not applied and the existing contingency plan was not activated and followed at the time of landslide and floods in Gakenke and Ngororero Districts. At local level, the decentralized entities were not well positioned to play their part and roles as first responders. The support from NPDM were directly received by the district while it was supposed to reach beneficiaries through MIDIMAR. This denotes the coordination mechanisms weaknesses and we recommend the improvement of the coordination of the Government of Rwanda.

The staff at the ground to conduct rapid assessment was not well skilled as confirmed by the respondents where the interventions were not well coordinated. This brought disorder during the relief phase whereby some affected community did not receive the aid. The list of affected people could change day to day which could bring wrong calculation and request of

the assistances to meet humanitarian needs. Lesson learnt here is to be ready at all times about the response and recovery mechanisms with clear roles and responsibilities of the humanitarian actors in the emergency matters.

However, the case of Disaster Response in Gakenke is an interesting illustration of the World Humanitarian Summit's Core Responsibility "Change people's lives from delivering aid to ending need." In the post-recovery period in Gakenke, building upon the successful platform established in the humanitarian response. From recovery period, long term sustainable development programme has been built to transcend the humanitarian development divide. Working across sectors and institutional boundaries, resilience has been built as was through the adoption of green agriculture and crop intensification activities; the use of soil erosion, reforestation and terracing techniques, livelihoods diversification, and the construction of disaster-resilient housing, as well as supporting the green cities and population relocation efforts, particularly for those most vulnerable families inhabiting marginal, high risk dwellings, many of which are households headed by women as was recommended by the mid-term evaluation<sup>25</sup>.

### **Best practices**

Among the identified best practices are:

- Rwanda National Risk Atlas which is the first ever comprehensive risk profile developed in Africa, using innovative approaches. This has been for great importance as it is even informing policy planning, investors, infrastructure development including urban planning for settlement, agriculture, etc;
- Strong cooperation between One UN agencies, MIDIMAR, other Ministries and agencies, decentralized entities and local community.

---

<sup>25</sup> UNDP and MIDIMAR (2017), Mid-term evaluation of "building national and local capacities for disaster management in Rwanda" project for MIDIMAR

- The cash for work has been a strategic tool in recovery process following the aftermath of disasters for the affected communities. People were paid on daily basis 1,000 Rwf for casual laborers, 2,000 Rwf for capitas, 2,500 Rwf for technicians and 10,000 Rwf for engineers. They got job during the rehabilitation and construction of destroyed houses and roads. The paid cash contributed a lot in socio-economic development of the beneficiaries where some of them used the cash for work in starting farming business and other small business. Now they are earning income through the created/established business.
- Food for work contributed a lot in fighting against the hunger as the crops were also destroyed by disasters in Gakenke District. This was provided by WFP to 11,517 households victims of disasters. The food for work programme involved 11,157 active (able bodied) plus 358 vulnerable people. Based on the information from the programme beneficiaries, this has been for great importance in family feeding of disaster victims.
- Strong partnership between UN agencies and government institutions during recovery in Gakenke district. Here we can mention the development partners (FAO, IOM, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP and WHO), MIDIMAR, MINALOC, district authorities, RDF, SACCOs, etc.
- Home grown solutions:
  - ✓ Umuganda has been one of the key channels used during awareness raising and other campaigns. It has been also used during construction of houses for poor and vulnerability in the affected areas.
  - ✓ Imihigo (performance contract) which mainstreamed disaster management into performance contract focusing on key government stakeholders such as Ministries, agencies and decentralized entities.
  - ✓ Ubudehe which played key role in classification of the community based on their socio-economic status. This facilitated to know easily the economic status of project beneficiaries during the assistance process.

The home grown solutions have contributed to the ownership by the communities and contributed to the sustainability of the project interventions.

#### **4.2. Recommendations**

- Extend project for at least another five years, as some activities were not implemented as planned and capacity gap is still observed;
- Focus on capacity building including trainings and simulation exercises related disaster management (most of simulations are functional and table top, therefore, full scale is needed);
- Strengthen coordination for disaster management;
- Clearly indicate the theory of change and define the role of every stakeholder in the upcoming programmes;
- Conduct capacity needs assessment by UNDP/One UN in the areas related to disaster management;
- Support the operationalization of early warning system;
- Improve database (data management) as some of them are not available. This is the case especially of training where the data are not well organized.

**REFERENCES**

- Addendum June 2011 Evaluation: Updated guidance on Evaluation in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009)
- Annual report “Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda” Project, 2013-2014
- CERF project document Restoration of critical community infrastructure and emergency off farm livelihoods for landslides affected population in Gakenke District
- DRG4 Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management
- Evaluation of the Government of Uganda and UNDP Crisis Management and Recovery Program (CMR), 2011
- Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Disaster Prevention and Recovery, UNDP 2010
- For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation”  
<http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>
- Glossary of Meteorology (June 2000) Flood Archived 2007-08-24 at the Wayback Machine., Retrieved on 2009-01-09 visited on 2 October 2017 at 4:12pm
- Government of Rwanda Vision 2020 and Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) II, 2013-2018
- <http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/manageevaluation/viewevaluationdetail.html?evalid=4782>
- <http://www.oecd.org/derec/undp/47871337.pdf>
- <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/disaster>
- <https://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=5296>
- Human Development Report – Rwanda 2015
- Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015
- IPCC (2007), Fourth assessment report, climate change, AR4

- Kent, R. (1994), "Disaster Preparedness", United Nations Disaster Management Training Program
- Kieran Rose (2012), Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC), Center for Theory of Change
- Law N° 41/2015 of 29/08/2015 relating to disaster management
- Law N° 41/2015 of 29/08/2015 relating to disaster management
- MIDIMAR (2012) National Disaster Management Policy
- MIDIMAR (2012), 2009 National disaster management policy revised
- MIDIMAR (2012), Disaster high risk zones on floods and landslides
- MIDIMAR (2012), Disaster high risk zones on floods and landslides
- MIDIMAR (2012), National Disaster Management Policy
- MIDIMAR (2015), National Risks Atlas of Rwanda
- MIDIMAR (2015), The National Risk Atlas of Rwanda, Kigali
- Mid-term evaluation of the UNDP funded activities of the DRG4 Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management in Rwanda 2017
- MINAGRI: Comprehensive Vulnerability and Food Security Analysis
- MINECOFIN (2013), Economic Development and Poverty Reduction strategy II 2013-2018
- Minutes National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction quarterly meetings, 2013-2015
- MSN Encarta Dictionary (2007), Flood, Retrieved visited on 2 October 2017 at 4:12pm
- National Disaster Management Policy, MIDIMAR, 2014
- One UN and Rwanda (2016), Report Natural Disaster, Rwanda
- Project Steering Committee Meetings minutes, "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project , 2013-2015
- Quarterly Progress report "Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda" Project, 2013-2015
- Republic of Rwanda, Vision 2020
- RPA and MIDIMAR (2011), Field visit report conducted

- Rwanda Comprehensive Disaster Risk profile (Disaster Risk Atlas) 2015
- Rwanda National Human Rights Commission, 2010 conference report of National human Rights commissions in EAC
- Rwanda National Progress Report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (Monitoring report 2011-2013)
- Rwanda Outlook State of the Environment - 2015
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2015-2030
- UN (2015), Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015-2030
- UNDP (2012), Hyogo framework for action, Japan
- UN (2015) Sustainable Development Goals 2030
- UNDP and MIDIMAR (2017), Mid-term evaluation of “building national and local capacities for disaster management in Rwanda” project for MIDIMAR
- UNDP Global Strategic Plan 2014-2017 and UNDP Delivering the Post-2015
- UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluations for Development Results (2009)
- UNDP Rwanda United Nations Development Assistance Programme (UNDAP) 2013-2018 and related monitoring indicators and targets
- UNEG ‘Standards for Evaluation in the UN System’ 2005.
- UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation
- UNFCCC (2007), Climate Change: Impacts, Vulnerabilities and Adaptations in Developing Countries
- UNISDR (2003), ISDR background paper for WSSD. Geneva: UN.
- UNISDR (2005), Hyogo framework for action 2005-2015
- UNISDR (2009), UNISDR terminology on disaster risk reduction. Geneva
- United Nations Rwanda, UNDP Programme Rwanda, CCPD 2013-2018
- United Nations Rwanda, UNDAP 2013-2018

- United Trust Fund for Human Security proposal “Strengthening Humann Security by enhancing resilience to natural disasters and climate-related threats in Ngororero District



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX

The questions of the evaluation will be centered to the relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and the impact of the project vis-à-vis the disaster management in Rwanda through MIDIMAR.

#### Performance ranking

- 1- Not at all (1)
- 2- To some extent/with constraints (2)
- 3- To a large extent/in progress (3)
- 4- Fully (4)
- 5- Strongly (5)
- 6- NA – Not Applicable (6)

N°	QUESTIONS	RATING	POINTS	INFORMATION SOURCES
<b>I.</b>	<b>Relevance</b>			
1	Alignment with Global and national policies and programmes (HFA, Sendai, SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17, Vision 2020, EDPRS, etc.)	To a large extent	3	Documents review: HFA, Sendai, SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17, Vision 2020, EDPRS, etc.)
2	Process from project inception to the intervention framework (not only focusing on what have been achieved or not	Fully	4	Documentation and interviews with UNDP&MIDIMAR
3	Where is this Programme being implemented?	Fully	4	Documentation and interviews with UNDP&MIDIMAR
4	Programme site selection criteria?	Fully	4	Review of annual work plans, annual reports, site selection criteria and interviews with UNDP and other partners
5	How has been the main focus of the programme implementation so far?	Fully	4	Reports and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community
7	How were they selected?	Fully	4	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR, UNDP and District
8	Were the selection criteria objective	Fully	4	MIDIMAR, District and beneficiaries
10	To which extent the programme activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.	Fully	4	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR, UNDP and all other partners including local community
11	To what extent did the objectives remain valid throughout the programme duration?	Fully	4	Interviews with MIDIMAR, UNDP, Gakenke District and all other partners including local community
12	Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?	Fully	4	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR & UNDP
13	Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and Effects?	Fully	4	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR & UNDP
14	Has a gender strategy been mainstreamed in the programme design?	To a large extent	3	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR, UNDP and all

b

		extent		other partners including local community
15	Is the programme relevant to vulnerable groups as identified in HDR, Vulnerability Assessment, Risk Atlas etc.	Fully	4	Interviews with District, MINALOC, MIDIMAR and UNDP and all other partners including local community
16	Are the disaster risk reduction and humanitarian response strategies mainstreamed within the project of high relevance to the context?	To a large extent	3	Document reviews
17	Has a human rights-based approach been utilized to understand causality and inform programme design?	To some extent	2	Documents review and interviews with MIDIMAR, UNDP and MINALOC
18	Is there a clear theory of change evident in the project logic? Are multiple outcomes complementary and so they support a logical theory of change?	To a large extent	3	Desk review of key project documents and UNDP and interviews with UNDP and government partners
19	Are there complementary upstream and downstream activities that seek to inform policy and law?	Fully	4	Desk review of key project documents and UNDP and interviews with UNDP and government partners
20	To what extent have participatory approaches been adopted in the planning and delivery of the project, and what stakeholders were involved?	Fully	4	Reports and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community.
21	Result of the capacity building/trainings interventions	Fully	4	Reports and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community.
22	Qualification of available trainers	Fully	4	MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community.
23	UNDP support to the achievement of programme outcome and outputs	Fully	4	UNDP and MIDIMAR
24	How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP?	To a large extent	3	Reports and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community.
25	Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective	Fully	4	Reports and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community.
II.	<b>Effectiveness</b>			
1	To what extent were the objectives achieved?	Strongly	5	Desk review and interviews with UNDP and all other partners including local community
2	Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP and government partners
3	Have the different outputs been achieved?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP and government partners
4	To what extent did the criteria for the select of project sites take vulnerability and marginalization into account?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with MINALOC, District, UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community

5	What progress toward the outcomes has been made?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community
6	To what extent the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach?	To a large extent	3	Document review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR, District and Community
7	To what extent have project governance mechanisms such as steering committees at different levels been functioning Effectively?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP and all stakeholders
8	To what extent has the project supported positive changes in terms of gender quality and were there any unintended Effects?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and District
9	To what extent has the project supported positive changes in terms of social equity and addressing the needs of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP and government partners
10	To what extent has the project responded effectively to disasters during the 2013-2017 implementation cycle?	Strongly	5	Field visits to disaster-afflicted areas (landslides, droughts); interviews with District, MIDIMAR, UNDP and all other partners including local community
11	To what extent has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions?	Fully	4	MTE reports, annual reports and interviews with UNDP all other partners including local community
12	To what extent UNDP support the achievements of programme outcome and outputs?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR all other partners
13	Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?	Fully	4	Interviews with project stakeholders, especially MIDIMAR and members of DDMO
<b>III.</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>			
1	Has the project raised the level of funds necessary to achieve its 5-year scope of work?	To a large extent	3	Desk review including ATLAS and interviews with MIDIMAR & UNDP
2	Were activities cost-efficient?	Fully	4	Interviews with MIDIMAR and UNDP
3	Were objectives achieved on time?	Fully	4	Desk review (documents/annual work plan and reports)
4	Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?	Fully	4	Desk review (documents/annual work plan and reports) and interviews with MIDIMAR & UNDP
5	How have the Programme funds been spent?	Fully	4	Desk review (annual and MTE reports)
6	Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?	Fully	4	Desk review (reports)
7	To what extent is the project's utilization rate from various funding sources on track?	Fully	4	Desk review of data, including ATLAS and interviews with UNDP and MIDIMAR
8	Was the financial and narrative reports provided on time?	Fully	4	Desk review

d

IV.	<b>Sustainability</b>			
1	To what extent the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?	Fully	4	Programme assessment and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR, MINALOC, RHA, Meteo Rwanda, District Mayor, and all other partners including local community
2	To what extent will the benefits of the programme or programme continue after donor funding stops?	To a large extent	3	Document review and interviews with Government institutions and UNDP
3	Does the programme have a clear exit strategy?	To a large extent	3	Desk review, interviews with UNDP and project stakeholders
4	To what extent has the project developed public awareness and knowledge about disaster risk reduction and response?	Fully	4	Desk review and interviews with stakeholders including local community
V.	<b>Impact of interventions</b>			
1	To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders?	Fully	4	Interviews with all selected stakeholders
2	To what extent have the activities progressed?	Fully	4	Document review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and District
3	How did the programme contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?	Fully	4	Document review and interviews with UNDP
4	Has the programme contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the programme?	To a large extent	3	Document review and interviews with UNDP and other stakeholders
5	What difference has the programme made to beneficiaries?	To a large extent	3	Document review and interviews with UNDP, MIDIMAR and all other partners including local community

**ANNEX 2: LIST OF VISITED INSTITUTIONS AND TIMEFRAME**

<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>NAME AND POSITION</b>	<b>GENDER</b>	<b>DATE</b>
MIDIMAR	Antoine RUVEBANA, Permanent Secretary	M	29/11/2017
	Veneranda INGABIRE, SPIU Coordinator	F	29/11/2017
	Gilbert URAMUTSE, Disaster Project Manager	M	29/11/2017
	Eric BUDEDERI, Disaster assessment and Emergence Response Officer	M	7/12/2017
	Eric Francois MWIZERE, Nyagatare DDMO	M	8/12/2017
	Innocent RUHIGIRA, Statistics Officer	M	7/12/2017
UNDP	Sophie NYIRABAKWIYE, Programme Specialist and Head of Poverty and Environment Unit	F	27/11/2017
	Nicolas SCHMIDS, Programme Analyst , Poverty and Environment	M	24/11/2017
	Bernardin UZAYISABA, Programme Analyst	M	27/11/2017
MoH	Dr. Jean Leonard HAKIZIMANA, Epidemic Surveillance and Response	M	08/12/2017
MINALOC	Olivier RUHAMYAMBUGA, Corporate Planning Specialist	M	5/12/2017
REMA	Alphonse MUTABAZI, Climate Change Specialist	M	9/12/2017
Gakenke District	Catherine UWIMANA, Vice-Mayor in charge of social affairs	F	30/11/2017
	Jerome, Former District Disaster Management Officer	M	30/11/2017
	BIZIMANA NDABABONYE, Director of Social Development	m	30/11/2017
	Victims/beneficiaries (17 people)	11 F&6 M	30/11/2017
Ngororero District	Janvier KURADUSENGE, Vice-Mayor in charge of social affairs	M	1/12/2017
	RUTAGISHA Aimable, District Disaster Management Officer	M	4/12/2017
	Project beneficiaries (7 people)	4F&3M	5/12/2017
RHA	Eng. Janvier MUHIRE, Director of Housing Regulations	M	7/12/2017
Meteo Rwanda	Serge SENYANA, Meteorological application officer	M	8/12/2017
RRC	Angelique MURUNGI, Head of Disaster Management	F	7/12/2017
<b>TOTAL</b>	25 Females and 19 Males		

### ANNEX 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

#### Final evaluation: “Joint Programme on Support to Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs MIDIMAR”

##### I. Background and context

UNDP/One UN and MIDIMAR initiated “**Building national and local capacities for Disaster Management in Rwanda**” project in 2013, a Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity development initiative. This 5-year project built upon the Project Initiation Plan for National Capacity Building for Disaster Risk management Programme signed in 2011 by UNDP/One UN and Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR) and whose implementation ended in 2013. The project started its implementation in June 2013 and is designed to end in June 2018. It aims to support the national development framework, the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS II 2013-2018) where disaster Management has been mainstreamed as a cross cutting issue. The project is geared towards helping the Government of Rwanda strengthen its DRM capacity, enhance preparedness and reduce risks, and achieve its global commitment to the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) and the MDGs. It aims at building national capacities for disaster risk management through advisory, policy and technical support to render fully operational an effective disaster risk management system at the national and local levels.

Furthermore, the project is in line with Outcome 3 of the United Nations Development Assistance Plan 2013 – 2018 (UNDAP)<sup>26</sup>: “Rwanda has in place improved systems for: sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources, energy access and security, for environmental and climate change resilience, in line with Rio+20 recommendations for sustainable development.”

In 2014, the project was incorporated in the **One UN Joint Programme on “support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management”**. The revised joint programme has five inter-related outputs.

- Output 1: Technical and financial assistance for capacity development of central and local bodies dealing with disaster management, early warning and monitoring.
- Output 2: Support to risk, vulnerability and emergency assessments.
- Output 3: Policy and strategy formulation, including integration of cross-cutting issues in disaster management and preparedness.
- Output 4: Increased Public Awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction and reduced community vulnerabilities in selected high risk districts
- Output 5: Technical and financial support to respond to Disasters

The joint programme aimed to reinforce and develop MIDIMAR’s capacity to fulfill its mandate and implement the national disaster management policy which was developed in 2012. It also aimed to enable MIDIMAR to coordinate disaster management and facilitate mainstreaming of disaster risk management in national programmes, policies and plans as stipulated in the EDPRS II. This joint programme is aligned with the country’s vision 2020 and the second Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2013-2018) both of which point at some of the impacts of natural disasters on the country’s economy, and proposes to develop strategic plans for disaster preparedness, risk analysis, mitigation measures and response.

---

<sup>26</sup> UNDAP is the business plan of all the UN agencies, funds and programmes in Rwanda for the period July 2013 to June 2018. UNDAP Rwanda supports the realization of the Millennium Declaration, the related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the other international development aspirations, the transition from the MDGs to the post-2015 framework, the country’s medium-term national development priorities as set out in the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS 2) for the period 2013-2018, as well as the Rwanda Vision 2020.

The joint programme employed a three-pronged strategy towards institutional strengthening of MIDIMAR on disaster management. The key strategy adopted for the joint programme includes research and assessment; building a solid disaster information management system and strengthening coordination (including the use of joint GoR/UN appeal process to respond to disasters). Gender, human rights and sustainability mainstreaming are cross-cutting strategies within the three elements. Finally, the joint programme aimed at strengthening human security, enhancing resilience, and improving disaster risk management of high-risk communities and most vulnerable populations of the most disaster prone areas District of Rwanda (United Trust Fund for Human Security joint programme).

The joint programme is jointly supported by the One UN Rwanda specifically combining technical expertise, financial support and mandates of different UN Agencies namely UNHCR, UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, IOM, UNHABITAT and UNV. The joint programme consolidated all the disaster management initiatives and support of the abovementioned UN agencies and integrated under this One UN Disaster Management Joint Programme. It will be implemented within a duration of 4 years (starting from mid-2014 - mid 2018).

The main implementing partner for this Joint Programme is the Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR). The MIDIMAR, with its DRR mandate is required to “develop a highly proficient mechanism for preventing, mitigating, responding to, recovering, securing, monitoring and responding in a timely manner in order to promote management of natural and man-made disasters including volcanic activity, earthquakes, floods, landslides, mudslides, storms, fire and drought.

## **II. Evaluation Purpose**

The purpose of the Final Evaluation (FE) is to examine the results, achievements and constraints of UNDP/One UN funded activities of the Joint Programme to support MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The Project was initiated in 2013 and is planned to end in June 2018. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation and lessons learned from its implementation will inform for the upcoming project cycle. The Evaluation also aims at assessing UNDP/One UN's contribution to the achievement of UNDAF Outcome 3.

The consultant is intended to identify weaknesses and strengths of the project design and implementation, and to come up with recommendations regarding the overall design and orientation of the project and on the work plan for the next programming cycle, after evaluating the adequacy, efficiency, and effectiveness of implementation, as well as assessing the achievements the project outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will also assess early signs of project success or failure and prompts adjustments. The results and recommendations of the evaluation would therefore help UNDP/One UN and MIDIMAR to document lessons learnt and best practices for the next project cycle.

## **III. Evaluation scope and objectives**

### **Objectives**

In line with the project's objectives, UNDP/One UN Rwanda, in collaboration with the project's implementing partner (MIDIMAR), plans to conduct a final evaluation of UNDP funded interventions of the Joint programme on Support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The evaluation aims to assess the achievements of the outputs and outcomes. The final evaluation main objectives are the following:

h

- Assess the Programme's implementation strategy.
- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the interventions.
- Assess the Programme's processes, including budgetary efficiency
- Assess the extent to which planned activities and outputs have been achieved.
- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the programme's activities
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets
- Document lessons learnt
- Make recommendations for the next project cycle

## Scope

The evaluation covers the implementation period of the project, from July 2013 up to September 2017. It covers the specific UNDP funded interventions of the One UN Joint Programme on support to MIDIMAR to address Disaster Management. The geographic coverage of the evaluation is the whole country (Rwanda). The scope of the final evaluation covers all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the project compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the project objectives.
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments to document lessons learnt.
- Efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the project in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the programme.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

- (i) Assess whether the programme design was clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
- (ii) An evaluation of the project's delivery of achievement of its overall objectives;
- (iii) An evaluation of programme's performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Project Document; An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the programme outputs produced to date in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the duration of the project and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the programme;
- (iv) An evaluation of the programme's contribution to the achievements of UNDP's outcome and outputs;
- (v) Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Programme Document;
- (vi) An evaluation of project coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:
  - a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in project arrangements and execution;
  - b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms used by MIDIMAR in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in project implementation;
  - c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project;
  - d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC);



- e. Financial management of the project, including the balance between expenditures on administrative and overhead charges in relation to those on the achievement of substantive outputs.
- (vii) A prognosis of the degree to which the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the programme were met;
- (viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of programme activities;
- (ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach<sup>27</sup>
- (x) Assess of the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the project have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly
- (xi) Lessons learned during programme implementation;
- (xii) Evaluate the programme's exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity

#### IV. Evaluation

##### Evaluation criteria

The programme will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria:

- Relevance: measures whether the programme addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid.
- Effectiveness: measures whether the programme activities achieve its goal.
- Efficiency: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results.
- Sustainability: measures whether the benefits of the programme are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The programme needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.
- Impacts of intervention: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

##### Evaluation Questions

More specifically, the final evaluation aims at addressing the following questions for each evaluation criteria:

##### Relevance

- Where is this Programme being implemented? How was the Programme site selected? What has been the main focus of the programme implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the programme aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS 2, Vision 2020)?
- The extent to which the programme activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent did the objectives remain valid throughout the programme duration?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and Effects?

---

<sup>27</sup> For more guidance on this, the consultants will be requested to use UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation" <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

**Effectiveness**

- To what extent were the objectives achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?
- Have the different outputs been achieved?
- What progress toward the outcomes has been made?
- To what extent the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?
- What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?
- How did UNDP support the achievement of programme outcome and outputs?
- How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other programmes?

**Efficiency**

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- What was the original budget for the Programme? How have the Programme funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?
- Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the Programme? What are they and how are they being addressed?

**Sustainability**

- To what extent the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?
- To what extent will the benefits of the programme or programme continue after donor funding stops?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or programme?
- Does the programme have a clear exit strategy?

**Impact of interventions**

- What are the stated goals of the Programme? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the programme and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the programme contribute to the achievement of UNDAF outcomes and outputs?
- What has happened as a result of the programme?
- What have been the main impact of the programme on the Disaster Management framework in Rwanda?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the programme contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the programme?
- What difference has the programme made to beneficiaries?