

FINAL EVALUATION OF UNDP JOINT PROJECT: Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda's Economic Transformation 2014-2018

Amitav Rath
FINAL: 16 October 2018



Green Infrastructure in Taba village, Huye District.



Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many people for their cooperation and assistance during the conduct of this evaluation and wish to thank them for providing time for meetings, interviews and for answering many questions in person and by email and phone. Special thanks are due to all the persons consulted (listed in the Annex) who provided time and valuable insights and information and contributed to this evaluation. Special thanks are due to the staff of the Ministry of Environment, Government of Rwanda for their support during the evaluation mission and to the UN staff and UNDP, who provided many documents, shared their insights and provided full assistance. I wish to individually mention and acknowledge the ongoing assistance provided by William Mugabe and Innocent Musabyimana at the SPIU, MoE; Jaeun Kwon and Gabrielle Tillberg at the UNDP; and finally to Frank Kagame, RHA, for organizing the field visit to Taba village in Huye District to see the work done there (see cover photo) and to interview a subset of beneficiaries; the visit also allowed a stop at the CoEB office.

The views expressed in this final report are those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the views of UNDP, the Government of the Rwanda or the project stakeholders, who were consulted in the preparation of this report, except as directly quoted or referenced. Earlier drafts have been shared with the Government of the Rwanda and UNDP staff and revised according to comments received. This report, or portions thereof, may not be reproduced without explicit written reference to the source.

Amitav Rath

16 October 2018

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Green Economy Joint Programme Evaluation.....	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	1
Subject of the evaluation	2
DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION	3
Defined Actions and Partners	4
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	7
Purpose of the Final Evaluation	7
Scope of the Final Evaluation.....	8
Evaluation Questions and Criteria	9
EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS.....	12
METHODOLOGY	12
KEY PARTNERS and STAKEHOLDERS.....	14
LIMITATIONS AND APPROACHES TO OVERCOME THEM.....	15
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	17
JP RESOURCES.....	17
FINDINGS – BY ACTIVITY AND OUTPUT	18
RATING OF ACTIONS BY GOR SCALE	32
Findings by Key Questions.....	36
Relevance	36
Effectiveness:.....	37
Efficiency:	38
Sustainability:	39
Outcomes and Impacts:	40
Cross Cutting Issues	40
CONCLUSIONS	40
RECOMMENDATIONS	42
LESSONS LEARNED.....	42
ANNEXES TO THE REPORT	44

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION.....	45
ANNEX 2: INFORMATION SOURCES	54
List of supporting documents reviewed	54
List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited	57
Questionnaire Used	58
ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX.....	65
ANNEX 4: EVALUATION SCHEDULE	70
ANNEX 5: THE EVALUATOR.....	72
ANNEX 6: EVALUATOR CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT.....	73
ANNEX 7: THE SIX-POINT PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE.....	75

TABLES

Table 1: Project Output One of the JP and the Partners	4
Table 2: Project Output Two of the JP and Partners	5
Table 3: Project Output Three of the JP and the Partners	5
Table 4: Project Output Four of the JP and Partners.....	6
Table 5: Project Output Five of the JP and Partners.....	6
Table 6: Allocated Resources in US\$ by agency and total	7
Table 7: Partners in the JP	14
Table 8: Allocated Resources in US\$ by agency and total (Sources: PRODOC, MTE and submissions by partners and agencies)	17
Table 9: Output 1-Innovation Centres of Excellence established and linked.....	20
Table 10: Output 2 - Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches	22
Table 11: Output 3 - Planning and implementation of “Smart Green Villages” and investment in Green Urbanization increased	23
Table 12: Output 4 - Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals advanced	28
Table 13: Output 5 - Initiatives in policy, advocacy, capacity development and coordination ...	31
Table 14: JP Output One Rating	32
Table 15: JP Output Two Rating.....	33
Table 16: JP Output Three Rating	33
Table 17: JP Output Four Rating	34
Table 18: JP Output Five Rating	35
Table 19: UNDP contributions to the JP. Source UNDP and the SPIU, numbers in US\$.	39

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CoEB	Centre of Excellence for Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management
DP	Development Partner
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FONERWA	National Fund for Environment and Climate Change
GE	Green Economy
GGCRS	Green Growth and Climate Resilience
GoR	Government of Rwanda
IP	Implementing Partner
JP	Joint Programme
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINEDUC	Ministry of Education
MINICOM	Ministry of Trade and Industry
MININFRA	Ministry of Infrastructure
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
OECD	Organization for Economic Corporation and Development
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
PSF	Private Sector Federation
REMA	Rwanda Environment Management Authority
RHA	Rwanda Housing Authority
RNP	Rwanda National Police
SE4ALL	Sustainable Energy for All SME Small and Medium Enterprises
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAP	United Nations Development Assistance Plan
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UR	University of Rwanda
WHO	World Health Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Green Economy Joint Programme Evaluation

This is a Final Evaluation of the One UN supported project “Green Economy Joint Programme” in accordance with the agencies’ M&E policies and procedures, to undergo a final evaluation upon completion. The evaluation was conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP.

Evaluation objectives

The objectives set for the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation, following the terms of reference, had two primary purposes:

- To provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and,
- To promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned.

The report is prepared for the use of the primary stakeholders – the UN agencies which form the One UN in Rwanda and the institutions of the Government of Rwanda, are the primary audiences for the report. Other national government agencies who are key stakeholders and donor and partner institutions contributing to the development of Rwanda should find the report of value as well.

Subject of the evaluation

The objective of the “Green Economy Joint Programme” was to contribute to the achievement of the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) Result 1 of Inclusive Economic Transformation, through its Outcome 1: “Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction.”

The UNDAP Outcome 1, also aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1, includes within it many supporting activities, which aim to improve national systems to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation. They include, among others, the development of green cities and villages, green industries and services, codes and standards for energy efficiency, framework and assessment tools for renewable energy development, and the establishment of Centres of Excellence on environment and climate change, areas of focus for the JP, defined through five output groups:

Output 1: Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions

Output 2: Public and private investment in Green Urbanization approaches to Economic Transformation increased

Output 3: Planning and implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages), especially for vulnerable women and men, strengthened

Output 4: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the Energy Sector of Rwanda advanced

Output 5: Initiatives in support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy effectively coordinated

The Joint Programme (JP) was to be funded through multiple sources including the One UN Fund, which is a pooled fund mechanism, in addition to core and vertical resources from the different partner UN agencies, including UNDP. UNDP is the Administrative Agent of the One UN Fund.

Scope

The scope of the evaluation is limited to the activities of the Joint Programme (JP), as described in the JP Project document (PRODOC), from its design and inception in 2014 until June 2018, focused primarily on the period after February 2015. The scope is also bounded by the extent of outputs, the magnitude of direct project outcomes and possible impacts to date, from the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs in Rwanda.

It was a known fact at the start of the evaluation that the project activities had been both delayed and many remained unfunded due to budgetary shortfalls compared to initial assumptions at the project approval. During the inception phase, discussions were held with UNDP and GoR stakeholders on the priorities for the Final Evaluation and the value added from the exercise. It was agreed during the consultations that a priority for UNDP and GoR would be to closely examine the actual achievement of project outputs, to verify what was in fact achieved, compare that to the plans, and attempt to go beyond the known facts of budget shortfalls and time delays. It was also agreed that it will be important to determine the nature of the outcomes and impacts of this project, as the goals and objectives remain of high significance for Rwanda, and they also have multiple linkages to other ongoing and planned development activities. It was also suggested that the evaluation could be useful for learning purposes for future planning, including any next phase of work, allowing stakeholders to take stock of how a project with initial risk estimated as “moderate” deviated from the plan by a very large degree.

Approach and methodology

The overall approach and methods followed the details in the UNDP guidance for conducting such evaluations of UNDP-supported projects and focused on the set of questions covering these criteria, as specified in the ToR (Annex 1). The approach was further elaborated in an evaluation matrix. The evaluation followed a participatory and consultative approach, within the constraints of time available for the evaluation, and also constraints on the project partners (detailed in Table 3). The evaluation commenced with an Inception Phase, which was used to ensure that the UNDP and the GoR stakeholders and the consultant had a shared

understanding of the purpose, scope, approach, deliverables, and timeline and that the assessment would address key stakeholders' needs. The inception report was shared in a draft form to secure feedback from the stakeholders and was revised to take in additional views.

The evaluation is evidence-based, triangulating several streams of evidence collected, with cross-referenced findings and recommendations. The evaluator maintained close communication with the Special Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) and UNDP officers as the primary users of this evaluation – to ensure that the assessment critically supported their information needs. Consultative and participatory processes were used within the constraints of time and availability of counterparts, to foster shared understanding and ownership of the evaluation. The evaluation maintained open communications with project partners during the evaluation.

The review of all project documents, including the Mid Term Evaluation¹ (MTE) and annual progress reports, suggested early that multiple areas of the project had suffered from unsatisfactory performance. Delays and poor ratings were noted and discussed before the field visit. The desk review included review of the project planning and design documents, as well as annual work plans and budgets, progress, and financial reports and project deliverables, and other relevant materials produced under outputs of the project (listed in the Annex 2). They included Steering Committee meeting minutes, minutes from other technical meetings, workshop proceedings, and relevant correspondence, and supplemented by additional searches undertaken for online publications relevant to the Green Economy JP project components and national plans. A field visit was undertaken to Kigali during 26 August - 12 September 2017. Semi-structured interviews (individual and in groups) were undertaken with primary stakeholders, guided by the evaluation matrix, the evaluation criteria, and questions prepared (see Annex 3). The list of all stakeholders contacted is provided in Annex 2.

Limitations and mitigation of challenges

The evaluation of the project presented several unique challenges. One related to logistical challenges due to the wide range of stakeholders and it was anticipated that face to face meetings could not be held with all stakeholders due to conflicting commitments. The limitation was very partially remedied through extensive email exchanges and a questionnaire mailed to stakeholders. Another challenge was that the JP was designed to operate in a cooperative and integrated manner, but there was almost no information provided by the majority of the partner agencies², which made it difficult to ascertain the contributions from the JP activities through supporting evidence documents. The challenges were mitigated to a large extent through extensive consultations with the stakeholders and a wider and more extensive review of both the literature and related developments in Rwanda. The SPIU ensured that additional information was provided during the presentation of the draft report to the

¹ The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) was undertaken in 2017 and the complete reference is Ibrahim C. Musobo, 2018. Mid-Term Evaluation of the Joint Programme on “Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda’s Economic Transformation” Final Report, Kigali, February 2018.

² A number of stakeholders commented on this fact of a lack of information exchanges between partners.

local stakeholders on September 10. Subsequently, staff at the Ministry of Environment and some of the UN agencies involved, have provided additional information on a number of activities and reports that supplemented the information and the evaluation was kept open up to 28 September. It was challenging to link the outputs to larger national outcomes, although some of the testimonies indicated that this had been the case. Ultimately, the lack of ownership by agencies for activities planned but not delivered meant that in spite of reminders, a number of respondents never engaged with the evaluation.

FINDINGS

The evaluation determined that confirmed contributions came from only 4 agencies out of 10 for a total input of US\$**1,775,887** - **only** around 17 % of the total inputs planned. The difficulties encountered in obtaining the numbers for the resource inputs, suggested a serious lacunae in the coordination of the JP, and limited feedback by agencies to the coordinating entities at UNDP and the SPIU at MoE. Reporting by agencies to partners was highly inadequate and many interviewees commented on this. Sometimes parallel lines of communications were preferred as some reports were seen at the UNDP level, and others were generated by regional projects but had not been shared with other implementing partners and UN agencies. There were information gaps and a lack of adjustments to circumstances by the JP, counter to the guidance provided by the UNDG for joint programmes.

The findings – by activity and output show that among the constituent elements of the JP, Outputs One, Four and Five have the highest ratings of Marginally Satisfactory; Output Two is Highly Unsatisfactory; while Output Three is Marginally Unsatisfactory. Taking the individual ratings, the evaluation finds an overall rating for the JP to be Marginally Unsatisfactory.

The MoE requested the additional use of a parallel set of national evaluation criteria - Not done: Red 0-50%; Partly done (Yellow 50%-80%) and Fully done (Green 80%-100%). In the case of the JP, where 9 out of the 20 activities planned were not provided with any resources, and so there were no inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts in 45% of the planned work. In 6 of the 20 activities there was the complete chain of results – inputs, outputs and outcomes and so 30% of the work by activity was fully done. The evaluation is not able to judge the five activities under the SE4ALL, accomplished outside the JP. The most positive score that can be attained by the JP in this evaluation would be for 11 of 20 activities fully done, or a score of 55%, leading it to be rated as Partly done. The other ratio would be to take 6 of 15 activities as fully undertaken, 9 not undertaken and 5 were outside the JP, this would lead to 40% fully done and that would rate the JP at Red (0-50%) achievement or “Not done”. A principal challenge noted is the lack of focused interest and participation by five of the UN partners to the agreed to JP activities, together with inadequate reporting to the PSC on work assigned, leading to low synergies between high level JP goals and the activities undertaken.

Relevance

The evaluation confirms that the JP activities and the effort to focus on “Green Growth and Economy” were and remain highly relevant for the country and for the UN agencies participating in the design of this JP. The PRODOC and subsequent reports and documentation confirm that JP activities selected are priorities for strategic results in several national plans and goals.

The evaluation concludes that the JP addresses several important development goals and whether its objectives remain valid and will remain valid for at least a decade or longer, as each of the goals, in particular transforming economic activities to be green, will be a long term goal and require ongoing efforts. The relevance of the JP to the goals and objectives of both the UN and to the GoR is rated High.

Effectiveness:

Effectiveness is considered here for the JP as a whole and also for each of the five outputs and 20 activities that constituted the elements of the JP. As a group, the JP cannot be considered to have achieved its goal. The objectives of the JP were to mobilise resources and utilize the JP to focus around eleven million dollars of resources, and the expertise and capacities of ten agencies. It has been reported that this JP could only mobilize 17% of the planned resources; there were no annual narrative and financial reports provided by 9 of the partner UN agencies. There was no adherence to the guidelines for coordination and reporting and the JPSC, which did meet regularly, was unable to secure compliance. The challenges are found to be somewhat ameliorated by the fact of the JPSC meetings which were seen to have value for information sharing (even with the gaps mentioned) and many participants learned about the parallel activities that were discussed at the JPSC, specifically activities 1.2, 2.1 and 5.2, where the partners and stakeholders were often present at the JPSC and shared information. In addition, no synergies were noted with other projects and any other national and joint programmes. Thus at the level of the JP the evaluation considers the achievement of objectives to have major shortcomings in the achievement of raising resources and focus and coordination of the programme, and is rated as Unsatisfactory.

Moving down to the activity and output level (see tables 5.1 to 5.5 above) it is positive to note that several activities were performed well, and each of them contributed to their associated outputs. The activities that were undertaken have contributed to the achievement of the planned outputs and each is shown in the table above.

The major factors influencing the non-achievement of the objectives were first the shortfalls in the planned resources. This could possibly have led to a lack of enthusiasm among many of the partner agencies. That could then have generated indifference as the perception could have been that without the planned resources any further involvement in the JP only added costs without commensurate benefits.

The capacity building and trainings interventions were relatively small, and within their scope they appear to have the required qualified trainers. UNDP struggled to support the achievement of JP outcomes and outputs within the limitations of budgetary resources, staff shortages and the absence of inputs from other agencies, as well as it could. It partnered well

with its counterpart at the MoE, and considering constraints on both sides the partnership was appropriate and moderately effective.

Efficiency:

The original budget for the JP was over ten million US dollars. The actual amount made available to the JP activities was around 17% (US\$ 1.8 million). It is our view that the percentage for coordination is on the higher side but the amount is not. The higher percentage is likely due to the much smaller allocation, at 17% of the amount planned for. The review indicated slower use of funds and delays in implementation but the experiences of similar work indicates the activities here were cost effective. The JP was implemented in the most efficient way if it was to remain a JP. The alternative of independent activities by the partners was a feature of the actual implementation and hence the efforts made for coordination were not efficient or effective.

Sustainability: The benefits of the JP activities that have successfully been carried out are likely to continue even after JP funding has been completed and the project closed at the end of 2018. The JP was in fact focused on issues of environment sustainability and it also aimed to promote environmental sustainability mainstreaming. The evaluation concludes that the benefits of each of the successful JP to continue after 2018 as they all belong to UN and GoR national development priorities and so will attract national and additional donor funding. The JP had no clear exit strategy defined in the PRODOC nor is any strategy beyond closure at the end of the extended project period in December 2018 planned.

Outcomes and Impacts: Some JP activities increased capacity and built institutions to assist in the future planning and implementation of GE measures in Rwanda and others provided direct benefits to small numbers of poor women and men. The first type, are considered successful for the current time and true measures of their positive impacts will only be known going forward. In these the JP certainly contributes to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs. Given the recent time when many outputs have been concluded it is too early to assess the impacts of the JP and second, the smaller size of the JP inputs would imply a smaller set of results. No negative changes were seen to have been produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Cross Cutting Issues: All government and UN documents seen have emphasized the crosscutting themes of gender and human rights, including the HRBA, and given their overwhelming emphasis in reports that the evidence supports knowledge and adherence to the principles. The activities seen do not raise any recommendations to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming, as they appear appropriate to the activities.

The activity supported by UNEP involved five countries in the region and had South-South knowledge and experience exchange built in to the design and its execution. In activity 5.2, involving Rwanda Investigation Bureau (RIB) in mapping environmental crimes and building capacity to reduce them, it was stated in interviews that the project partners availed of opportunities to discuss rules, regulations and operating procedures with neighbouring

countries as the ecosystem issues often have cross boundary implications. The SE4ALL activities were incorporated within a continent wide collaborative effort.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. There has been very high GoR involvement and commitment at the highest levels of government of the activities within the JP, which have often taken place outside the boundaries of the JP. The JP arrangement has provided a very useful forum for the various national actors involved to recognize the importance and value of a green economy which is a constituent part of the GoR national development agenda. The 11 activities that are reported here as fully done testify to the main achievement of the JP.

2. The JP as a project has catalysed interactions to some other development initiatives with the engagement of the diverse national stakeholders. The meetings of the PSC provided very useful opportunities for stakeholder interactions and dialogue but its full potential was not utilised. The learning and adaptation opportunities could have been enhanced with annual project Reviews to assess whether or not all of the activities were making progress, and the results of activities did not contribute to project outcomes, and as in this case, new information was available on changes in resources, priorities or the context, in ways that affected the JP, the individual activities and overall purpose should have been adapted to reflect that. The information available at the design can never be perfect for the future. The project guidance should clearly establish circumstances, when project documents must be formally amended versus when an informal update can be adequate.

3. The idea that the JP can potentially provide a mechanism to focus the work of dozens of UN agencies that underpins one of its motivations was not proven to be valid. The project, at the level of expectations of the JP, that would allow for greater synergies and focus a set of sub projects and multiple agencies to work together, where working together is the key word, did not work. The One UN fund was smaller than anticipated and agencies that had begun the engagement with enthusiasm and high expectations were not able to maintain their initial plans as smaller resources became a reality. In some cases, most likely in Output Four, SE4ALL, additional resources outside the JP framework led to a complete reorganization of the partnerships expected between the UN agencies and national counterpart.

4. The JP has performed well in implementing activities where both resources and commitment existed from both the concerned UN agencies and the IPs. However, even in instances where there was weak coordination, there is still an opportunity to better integrate the different projects under this JP, especially where there is common ground and opportunities for cross-cutting activities for collaboration.

5. The JP process has proved inefficient and burdensome and the results achieved could also have been largely achieved by standalone projects. It proved very difficult to establish the financial and narrative status for most of the activities. The JP Steering Committee served well to bring together the different actors in a knowledge sharing mode, but it did not exercise management and control authority to the expected extent. Clearer annual statements of work

done and planned were required for adaptive planning and management under the changes that it faced.

6. Two agencies, namely UNESCO and UNEP, have performed well in their activities, albeit in different ways. UNEP has undertaken the work it committed to and the evidence provided suggests successful outputs and outcomes (this will need to be confirmed by UNEP evaluation planned) appropriate to the JP through the planning of the toolkit and its deployment. However, UNEP contributions to the SE4ALL (output 4) was highly limited. Also, UNEP remained outside the JP management and coordination. The UNDP has done a difficult task of attempting to coordinate the JP and integrate the activities into a larger whole; managing activity and financial reports, meetings and supporting two activities on its own, while challenged by staff shortages and frequent turnover, together with the SPIU. The challenges faced by both UNDP and the SPIU have led to inefficiencies and a loss in effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Both the MoE and UNDP should improve their reporting and monitoring format and framework. UNDP in Rwanda has been working on a template for annual reporting of all activities it is involved in. The template was discussed with the evaluator and it is recommended that such a template be reviewed within the agency and applied to all multi-years projects undertaken.
2. The UN, UNDP and the GoR, should undertake a review across all the JPs supported during the same 2014-2018 period to examine whether similar or different experiences and lessons emerge from them.
3. Rwanda has ambitious plans for environmental protection and climate change actions. This includes the Green Growth and Climate Change Strategy. Successful implementation of such cross cutting plans will require stronger a SPIU than seen here, with more resources and the ability to work across government departments and external agencies. The MoE and UNDP must ensure in future work that the SPIU is provided with adequate resources to efficiently perform their tasks.
4. UNDP and MoE should plan their future co-operation for the joint priorities of promoting the green economy approach to economic transformations, which support pro-poor growth, with inclusive economic development and poverty reduction with activities that are within their core competencies and where adequate resources are available. In these plans some of the work done under the JP should be consolidated, scaled up and made more effective towards longer term goals.

LESSONS LEARNED

The successes (and the lack of it) in each specific activity of the JP provides some individual and systemic lessons:

1. Each activity that was found to have delivered is scalable, and it has significant potential to be undertaken in wider scope and covering additional parts of the country.

2. In any common endeavour, emphasis must be placed on the rules and sets of incentives and penalties for participants for high performance. The JP provided only one incentive - that by participating the UN and national agencies would have access to additional resources. The incentive of resources was lost when they did not materialize. When the incentive failed to materialize, the partnerships dissolved with it.
3. UN agencies work best when there have been assured resources and the resources are well targeted towards work involving the agencies' core competencies. The fact that so many actors (UN Agencies and IPs) were seemingly involved in the JP caused coordination challenges and eventual weathering away of commitment by some actors.
4. All future progress towards achieving the goals of the Green Economy for Rwanda requires improvements in the current practice of administration. There is the classic model that agencies are more familiar with – the design of a programme that in the case of the JP was established by the PRODOC. This set out the resources and tasks, and the responsibilities for those tasks, by the key agents. This model proved inadequate to two facets of reality – first, short fall in the resources available, and second, the degrees of commitment to the common programme was not uniform among the agents. A solution of the first issue and minimisation of the effects of the second, require planning that is more attuned to risks and to changed circumstances over time. This requires a degree of **adaptive planning** that could have improved the performance of the JP. Adaptive processes require some level of scenario development, into design strategies – what if statements and possible actions that address the relevant changes that can occur in the course of implementation. This also requires regular portfolio reviews to check assumptions and re-engage stakeholders, to adapt to the new information. Triggers for adjusting the JP could have been through an annual review of the JP elements, followed by a revised plan going forward.
5. The One UN Fund allocations to Rwanda can play a catalytic role when it is able to incentivize all partner agencies to put more emphasis on synergies with other actors but that requires adequate support by the donors and greater awareness by the government and all partners on the potential catalytic role of the One UN. This is only possible when it is sufficiently resourced.

INTRODUCTION

Background

1. Rwanda has laid out a set of comprehensive, inter-related and ambitious plans for development. The overarching document is Vision 2020³, which provides an overall statement for the country's development. The vision is supported by a series of policies and programmes aimed at reducing poverty, including the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS 1), followed by the EDPRS 2 (2013-2018). The country suffers from a number of adverse environmental challenges and negative effects of climate change as well. The national strategy for "Green Growth and Climate Resilience" (GGCRS) was developed to design strategies to mitigate environmental challenges while supporting economic growth. The GGCRS influenced the inclusion of the "Green Economy Approach" as a priority of EDPRS II (2013-2018) under the Economic Transformation thematic area. The main objective of the Economic Transformation thematic area is to propose a cross-sectorial strategy to sustain rapid growth and facilitate Rwanda's process of economic transformation to meet targets laid out while pursuing a green economy approach to economic transformation by reducing costs by going 'green' and exploiting new 'green' economic opportunities.

2. Under the plans for UN reforms, begun in 2005, Rwanda offered and was selected as one of eight pilot countries for the UN agencies to work together as 'One UN'.⁴ Following the pilot phase, a new UN Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) was developed covering all UN agencies' funds and programmes in Rwanda for the period July 2013 to June 2018. The Rwanda UNDAP was designed to meet both global goals such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and medium-term national development priorities as set out in the EDPRS 2, also covering the same period, 2013-2018.

³ Government of Rwanda, 2012, Vision 2020 (Revised 2012). It highlights many of the issues which are incorporated in the Joint Programme (JP) being evaluated, such as Private Sector-led Development; land use; urban development; energy; water and waste management; gender equality; natural resources, environment and climate change; and science and technology.

⁴ After that, the UN Country Team in Rwanda elaborated a United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2008-2012, to provide a coherent framework for the implementation of the 'One UN Programme' model where the UN system could better respond to the development challenges and support the MDGs, by reducing "fragmentation, duplication, high overhead costs, and lack of focus" (UNCT, 2007, One UN "Delivering as one" In RWANDA: CONCEPT PAPER, One UN' in Rwanda, 5 April 2007, page 6).

3. It was envisaged within the UNDAP 2013-2018, that through several Joint Programmes⁵ under its new support framework, the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) 2013-2018, the UN Country Team would enhance coordinated support of the implementation of several priority areas. In addition to alignment with EDPRS II, the UNDAP takes serious consideration of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1 that elaborates sustainable development pathways that can eradicate extreme poverty and reduce social and economic inequality and exclusion. “Area of Work 1” includes the development of sustainable and inclusive productive capacities, including Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency, and is in alignment with the EDPRS II priorities that are supported by the JP.

Subject of the evaluation

4. The evaluation covers the Joint Programme (JP) titled: “Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Economy Approach to Rwanda’s Economic Transformation” and was designed to support improved systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources and energy access, to achieve greater environmental and climate change resilience by supporting sustainable urbanization, with a focus on resiliency and green growth; supporting the scaling up of renewable energy, energy efficiency and energy access; supporting increased levels of public and private investment in sustainable environment and natural resource management and climate change; strengthening sectoral capacity to develop and/or acquire appropriate technologies and skills for resource efficiency and cleaner production; strengthening the capacity of national and local institutions to reduce the carbon foot print in human settlements, through the green cities and villages; and the establishment of Centres of Excellence.

5. UN support for this JP as articulated in the Project Document (PRODOC) and by UNDAP is led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the One UN Fund. Other supporting UN agencies include the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

⁵ The UNDAP Annual Report 2016-2017 mentions a number of additional Joint Programmes and they include: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; JP on “Youth and Women Employment”; “Value Chains”; “Accelerating Progress Toward the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women (RWEE)”; “Advancing and Sustaining Gender Equality Gains in Rwanda” and others.

6. The Green Economy Joint Programme was to contribute to achievement of the UNDAP Result 1 of Inclusive Economic Transformation through UNDAP Outcome 1: “Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction.” Outcome 1 was to be enhanced by activities aimed at improving systems to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation through, among others, the development of green cities and villages, green industries and services, codes and standards for energy efficiency, framework and assessment tools for renewable energy development to expand energy access, as well as the establishment of Centres of Excellence on environment and climate change. UNDAP’s Outcome 1 is also directly aligned to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 “Area of Work 1” that includes Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency, through the five following outputs:

Output 1: Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions

Output 2: Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches to Economic Transformation increased

Output 3: Planning and implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages), especially for vulnerable women and men, strengthened

Output 4: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the energy sector of Rwanda advanced

Output 5: Initiatives in support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy effectively coordinated

7. The JP is funded through multiple sources of funds including the One UN Fund, which is a pooled fund mechanism, in addition to core and vertical resources from different UN agencies including UNDP. UNDP is the Administrative Agent of the One UN Fund.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION

8. The original Project Document (PRODOC) defined the project along the outputs, actions, anticipated results, partners involved and the allocated resources by activity and output. The PRODOC indicated a total of 10 UN agencies (see Tables 1 to 6 below) had agreed to form partnerships contributing to 5 outputs, which in turn are composed of 20 activities. The PRODOC was signed by all the ten UN agencies that were to participate and indicated a total resource allocation of US\$10,421,349.

9. The Ministry of Environment (MoE) and its affiliate institutions, the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) and the National Fund for Environment and Climate Change (FONERWA), have been mandated to lead the implementation of Priority 5 of the Economic Transformation thematic area of EDPRS II. The Ministry of Finance and Economic

Planning (MINECOFIN), as the Ministry responsible for national economic planning and therefore green economic transformation, continued to provide guidance and advice. In this regard, therefore, the JP was led by the MoE on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. The Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) has implemented a significant proportion of the planned joint programme activities. Other Implementing Partners (IPs) include the University of Rwanda under the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), the Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM).

Defined Actions and Partners

As determined in the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) in 2017:

Output 1: Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions				
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency	GoR
1.1	Support establishment and operationalization of an innovation centre of excellence that promotes the environment, climate resilience, green urbanization and green technologies.	Innovation Centre for Environment, Climate Change, Green Urbanization and Green Technologies established and operational	FAO	MoE (REMA)
1.2	Support operationalization of the Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management	Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management, established and operational	UNESCO	MINEDUC (UR)
1.3	Support institutional linkages in pursuing GE growth (Innovation Centre of Excellence Research/Academic/RECP/BDC/TVET)	Institutional linkages established and functional between innovation centres and RECP Centre, Business Development Centres, Research, TVET, Academic etc.	UNIDO	MINICOM (PSF)

Table 1: Project Output One of the JP and the Partners

Output 2: Public and private investment in Green Urbanization approaches to Economic Transformation increased				
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency	GoR
2.1	Support for the establishment and operationalization of a private sector-led structure for the construction of a model green city in Rwanda	Private sector-led structure established and operational for the construction of a model green city	UN HABITAT	MININFRA (RHA)

2.2	Support for private sector-led resource mobilization and construction of a model green city in Rwanda	Resources available for private sector led construction of a model green city in Rwanda	UNCTAD	MININFRA (RHA)
2.3	Support for private investment in green technology goods for large scale national and/or export market	At least one industry operational, producing green technology goods for the national and/or export market	UNIDO	MoE (FONERWA)

Table 2: Project Output Two of the JP and Partners

	Output 3: Planning and Implementation of Integrated Rural Settlements (Green Villages), especially for vulnerable women and men, strengthened			
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency	GoR
3.1	Support the establishment of a gender-balanced private sector-led structure for up-scaling green villages in Rwanda for vulnerable women and men	Private sector-led structure established and operational for up-scaling green villages in Rwanda	UN HABITAT	MININFRA (RHA)
3.2	Support investment for integrating climate smart practices in the construction of green villages	2 demo green villages established with climate smart practices	UNDP/FAO	MININFRA (RHA)
3.3	Support private sector-led resource mobilization for up-scaling of green villages in Rwanda	Resources available for a private sector-led construction of green villages in Rwanda	UNCTAD	MININFRA (RHA)

Table 3: Project Output Three of the JP and the Partners

4	Output 4: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the energy sector of Rwanda advanced			
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency	GoR
4.1	Support the strengthening of national energy planning through renewable energy resource assessment and decisions tools development	National renewable energy resources assessment /development framework and tool developed to support renewable energy capacity expansion and investment decisions	UNECA	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.2	Support the development and execution of technical and economic assessment of renewable energy potentials at one of the sites	Geothermal energy potential established and documented	UNEP	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.3	Support the development of national energy efficiency standards and codes	Energy efficiency standards and codes developed	UNIDO	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.4	Support mainstreaming SE4ALL goals including: Energy Technology Deployment and Energy Security framework; SE4ALL multi-stakeholders' framework and coordinating committee;	SE4ALL goals mainstreamed in energy sector policy and planning through policy dialogue, policy review support, consultations and technical support	UNDP; UNHABITAT ;UNECA; UNIDO	MININFRA, (Energy)

	decentralized off grid solutions, in the energy sector of Rwanda through policy dialogue, consultation and technical support; and strengthen the decentralized energy segment of the Rwanda SE4ALL AA and develop programme framework for decentralized energy solutions			
4.5	Support the drafting/adoption of the SE4ALL Investment Prospectus	Rwanda National SE4ALL Action Agenda & Investment Prospectuses (AA/IPs) developed	UNECA/ UNDP	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.6	Support nationally adopted indicators and set-out the SE4ALL progress tracking system	SE4ALL RBM and M&E systems developed	UNECA/ UNDP	MININFRA, (Energy)

Table 4: Project Output Four of the JP and Partners

5	Output 5: Initiatives in support of policy, advocacy and capacity development for Green Economy effectively coordinated			
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency	GoR
5.1	Support the development and operationalization of a toolbox for operationalizing the GE in Rwanda	A toolbox for operationalizing GE Transition in Rwanda developed and operationalized	UNEP	MoE (REMA; FONERWA)
5.2	Provide capacity-strengthening support for the Environment Unit of the RNP to support in implementing green growth related standards	Environmental Unit within RNP exists and is operational	UNDP	RNP/ REMA
5.3	Support the costing of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	All sectors costed for the implementation of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	UNDP/ Others	MoE (REMA; RNRA; FONERWA)
5.4	Support the urbanization and environmental health risk reduction policy development and implementation pilot projects	Urbanization policy produced and pilot projects implemented	UN HABITAT/ WHO	MININFRA , (RHA) MoE (REMA; FONERWA)
5.5	Support technical and capacity development and provision of advisory services for Green Growth and Green Economy	GE Advisory services provided	ONE UN	MoE (REMA; FONERWA)

Table 5: Project Output Five of the JP and Partners

	The JP planned financial resources in US\$ for UN agencies
--	---

	UN agencies	Allocated resources in the PRODOC 2015
1	UNEP	1,250,000
2	FAO	1,388,802
3	UN-HABITAT	1,723,749
4	UNDP	2,582,965
5	UNECA	638,750
6	UNCTAD	575,000
7	UNIDO	878,750
8	UNESCO	320,000
9	WHO	103,333
10	OneUN	960,000
	TOTAL	10,421,349

Table 6: Allocated Resources in US\$ by agency and total

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Purpose of the Final Evaluation

10. The purpose of the final evaluation has been to assess the level of achievement of the Joint Programme (JP) during the period February 2015 to June 2018, since the initiation of its implementation. This final evaluation has partly been backward looking, to provide information to the extent possible, of the potential impact and sustainability of the JP and to capture lessons learnt. It partly looks forward so as to inform the design of the next phase of the programme.

11. The evaluation assessed the design, scope, implementation and sustainability of the JP and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes, recorded challenges faced and best practices used or not used, during the implementation period, which will inform the next phase of the programme, to be designed during 2018. The main objectives of the final evaluation are the following⁶:

- Assess the achievements of the programme against its stated outputs and its contribution to the achievement of UNDAP and EDPRS outcomes;
- 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;

⁶ The scope, objectives and questions addressed in the evaluation were as stated in the terms of reference.

- Identify the main achievements and impacts of the JP's activities;
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
- Document lessons learnt;
- Assess the programme exit strategy; and
- Inform the design of the next programme phase.

12. The emphasis on lessons learnt focuses on understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future programmes. The evaluation has assessed the performance of the JP against planned results, as well as preliminary indications of potential impact and sustainability of results in national plans and potential sustainability of results. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation are aimed at the key stakeholders of the Government of Rwanda – through the Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), Rwanda Housing Authority (RHA), University of Rwanda (UR) under the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with REMA, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM) – UNDP and other One UN agencies, especially those partaking in the JP.

Scope of the Final Evaluation

13. 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 JP. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the JP compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the JP objectives;
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments for future programmes;
- Efficiency of JP management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency;
- Likely outcomes and impact of the JP in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the JP.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

- (i) Assessment of whether the JP design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
- (ii) An evaluation of the JP's progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;
- (iii) An evaluation of JP performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Joint Programme Document; an assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the JP outputs produced during the implementation period in relation to expected results; identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the implementation of the JP; and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of

- the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the JP;
- (iv) An evaluation of the JP's contribution to the achievements of UNDAP's outcome and outputs;
 - (v) Identification and, to the extent possible, quantification of any additional outputs and outcomes beyond those specified in the Joint Programme Document;
 - (vi) An evaluation of JP coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:
 - a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in JP arrangements and execution;
 - b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms in monitoring on a day to day basis and progress in JP implementation;
 - c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the JP;
 - d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the PSC;
 - e. Financial management of the JP, 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 JP are likely to be met;
 - (viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of JP activities;
 - (ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach⁷;
 - (x) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendations accordingly;
 - (xi) Lessons learned during JP implementation; and
 - (xii) Evaluate the programme's exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity.

Evaluation Questions and Criteria

14. The JP will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria (as specified in the ToR):

⁷For more guidance on this, the UNEG's Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation" was reviewed at <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

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

More specifically, the final evaluation was tasked to address the following questions for each evaluation criteria:

Relevance

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

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 JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach⁸? 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?

⁸ The evaluation has used all UN, UNDP and UNEG's guidance documents in the conduct of this evaluation.

- How did UNDP and One UN support the achievement of JP outcome and outputs?
- How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective? What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other projects/ (joint) programmes?

Efficiency

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

Sustainability

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

Impact of interventions

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

METHODOLOGY

15. The evaluation methodology followed the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation. The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation has emerged from consultation among programme staff, the evaluator and key stakeholders, based on the inception report, followed by discussions in the field on what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, within the limitations of budget, time and data availability (inadequate reporting is discussed in the findings).
16. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach, drawing on primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data was also collected through surveys of all partners and stakeholders (national and local government institutions, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Data on the JP indicators have been used by the evaluation to assess the JP progress and achievements.
17. In evaluation literature, the relationships in the results chain (they are defined in the OECD DAC and UN guidelines) as comprise a sequence beginning with the inputs – in this case the financial resources and the expertise provided by the named partner agencies for achieving the goals of the JP. In the JP, the stated goal (as in the PRODOC) was “to support improved systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources and energy access, to achieve greater environmental and climate change resilience” by undertaking five types of activities with the joint inputs of the UN and national partners named in Tables 1-5 and Table 3.
18. The Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) considers the programme and lower level managers responsible for using the inputs made available to them to design and deliver the individual activities. Each activity then leads to one or more output – where an output is defined as a result within the direct control of the executing agent. An output may be a training workshop, a concept note, a tool to measure some indicator or to generate a plan for a new green activity.
19. Outcomes are defined as immediate **results of the output delivered, and having elements beyond the control of the executing agent**. An outcome may include increased capacity of trainees, use of a new device such as a biogas unit by the recipient, the imitation by others of a desirable practice such as composting and so on. Outcomes are the immediate result of the activity and in practical terms may be within 1-3 years of the activity, defined by the nature of the activity. Finally, for many development projects, are project impacts observed 3-5 or more years after the end of the activity, after a time lag. Hence it is useful to distinguish

outcomes by time - direct outcomes, which can be expected soon after the outputs are delivered; medium term outcomes; and finally, impacts.

20. The evaluation follows the above logic and definitions. It tracked each of the 20 planned activities to determine inputs used and the outputs of the activity and that provides a metric for efficiency of the activity undertaken. It then examined the outcomes from the activity and the contributions of individual outcomes to those specified in the PRODOC. Finally, the findings were triangulated (validated through cross verification from more than one source) and then reviewed across the activity areas and evaluation questions to arrive at the final ratings.⁹

21. The evaluation methodology included the following:

- (i) Desk review of the Joint Programme Document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, Programme Annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- (ii) Review of specific products produced so far, including data sets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
- (iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Programme Coordinator, Technical Assistant, and Administrative Assistant in MoE;
- (iv) Interviews with UNDP Country Director, Head of Poverty and Environment Unit in UNDP and UNDP Programme focal point;
- (v) Interviews with central and local government officials and other JP beneficiaries;
- (vi) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, such as Resident Coordinator's Office;
- (vii) Focus group discussions with stakeholders as feasible and organized with the help of UNDP and MoE;
- (viii) In addition, one questionnaire and short survey¹⁰ was developed and provided to all the stakeholders. The actual format and questions were developed during the week of 12-18 August and discussed and reviewed with the evaluation management team prior to implementation.

⁹ The above discussion on outcomes and impacts and on ratings was added on the request of the SPIU at the MOE to explain the process of arriving at the judgements made.

¹⁰ A questionnaire is the tool – a list of questions designed to be relevant to the respondent and their knowledge and experience in relation to the JP. The word survey, covers the entire process – the design, universe, sampling or other methods, data collection, and analysis.

KEY PARTNERS and STAKEHOLDERS

Key Partners ¹¹ by activity		
Action	UN Agency	GoR
1.1	FAO	MoE (REMA)
1.2	UNESCO	MINEDUC (UR)
1.3	UNIDO	MINICOM (PSF)
2.1	UN HABITAT	MININFRA (RHA)
2.2	UNCTAD	MININFRA (RHA)
2.3	UNIDO	MoE (FONERWA)
3.1	UN HABITAT	MININFRA (RHA)
3.2	UNDP/FAO	MININFRA (RHA)
3.3	UNCTAD	MININFRA (RHA)
4.1	UNECA	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.2	UNEP	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.3	UNIDO	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.4	UNDP; UNHABITAT; UNECA; UNIDO	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.5	UNECA/UNDP	MININFRA, (Energy)
4.6	UNECA/UNDP	MININFRA, (Energy)
5.1	UNEP	MoE (REMA; FONERWA)
5.2	UNDP	RNP/REMA
5.3	UNDP/Others	MoE (REMA; RNRA; FONERWA)
5.4	UN HABITAT/WHO	MININFRA, (RHA)
		MoE (REMA; FONERWA)
5.5	ONE UN	MoE (REMA; FONERWA)

Table 7: Partners in the JP

22. Rwanda is among eight pilot countries selected in January 2007 to implement the One UN Reform, which enables the UN System to provide a more effective and coherent response to the needs of the Government of Rwanda and its Development Partners. As part of the UN Country Team, UNDP works with other sister agencies to implement the “One UN – Delivering as One” process. UNDP-Rwanda’s programmes and activities respond to the challenges facing

¹¹ OECD DAC defines Partners as “individuals and organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives”; while stakeholders are a larger group of organizations and/ or individuals who have a “direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation”. See OECD, 2002, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, pages 28 and 37.

the country to achieve its own short and long term goals such as EDPRS (Economic Development and Poverty Reduction), Vision2020, as well as global goals such as the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals).

23. UNDP provides the most comprehensive development support in three major areas of expertise and practice together with the area of Millennium Development Goals: Poverty Reduction and Environment, Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation, Aid Coordination. UNDP coordinated many of the activities in the JP and together with the MoE had the most important role in the JP. In addition, there were 9 additional UN agencies which had agreed to partner in the JP and were to work with 5 ministries of the GoR and the subsidiary agencies and organizations under the respective ministry (Table 7). Additional details on each activity are provided earlier from the PRODOC (summarised in Tables 1-5) and subsequently in the findings and not repeated further here.

LIMITATIONS AND APPROACHES TO OVERCOME THEM

24. The evaluation of the project presented several unique challenges. The issues covered in this project are wide ranging, with many stakeholders and partners. Over the course of its execution, there was a significant turnover of staff, and some of the key staff of partners and stakeholders were not available for inputs. Two approaches were used to enhance the quality of data collected. First, interviewees were contacted several times during the evaluation, by UNDP, the SPIU and the evaluator. In addition, a short electronic questionnaire was used to extend the scope and depth of the feedback on the key questions in the matrix below. The survey was an additional important tool to gauge users' views of the project outputs and outcomes. In addition, the project M&E documents were used extensively to supplement the primary data collected.

25. Another challenge was that the JP was designed to operate in a cooperative and integrated manner, but there was almost no information provided by the majority of the partner agencies, which made it difficult to ascertain the contributions from the JP activities through supporting evidence documents. The challenges were mitigated to a large extent through extensive consultations with the stakeholders and a wider and more extensive review of both the literature and related developments in Rwanda. Several drafts of the Final Evaluation report were shared with the partners and modified to take into account the suggestions, questions and additional feedback provided. Presentations to stakeholders in Kigali were made on 10 September, and another on 26 September, 2018.

26. Additional information was provided to the evaluation during the presentation of the draft report to the local stakeholders who added some of the missing information. And subsequently, staff at the Ministry of Environment and the UN agencies involved, have provided some additional information on a number of activities and reports that supplemented the information and added perspectives to the work supported by the JP. The discussions with and inputs from the stakeholders have been incorporated.

27. Given the gaps in information and low fulfilment of the JP in its mobilization of resources whereby activities were not attempted and others scaled down, it was challenging to link the outputs to larger national outcomes. While strong evidence on results were lacking without adequate ongoing monitoring, some of the testimonies indicated that in the activities successfully implemented, there were useful outcomes. Ultimately, the lack of ownership by agencies for activities planned but not delivered meant that in spite of many reminders, a large number of respondents never engaged with the evaluation.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

JP RESOURCES

28. The evaluation used all available M&E documents, quarterly and annual plans, annual project reports, steering committee meeting reports and the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) together with feedback from interviews and the survey, to ascertain the activities undertaken, their list of outputs and purpose. It also examined the use and relevance of outputs, including materials produced, and, for relevance it consulted a wider set of documents on UNDAP, other Joint Programmes, national plans and documents on green growth and economy, to assess relevance. The documents were supplemented by consultations with stakeholders. All information sources used are provided in Annex 2.

The JP Resources: Planned and actual financial resources in US\$ for UN agencies				
	UN agencies	Allocated resources in the PRODOC 2015	Estimates in MTE¹²	Actual confirmed by the evaluation¹³
1	UNEP	1,250,000	720,000	\$720,000
2	FAO	1,388,802	608,682	N.R.
3	UN-HABITAT	1,723,749	455,878	N.R.
4	UNDP	2,582,965	673,427	\$921,887
5	UNECA	638,750	154,000	N.R.
6	UNCTAD	575,000	119,000	119,000
7	UNIDO	878,750		N.R.
8	UNESCO	320,000		\$15,000
9	WHO	103,333		N.R.
10	OneUN	960,000		
	TOTAL	\$10,421,349	\$2,730,987	\$1,775,887

Table 8: Allocated Resources in US\$ by agency and total

(Sources: PRODOC, MTE and submissions by partners and agencies)

¹² The figures in this column were reported in the Mid Term Evaluation conducted in December 2017. This evaluation could not ascertain the source for the figures provided in the MTE and the submissions could not be found in the evaluation.

¹³ The figures reported in this final column were obtained during the evaluation from each UN agency and/or their national partners. No confirmation could be made for the other agencies in spite of repeated efforts by the evaluator and the JP coordinators, represented as N.R. (No response).

29. The confirmed amounts in column 4 are seen from the submissions by UNEP, UNDP, and the SPIU. The estimates (in column 5) are provided here from the MTE, but they cannot be confirmed in this evaluation. UNESCO contributions to the University of Rwanda (UR)/ Centre of Excellence for Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management (CoEB) have been estimated by CoEB to total around US\$15,000 USD.¹⁴

30. The contributions that have been confirmed by the evaluation are from only four agencies out of 10 for a total input of US\$**1,775,887** only around 17 % of the total inputs planned.¹⁵ It is striking that the evaluation could only confirm that the JP was able to provide around 17% of the planned resource inputs by all the UN agencies. Second, the difficulties encountered in obtaining the numbers for the resource inputs, suggests serious lacunae in the coordination of the JP, and limited feedback by agencies to the coordinating entities at UNDP and the SPIU at MoE. Third, it is noteworthy, that in the four year period of the JP, and with resources allocated to a medium term evaluation, these input numbers and the activities, and, outputs and outcomes generated by partners could not be clearly established as required for a joint programme.¹⁶ Reporting by agencies to partners was highly inadequate and many interviewees commented on this¹⁷. Sometimes parallel lines of communications were preferred as some reports were sited at the UNDP level, but they did not appear to have been shared with other implementing partners and the coordinating unit. Fourth, the information gaps and the lack of adjustments by the JP, counter to the guidance provided by the UNDG¹⁸ for joint programmes.

FINDINGS – BY ACTIVITY AND OUTPUT

¹⁴ CoEB has now raised over US\$200,000 in 2018 for project work in its area of expertise.

¹⁵ A considerable effort was made in the evaluation to confirm the estimates of resources provided by the UN agencies.

¹⁶ On the weaknesses resulting from the lack of information sharing by the UN agencies, see also the next four footnotes.

¹⁷ This was noted in many Steering Committee meetings. The 2016 Annual Report for the JP states that apart from CoEB, UNDP and UNHABITAT, other UN Agencies “do not report as required and this would need to be discussed for the way forward”. Table 8 indicates that inputs from only four UN agencies could be confirmed and there was no response to the evaluation by five agencies.

¹⁸ UNDG guidance states (source UNDG, 2008 Guidelines; and confirmed in 2013 Guidelines) – “Once a Joint Programme has been initiated, UN organizations should ensure that all necessary arrangements are made in a timely manner to ensure prompt implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting” (page 8). It adds specific guidelines for coordination, reporting and revisions. Revisions are suggested where “budgets are revised by 15% or more”, with appropriate adjustments of affected activities, outputs and outcomes, which must be approved by the Steering Committee, with the Joint Programme Document amended, the annual work plan revised and the budgetary framework adjusted to accommodate the changed allocations.

Output and Action	Key Stakeholders	Activity Key Actions:	Indicators:	Evidence Project reports; July 2017 – MTE; interviews in August Sep 2018; documents seen
Output 1	UNDP Admin and REMA	Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions		<p>One out of three activities supported.</p> <p>The COE B is considered successful.</p> <p>Its origins lay with UNESCO and GoR beginning in 2007. It does not appear to have gained from its inclusion in the JP.</p> <p>Marginally Satisfactory (MS)</p>
Action 1.1	FAO MoE (REMA)	Support COE for innovation	COE established	No activity at all. Reported that no funds available at FAO. No formal notifications seen.
1.2	UNESCO MINEDUC (UR)	Support COE on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management	Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management, established and operational	<p>Work on the Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management (CoEB) began in 2007. It has been created, it exists, and it has worked on multiple initiatives, partners, with web and social media presence, and received many streams of funding. The CoEB has now raised over US\$200,000 in 2018 for project work in its area of expertise.</p> <p>A significant success.</p>
1.3	UNIDO MINICOM (PSF)	Support institutional linkages Innovation COE	COE linked.	No activity

Table 9: Output 1-Innovation Centres of Excellence established and linked.¹⁹

31. The evaluation noted the achievement that the Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management (CoEB) has been established and is operational. It is useful to note here the long period of work required for its establishment, which predated the JP. Planning and conceptual work defining the CoEB actually began in 2007. UNESCO had prepared several proposals for significant resources for CoEB from international donors, but it failed to get resources as planned. The government of Rwanda, the University and UNESCO continued to work and develop the ideas while working on multiple initiatives, with different partners, and made the CoEB a functioning unit with many streams of funding. Some of the funds came from UR, UNESCO, and from REMA for research scholarships for Masters and PhD students at UR to study impacts of the LAFREC Gishwati-Mukura landscape restoration project.

32. The CoEB has web and social media presence, and organizes bi-monthly research seminars. It organized two workshops - one on Insect Biology, Taxonomy & Field Skills for research capacity building, and another for high school Science teachers in Rwanda in Geosciences and biodiversity. There is a quarterly newsletter, presentations to local primary and secondary schools were made and grants received for research projects. The CoEB has now raised over US\$200,000 in 2018 for project work in its area of expertise. It is considering several options to enhance its activities and resources and is exploring building on its success to become recognized as a regional centre of excellence on its areas of work. This specific output and outcome are rated as a significant success within the JP. This JP output is rated as Marginally Satisfactory (MS)²⁰, because only one out of the three activities planned were supported by the JP, and the only success the COE B had did not appear to have gained from its inclusion in the JP, nor did the other JP activities take advantage of any potential synergies with the CoEB.

Output and Action	Key Stakeholders	Activity Key Actions:	Indicators:	Evidence Project reports; July 2017 – MTE; interviews in August Sep 2018; documents seen
2	UNDP Admin REMA	Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches to Economic Transformation increased		No evidence was found for two of the three activities to support this output in this group. The third supported by UNCTAD

¹⁹ For Output One, no information was available from FAO, UNESCO and UNIDO. The information on activity 1.2, on the CoEB was provided by the acting director together with many pieces of written narratives on its activities.

²⁰ The rating scale used is provided by UNDP and shown in Annex 7.

				could not proceed beyond initial preparations of the concept. Highly Unsatisfactory
2.1	UN HABITAT MININFRA (RHA)	Support private sector-led structure for the construction of a model green city in Rwanda	MTE stated a toolkit for Green City Development had been developed by UN-HABITAT with RHA. There was a feasibility study for grey water treatment technology in Nyarugenge/ Agatare Kigali and a workshop was held which recommended further work to improve the quality of the treated water.	No evidence seen. No responses from UNHABITAT. None provided by RHA. See also 2.3 below.
2.2	UNCTAD MININFRA (RHA)	Private sector-led resource mobilization and construction of model green city	UNCTAD reported ²¹ that core and ONE UN funds were used to develop a concept note on resource mobilization through the development of green investment exchange approach, taking into account the national context. See also 3.3.	UNCTAD reported that despite initial interest and commitment from national implementing partners, the needed resources for partner engagement to transform the concept into implementation did not materialize.
2.3	MoE (FONERWA)	Private investment in green technology goods for large scale national and/or export market	MTE stated - UN HABITAT undertook a feasibility study for grey water treatment technology in Nyarugenge. The pilot system at household level was stated "installed for testing". See also 2.1 above.	No evidence seen.

²¹ Additional information was provided by UNCTAD during 20-25 September. The MTE had stated that One UN Funds were not allocated. UNCTAD confirmed that an initial allocation of US\$50,000 was secured from the ONE UN Fund and supplemented by another US\$69,000 of its own resources.

Table 10: Output 2 - Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches

33. The MTE stated (Page 24) that a “Toolkit for Green City Development was developed by UN-HABITAT in conjunction with RHA”, and it was “finalized and validated in June 2017”. It also stated that UN-HABITAT was doing a feasibility study for the application of the grey water treatment technology in Nyarugenge/ Agatare Kigali. On this, a workshop was conducted to discuss the draft findings. The workshop recommended conducting further research to improve the quality of the treated grey water. The MTE stated that UN HABITAT undertook a feasibility study for the application of the grey water treatment technology in Nyarugenge and a pilot system at household level was installed for testing. The MTE also stated that “One UN Funds were not allocated” for 2.2 and this was confirmed by UNCTAD (see also 3.3 related to UNCTAD).

34. This specific output is rated as **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) by the evaluation**. The MTE did not have any supporting evidence on the activities supported UNHABITAT. UNHABITAT did not provide any inputs to the evaluation in spite of many efforts to seek their cooperation during the evaluation.²²

Output and Action	Key Stakeholders	Activity Key Actions:	Indicators:	Evidence Project reports; July 2017 – MTE; interviews in August Sep 2018; documents seen
3	UNDP REMA	Planning and implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages), especially for vulnerable women and men, strengthened		<p>This output is considered to have severe shortcomings in that 2 of 3 actions had no inputs.</p> <p>One green village at Taba in Huye District was seen. The project activities of biogas, rainwater harvesting tanks, cowsheds, cows, were seen. Beneficiaries were interviewed and seen to use and find the inputs beneficial. No analysis of costs and benefits has been found and hence its value</p>

²² At the dissemination meeting on September 10, 2018, the representatives from national partner organizations were also requested to provide any information they may have on output 2. No additional information was provided by UNHABITAT. Additional information was provided by UNCTAD during 20-25 September.

				towards the higher objectives is not known. Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)
3.1	UN HABITAT MININFRA (RHA)	Support the establishment of a gender-balanced private sector-led structure for up-scaling villages in Rwanda for vulnerable women and men	Private sector-led structure established and operational for up-scaling green villages in Rwanda	NO ACTIVITY
3.2	UNDP/FAO MININFRA (RHA)	Support investment for integrating Climate-Smart practices in the construction of green villages	2 demo green villages established with climate smart practices	Two Demo Green Villages of Rukumberi in Ngoma District and Taba in Huye District were supported with Green Infrastructures; capacity building was undertaken; training provided and study tours conducted as planned
3.3	UNCTAD MININFRA (RHA)	Support private sector-led resource mobilization for upscaling green villages	Resources available for a private sector-led construction of green villages in Rwanda	UNCTAD reported that funds were used to develop a concept paper ²³ . But there was no interest and engagement from local implementing partners on this. See also 2.2.

Table 11: Output 3 - Planning and implementation of “Smart Green Villages” and investment in Green Urbanization increased

35. In Output Three, the MTE had concluded that there had been no activity. As reported earlier, there was no additional information provided by UNHABITAT and by MININFRA.

36. In activity 3.2, UNDP²⁴ and MININFRA (RHA) provided support for investments for integrating Climate-Smart practices in the construction of two green villages as demonstrations. Both “Vision 2020” and the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategies (EDPRS-2

²³ Additional information was provided by UNCTAD on 20 September 2018.

²⁴ There was no response from FAO to the evaluation and the records did not show any FAO participation.

from 2013 – 2018) incorporate the concept of green village. The concept was designed to serve as a model of clustered rural settlements (umudugudu) where productivity and improved livelihoods can be enhanced through integrated environmental management; this is in the second pillar of EDPRS-2 on “Rural Development”. A number of different projects have been used in the past to support such demonstrations²⁵, where the goal is for at least 70 % of households living in rural areas to settle in integrated settlements, where the rural settlement model provides for access to clean water, electricity, health facilities, common marketplace, smart classrooms, improved road networks, common cowshed, better agricultural practices and other features.²⁶ The concept can be traced to one of the resolutions passed during the Government of Rwanda’s Akagera retreat in 2007. It has been reported that the programme implementation has been slower due to shortage of financial resources, and, the current target is to have two model villages in each of the 30 Districts in Rwanda.

37. In activity 3.2, UNDP supported RHA for two demonstration Green Villages. Rukumberi in Ngoma District and Taba in Huye District were supported with Green Infrastructure like biogas, rainwater harvesting tanks, cowsheds, cows, Greenhouse farming, and establishment of green jobs like basket weaving cooperatives. This also provided support for alternative income sources through building greenhouses with provision of hybrid seeds and providing seed money to women’s cooperatives in the green villages. Study tours in Gicumbi, Rwamagana and Kayonza were conducted as planned. The Ngoma District was affected by drought with over 47 thousand families affected by famine. ONE UN reported that it supported the Rukumberi green village, but “more financial support in climate proofing and greening infrastructures are required”²⁷

38. The Rwanda Housing Authority (RHA) implemented the greening of the 2 villages. The JP resources supported the construction of two cowsheds, one in each village; 20 hybrid cows were handed over to the beneficiaries in each; 63 households in Taba and 57 households in Rukumberi were supported with rain water harvesting; and 15 and 40 households were provided with biogas digesters in the respective villages where also waste collection centres were constructed in each; among other activities.²⁸

39. By piloting these infrastructures in Rukumberi green village, it stated, this “will generate an example to tackle the drought issue in villages in Eastern province”. The outputs could be observed in the visit to Taba in Huye District for the evaluation. Rapid observations indicated that the facilities provided were being used. Conversations with some residents there

²⁵ Concept Note on GEF Least developed country fund (LDCF) programming in Rwanda (GOR and UNDP) - 9
 “Climate Proofing Green Villages for better adaptation to climate change” (initial proposed title). After the approval of the PIF, a full proposal will be developed.

²⁶ More information is available at - <http://www.mininfra.gov.rw/index.php?id=271>;
http://www.mininfra.gov.rw/index.php?id=19&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=193&cHash=24a958642376da4312fa3d55b949386c

²⁷ <http://www.rw.one.un.org/press-center/news/>

²⁸ Documentation provided by RHA.

suggested they were using the new infrastructure and it provided them with benefits. The field visit could not conclude further on the value of the outcome without any monitoring data and such data will be critical for estimating longer term impacts.

40. Ongoing monitoring can provide information on the uses made by the beneficiaries of the facilities provided. To take biogas as one example, this is a very attractive green option provided that the units work and do not face technical problems leading to their disuse. A minimum sample of units in each model village should be monitored to learn how they were being used, the amounts of energy produced, how the energy was used by the household and whether supplemented or not by additional fuel wood.²⁹ The benefits are sustained only if the families continue to use them, it reduces the use of wood or charcoal that they used earlier, and the positive outcomes depend on behavioural change, adequate feedstock, system maintenance and after-sales repair services. The same can be said for rain water harvesting and for other benefits provided in the two model villages. Ideally, all model villages should be monitored to assess their impacts and to learn lessons for what is planned for a national roll out. No monitoring data was available.

41. The third activity for Output Three was for UNCTAD to work with MININFRA (RHA) to support private sector-led resource mobilization for upscaling green villages. UNCTAD reported that funds were used to develop a concept paper.³⁰ The UNCTAD Concept Note identified best practices to support Rwanda authorities with effective and transparent procedures to help the private sector to mobilize resources for upscaling green villages in Rwanda. The Concept Note presented an assessment of the needs/demand for green services and identification of providers of green services, including public and private sources of financing for green services with the aim to build a system matching the demand for, and the supply of, green services and green financing, and objective to promote an online Green Investment exchange to boost investment in the development of green cities and villages in Rwanda. But UNCTAD determined there was no interest and engagement from local implementing partners on further follow up on this.

42. This specific JP output and outcome under group three is rated as Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), because only one out of the three activities – demo green villages - was fully supported by the JP; one activity by UNCTAD produced a concept paper but did not move further; and, the third, had no inputs. Another shortcoming noted is that the successfully

²⁹ Some recent reviews of the national biogas programme in Rwanda will be found in ENEA, 2016. Domestic biogas diffusion in Rwanda – Key Learnings for Scale Up, March 2016. Available at <http://www.enea-consulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ENEA-Consulting-Domestic-biogas-diffusion-in-Rwanda-Open-Ideas1.pdf>; Matthew Landi Benjamin, Sovacool Benjamin and Sovacool and Jay Eidsness, 2013. Cooking with gas: Policy lessons from Rwanda's National Domestic Biogas Program (NDBP) *Energy for Sustainable Development* 17(4):347–356, DOI: 10.1016/j.esd.2013.03.007, August 2013; and, Arjun S. Bedia, Lorenzo Pellegrinia and Luca Tasciottia, 2013. Impact Evaluation of Rwanda's National Domestic Biogas Programme, April 2013, at <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23450/1/396-impact-evaluation-of-rwandas-national-domestic-biogas-programme.pdf>

³⁰ Information for this was provided by UNCTAD in written submissions and the staff interviewed. .

implemented green village demonstrations, while valuable to the beneficiaries, the beneficiaries were small in number (less than two hundred families benefited directly³¹) and there was no evidence of any synergy with other JP activities or of ongoing monitoring of the results from these demonstrations and their inputs into the national programmes for green villages.

Output and Action	Key Stakeholders	Activity Key Actions:	Indicators:	Evidence Project reports; July 2017 – MTE; interviews in August Sep 2018; documents seen
4	UNDP REMA	Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the energy sector of Rwanda advanced ³²		Marginally Satisfactory (MS)
4.1	UNECA MININFRA, (Energy) ³³	Support the strengthening of national energy planning through renewable energy resource assessment and decisions tools development	National renewable energy resources assessment /development framework and tool developed to support renewable energy capacity expansion and investment decisions	Rural Electrification Strategy with emphasis on Solar off grid technology and assessment of the Hydro potential has been undertaken. See text below from MININFRA.

³¹ The numbers of beneficiaries is provided in para 38. For example in one district, Ngoma, which was affected by drought caused 47 thousand families to be affected by serious food shortages.

³² The UNDP Annual Report 2017, page 12, states that this JP allowed for Global Environment Facility (GEF) resources to work in partnership with the EAC to promote energy efficiency in buildings in East Africa, where the UN in collaboration with Rwanda Institute of Architects and Rwanda Housing Authority (RHA) has supported the founding of the Rwanda Green Building Organization (RWGBO) launched in November 2016. RWGBO aims to support the local construction industry to transform the way buildings and cities are designed, built and operated as a contribution to Rwanda's "Green Urbanization Agenda". This is not recorded within the JP documents seen.

³³ There is reference in the JP annual report for 2016: "UNECA is reported to have developed solar energy strategy and action plan but the report was not available either at the Programme or at the MININFRA". No additional information was obtained from UNECA in this evaluation.

UNEP reported the geothermal workshop on Western Rift took place at Kigali in March 2016. The workshop provided participants an understanding of the geological processes and current state of the region that account for the creation and sustenance of its geothermal resources. It also discussed the technical training requirements for the geothermal staff to be provided by the UNEP. No follow up on this workshop was reported by UNEP.

4.2	UNEP MININFRA, (Energy) ³⁴	Support the development and execution of technical and economic assessment of renewable energy potentials at one of the sites	Geothermal energy potential established and documented	One workshop by UNEP was reported. See text below from MININFRA.
4.3	UNIDO MININFRA, (Energy)	Support the development of national energy efficiency standards and codes	Energy efficiency standards and codes developed	Energy Efficiency strategy was approved (see text below from MININFRA).
4.4	UNDP;UNH ABITAT;UNE CA;UNIDO MININFRA, (Energy)	Support mainstreaming SE4ALL goals; Energy Technology Deployment and Energy Security framework; SE4ALL multi-stakeholders' framework and coordinating committee; decentralized off grid solutions strengthened and a programme framework developed	SE4ALL goals mainstreamed in energy sector policy and planning through policy dialogue, policy review support, consultations and technical support	Energy Technology Deployment Framework and Regional Energy Security Policy Framework were developed to support roll out of SE4ALL initiative across 44 African countries.

³⁴ UNEP has reported to the SPIU that a workshop on geothermal energy in the Western Rift took place at Kigali in Rwanda in March 2016. It is not known if any additional outputs were achieved.

4.5	UNDP/UNECA/MININFRA	Support the drafting/adoption of the SE4ALL Investment Prospectus	Rwanda National SE4ALL Action Agenda & Investment Prospectuses (AA/IPs) developed	The SE4ALL Investment prospectus is being developed with the support of the AfDB. In September MININFRA to hold investment prospectus stakeholders consultation workshop to inform the development Status not known.
4.6	UNDP/UNECA/MININFRA	Support nationally adopted indicators and set-out the SE4ALL progress tracking system	SE4ALL RBM and M&E systems developed	

Table 12: Output 4 - Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals advanced

43. The evaluation determined that while many or all the activities under Output 4 have taken place, there were substantial changes between the plans made in the PRODOC and what has been undertaken.³⁵ MININFRA commented that it has developed an action agenda that highlights the actions that will be undertaken to meet the SE4ALL targets and this plan for Rwanda is available at - <https://www.se4all-africa.org/seforall-in-africa/country-actions/action-agenda/>

44. The Government of Rwanda signed a Country Programme Framework with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). This includes strengthening of Government Institutions in long term energy planning and assessment. The Government approved a new Rural Electrification Strategy that puts emphasis on the promotion of Solar off grid technology. An assessment of the Hydro potential has been undertaken. Non-performing government

³⁵ The first draft report prepared for stakeholder consultations reported only on activity 4.2 by UNEP and a contribution by UNECA, as in footnote 24. Subsequently on 13 September 2018 MININFRA provided additional details on work done for SE4ALL, which forms the basis for the narrative here.

projects have been leased to the Private sector, and concessions have been awarded to exploit potential hydro power resources.

45. Studies have been carried out and are under development, such as the recently presented “Study in support of developing geothermal resources at Rubavu-Kalisimbi.” Recommendations have been made for further studies to define the Gisenyi Geothermal Potential. Workshops to enhance the government’s ability to explore Geothermal Energy include a geothermal policy and regulation workshop carried out in 2016 with the support of the UK government Department for International Development (DFID).

46. The Ministry developed an Energy Efficiency strategy that was approved at Sector Working Group level pending approval of MININFRA Senior Management and cabinet endorsement. One of its recommendations is the development of Energy Efficiency Standards and Labels that is currently being carried out with the support of the European Union (EU).

47. The SE4ALL Investment prospectus is being developed by MININFRA with the support of the African Development Bank (AfDB). An Inception Meeting was held in August 2018 and in September MININFRA planned to hold an SE4ALL Investment prospectus stakeholders consultation workshop. The evaluation takes positive note of the many activities and outputs under SE4ALL undertaken by MININFRA. From the perspective of the JP, it is noted that none of the partners listed in the PRODOC for activity four (see Table 5.4 above) were engaged in the outputs of SE4ALL, diminishing possible contributions of the JP to the output four . The partners who contributed to the SE4ALL as provided by MININFRA submission are IAEA; DFID; the European Union (EU) and AfDB, with no involvement of the ONEUN partners named in the JP. From the perspective of the JP alone this would be **Unsatisfactory**. But from the perspective, of the goal for this “Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) goals advanced”, given the wide range of work done³⁶, which the evaluation has not reviewed but accepts, MININFRA can be congratulated at making progress on this area, with new partners. It is rated as **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)** here for its lack of feedback to the JP.

Output and Action	Key Stakeholders	Activity Key Actions:	Indicators:	Evidence Project reports; July 2017 – MTE; interviews in August Sep 2018; documents seen
5	UNDP REMA	Initiatives in support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy effectively coordinated.		Two of the five activities (numbers 1 and 2) effectively undertaken, with

³⁶ The evaluation makes no judgement on the outputs and outcomes of this activity as it was undertaken outside the boundaries of the JP and specified partners.

				useful outputs and likely contribution to outcomes. Two (3 and 4) were not undertaken. The fifth provided for coordination. Marginally Satisfactory (MS)
5.1	UNEP MoE (REMA; FONERWA)	Support development and operationalization of a toolbox for GE in Rwanda	A toolbox for operationalizing GE Transition in Rwanda developed and operationalized	The toolbox was established by UNEP and REMA and trainings were carried out for its use in 3 pilot districts. Satisfactory.
5.2	UNDP RNP/REMA	Provide capacity-strengthening support for the Environment Unit of the RIB to support in implementing green growth related standards	Environmental Unit within RIB exists and is operational	Supported Environment Protection Unit under Rwanda Investigation Bureau (RIB) (formerly Rwanda National Police (RNP)) for better inspection and investigation of environmental crimes. Satisfactory.
5.3	UNDP/Others MoE (REMA; RNRA; FONERWA)	Support the costing of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	All sectors costed for the implementation of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	It has been reported this was done at the beginning of the project ³⁷ but this evidence has not been seen. Some sectors were costed.
5.4	UN HABITAT/WHO MININFRA, (RHA)	Supporting the urbanization and environmental health risk reduction policy development and implementation pilot	Urbanization policy produced and pilot projects implemented	It was reported that UN Habitat developed a Green City Toolkit for the Development of Secondary Cities and

³⁷ Reports on this were requested from MoE and also from the former project manager. Both sources were followed up and no confirmation was available.

		projects		it was used to support Rubavu District Master Plan. No evidence seen and no responses from UNHABITAT.
5.5	ONE UN MoE (REMA; FONERWA)	Provide technical and capacity development advisory services for GG and GE	GE Advisory services provided	No activity within the JP beyond coordination. But the UN and UNDP have provided additional national support for green growth week ³⁸ . Marginally Satisfactory.

Table 13: Output 5 - Initiatives in policy, advocacy, capacity development and coordination

48. In the first activity³⁹, a toolbox was stated to have been established by UNEP and REMA and training was carried out for its use in 3 pilot districts.

49. In the second, UNDP supported the Environment Protection Unit under Rwanda Investigation Bureau (RIB) (formerly Rwanda National Police (RNP)) for better inspection and investigation of environmental crimes. A countrywide environmental crime mapping and capacity needs assessment was carried out. RNP conducted monitoring and operations for prosecution and inspection of environmental crimes on illegal mining in Kamonyi, Ngororero, Muhanga, Kayonza and Gatsibo Districts. RIB also conducted training on awareness creation and response on environmental crimes on three sites (Muhanga, Karongi & Rwamagana) and 12 Districts officials. The total number of trainees was 119 people.⁴⁰

50. For activity three, it has been reported that this was done at the beginning of the project but this evidence has not been seen. For activity four, it has been reported that UN Habitat developed a Green City Toolkit for the Development of Secondary Cities and this was used to support Green city toolkit in Rubavu District Master Plan and Spatial Development Framework. It has been noted already that there have been no responses from UNHABITAT and the evaluation was unable to confirm any evidence. Activity five was used for coordination of the JP work by UNDP and MoE.

³⁸ The additional support provided by UNDP under activity 5.5, such as the support for the Green Growth week is not captured in the evaluation and the budget table 19.

³⁹ This is based on interviews at REMA and with UNEP. The resources were provided through a 5 country regional UNEP project.

⁴⁰ This is based on interviews and project documents.

RATING OF ACTIONS BY GOR SCALE

The set of tables below and a new set of ratings were added during the final revisions at the request of the MoE. MoE suggested that the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning in Partnership with the Office of the Prime Minister have set national evaluation criteria - Not done: Red 0-50%; Partly done (Yellow 50%-80%) and Fully done (Green 80%-100%). The evaluation determines the following ratings by activity and then they are combined to arrive at a composite for each output.

Output 1: Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions			Partly done	
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency GoR	
1.1	Support establishment and operationalization of an innovation centre of excellence that promotes the environment, climate resilience, green urbanization and green technologies.	Innovation Centre for Environment, Climate Change, Green Urbanization and Green Technologies established and operational	FAO MoE (REMA)	Not done
1.2	Support operationalization of the Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management	Centre of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management, established and operational	UNESCO MINEDUC (UR)	Fully done
1.3	Support institutional linkages in pursuing GE growth (Innovation Centre of Excellence Research/Academic/RECP/BDC/TVET)	Institutional linkages established and functional between innovation centres and RECP Centre, Business Development Centres, Research, TVET, Academic etc.	UNIDO MINICOM (PSF)	Not done

Table 14: JP Output One Rating

Output 2: Public and private investment in Green Urbanization approaches to Economic Transformation increased			Not done	
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency GoR	

2.1	Support for the establishment and operationalization of a private sector-led structure for the construction of a model green city in Rwanda	Private sector-led structure established and operational for the construction of a model green city	UN HABITAT MININFRA (RHA)	Not done
2.2	Support for private sector-led resource mobilization and construction of a model green city in Rwanda	Resources available for private sector led construction of a model green city in Rwanda	UNCTAD MININFRA (RHA)	Not done
2.3	Support for private investment in green technology goods for large scale national and/or export market	At least one industry operational, producing green technology goods for the national and/or export market	UNIDO MoE (FONERWA)	Not done

Table 15: JP Output Two Rating

	Output 3: Planning and Implementation of Integrated Rural Settlements (Green Villages), especially for vulnerable women and men, strengthened		Partly done	
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency GoR	
3.1	Support the establishment of a gender-balanced private sector-led structure for up-scaling green villages in Rwanda for vulnerable women and men	Private sector-led structure established and operational for up-scaling green villages in Rwanda	UN HABITAT MININFRA (RHA)	Not done
3.2	Support investment for integrating climate smart practices in the construction of green villages	2 demo green villages established with climate smart practices	UNDP/FAO MININFRA (RHA)	Fully done
3.3	Support private sector-led resource mobilization for up-scaling of green villages in Rwanda	Resources available for a private sector-led construction of green villages in Rwanda	UNCTAD MININFRA (RHA)	Not done

Table 16: JP Output Three Rating

4	Output 4: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the energy sector of Rwanda advanced		Fully done as reported by MININFRA. Not evaluated as it was not undertaken within JP.	
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency GoR	
4.1	Support the strengthening of national energy planning	National renewable energy resources assessment	UNECA MININFR	

	through renewable energy resource assessment and decisions tools development	/development framework and tool developed to support renewable energy capacity expansion and investment decisions.	A, (Energy)	
4.2	Support the development and execution of technical and economic assessment of renewable energy potentials at one of the sites	Geothermal energy potential established and documented.	UNEP MININFR A, (Energy)	
4.3	Support the development of national energy efficiency standards and codes	Energy efficiency standards and codes developed	UNIDO MININFR A, (Energy)	
4.4	Support mainstreaming SE4ALL goals including: Energy Technology Deployment and Energy Security framework; SE4ALL multi-stakeholders' framework and coordinating committee; decentralized off grid solutions, in the energy sector of Rwanda through policy dialogue, consultation and technical support; and strengthen the decentralized energy segment of the Rwanda SE4ALL AA and develop programme framework for decentralized energy solutions	SE4ALL goals mainstreamed in energy sector policy and planning through policy dialogue, policy review support, consultations and technical support	UNDP;UN HABITAT; UNECA;U NIDO MININFR A, (Energy)	
4.5	Support the drafting/adoption of the SE4ALL Investment Prospectus	Rwanda National SE4ALL Action Agenda & Investment Prospectuses (AA/IPs) developed	UNECA/U NDP MININFR A, (Energy)	
4.6	Support nationally adopted indicators and set-out the SE4ALL progress tracking system	SE4ALL RBM and M&E systems developed	UNECA/U NDP MININFR A, (Energy)	

Table 17: JP Output Four Rating

5	Output 5: Initiatives in support of policy, advocacy and capacity development for Green Economy effectively coordinated		Partly done	
	Key Actions:	Indicators:	UN Agency GoR	
5.1	Support the development and operationalization of a toolbox for operationalizing the GE in Rwanda	A toolbox for operationalizing GE Transition in Rwanda developed and operationalized	UNEP MoE (REMA; FONERWA	Fully done

)	
5.2	Provide capacity-strengthening support for the Environment Unit of the RNP to support in implementing green growth related standards	Environmental Unit within RNP exists and is operational	UNDP RNP/REMA A	Fully done
5.3	Support the costing of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	All sectors costed for the implementation of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy	UNDP/Others MoE (REMA; RNRA; FONERWA)	Not done
5.4	Support the urbanization and environmental health risk reduction policy development and implementation pilot projects	Urbanization policy produced and pilot projects implemented	UN HABITAT/ WHO MININFRA , (RHA) MoE (REMA; FONERWA)	Not done
5.5	Support technical and capacity development and provision of advisory services for Green Growth and Green Economy	GE Advisory services provided	ONE UN MoE (REMA; FONERWA)	Fully done. Outside the JP.

Table 18: JP Output Five Rating

OVERALL RATING JP

51. Summarising the above detailed findings of the JP, the evaluation has determined that among the constituent elements of the JP, Outputs One, Four and Five have the highest ratings of Marginally Satisfactory; Output Two is Highly Unsatisfactory; while Output Three is Marginally Unsatisfactory. Taking the individual component ratings into account the evaluation finds an overall rating for the JP to be **Marginally Unsatisfactory**. The two principal reasons for the lower rating are, first, due to the fact that the majority of the planned activities were not undertaken at all. In the case of the JP, where 9 out of the 20 activities planned were not provided with any resources, it follows that there were no inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts in 45% of the planned work. In 6 of the 20 activities there was the complete chain of results – inputs, outputs and outcomes and so 30% of the work by activity was fully done. The evaluation is not able to judge the five activities under the SE4ALL, but notes the work done by MININFRA and the fact that it was accomplished outside the JP. Hence the evaluation arrives at two scores. The most positive score that can be attained by the JP in this evaluation would be⁴¹

⁴¹ The JP subset of activities are kept at 20, and the five for SE4ALL are counted as fully done, would lead to a score of 11 done out of 20, for 55%. reduced from 20 to 15, given 5 are reported on but could not be evaluated

for 11 of 20 activities fully done, or a score of 55%, leading it to be rated as **Partly done**. The other ratio would be to take 6 of 15 activities as fully undertaken, 9 not undertaken and 5 were outside the JP, this would lead to 40% fully done and that would rate the JP at Red (0-50%) achievement or “**Not done**”.

52. It is worth adding here that the principal observation is the lack of focused interest and participation by five of the UN partners on the way forward to the agreed to JP activities, together with inadequate reporting to the PSC on the entire set of work assigned to them in the JP. This primary shortcoming could have led to the lack of evidence of a search for synergies for the higher level JP goals and the activities undertaken.

Findings by Key Questions

Relevance

53. The evaluation confirms that the JP activities and the effort to focus on “Green Growth and Economy” were and remain highly relevant for the country and for the UN agencies participating in the design of this JP. The PRODOC and subsequent reports and documentation confirm that JP activities selected are priorities for strategic results in several national plans and goals.

54. This JP contributes to the following: EDPRS II Thematic Area/UNDAP Results Area 1: Inclusive Economic Transformation; to the UNDAP Outcome 1: Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction; and to the UNDAP Outcome 3. 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, for sustainable development, economic development and poverty reduction. The JP activities support EDPRS II Priority 4 - Econ Transformation: Transform the economic geography of Rwanda by facilitating and managing urbanisation, and promoting secondary cities as poles of economic growth; and very centrally, EDPRS II Priority 5 - Econ Transformation: Pursue a ‘green economy’ approach to economic transformation.

55. The evaluation concludes that the JP addresses several important development goals and whether its objectives remain valid and will remain valid for at least a decade or longer, as each of the goals, in particular transforming economic activities to be green, will be a long term goal and require ongoing efforts. **The relevance of the JP to the goals and objectives of both the UN and to the GoR is rated High.**

56. In addition, the evaluation considered whether the valid goals and activities in themselves justified the design of a Joint Programme.⁴² Thus when the range of work covered by the JP is taken into account and their inter-relationships, the choice of engaging in a JP was appropriate. At the same time, the evaluation finds, as discussed subsequently, the size, scope and the activities and outputs of the JP not consistent with their originally intended impacts and effects. This is largely due to changes in the resources available to the JP and the constituent UN agencies which had signed off on the ambitious effort. It is discussed further that a large part of the hoped for benefits of a JP lies in successful coordination. Successful coordination further relies on administrative structures and their capacities, incentives for common actions and penalties for non-cooperation or non-coordination. The evaluation concludes that while the JP was an appropriate response in 2014, the findings suggest it did not prove beneficial in providing focus or greater coordination among the chosen activities.

Effectiveness:

57. Effectiveness is considered here for the JP as a whole and also for each of the five outputs and 20 activities that constituted the elements of the JP. As a group, the JP cannot be considered to have achieved its goal. The objectives of the JP were to mobilise resources and utilize the JP to focus around eleven million dollars of resources, and the expertise and capacities of ten agencies. It has been reported that this JP could only mobilize between 16 and 29% of the planned resources; there were no annual narrative and financial reports provided by 9 of the partner UN agencies that have been seen in the evaluation. There was no adherence to the guidelines for coordination and reporting and the JPSC, which did meet regularly, was unable to secure compliance. The challenges are found to be somewhat ameliorated by the fact of the JPSC meetings which were seen to have value for information sharing (even with the gaps mentioned) and many participants learned about the parallel activities that were discussed at the JPSC, specifically activities 1.2, 2.1 and 5.2, where the partners and stakeholders were often present at the JPSC and shared information. In addition, no synergies were noted with other projects and any joint programmes. Thus at the level of the JP, the evaluation considers the achievement of objectives to have major shortcomings in the achievement of raising resources and focus and coordination of the programme, and is rated as **Unsatisfactory**.

58. Moving down to the activity and output level (see tables 5.1 to 5.5 above), it is positive to note that several activities were performed well, and each of them contributed to their associated outputs. The activities that were undertaken have contributed to the achievement of the planned outputs and each is shown in the table above.

⁴² United Nations Development Group (UNDG), 2008. Guidance Note on Joint Programmes explains a “Joint Programme” is only one possible modality of working together in the country context. It is best used to help achieve greater system wide coherence, and supports national priorities and needs, in areas where coordination of a coherent development response is especially urgent.

59. The major factors influencing the non-achievement of the objectives were first the shortfalls in the planned resources. This could possibly have led to a lack of enthusiasm among many of the UN partner agencies. That could then have generated indifference as the perception could have been that without the planned resources any further involvement in the JP only added costs without commensurate benefits.

60. The capacity building and trainings interventions were relatively small, and within their scope they appear to have the required qualified trainers. UNDP struggled to support the achievement of JP outcomes and outputs within the limitations of budgetary resources, staff shortages and the absence of inputs from other agencies, as well as it could. It partnered well with its counterpart at the MoE and considering constraints on both sides the partnership was appropriate and moderately effective.

Efficiency:

61. As mentioned earlier, the original budget for the JP was over ten million US dollars. The actual amount made available to the JP activities ranges between a confirmed value at the lower end at around 17% (US\$ 1.8 million) to a maximum upper estimate of almost US\$3 million. Of this amount, the UNEP allocation of US\$720,000 was spent by UNEP with their local implementing partner - Rwandan Environmental Management Authority (REMA)⁴³, in a regional five country project, Operationalising Green Economy Transition in Africa. This activity is appropriate for the JP as activity 5.1 to “Support development and operationalization of a toolbox for GE in Rwanda”. But as UNEP had not spelt out how it would utilise its planned contribution of US\$1.25 million, and it did not provide any information to the JP and nor did the national partner, it is not possible to answer if the funds have been spent as originally budgeted.

62. The second partner UNDP, which is also the coordinating partner for the JP, provided the evaluation with its expenditures and they were the only expenditures on record at the SPIU at MoE. They are provided below for the four years and broken down by 3 activities supported by UNDP. This shows UNDP spent 50% of its resources on the green village investments, 38% in support of the activity to support environmental monitoring by RIB and around 12% for management and coordination, together with the SPIU at MoE. It is our view that the percentage is on the higher side but the amount is not. The higher percentage is likely due to the much smaller total allocation.

	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Activity 3.2: Green	19,507	124,595	165,124	157,239	466,465

⁴³ REMA worked with MONALOC, MINECOFIN, and selected district governments and with the University of Rwanda (led by Claudine Uwera) Operationalising Green Economy Transition in Africa

Villages					
Activity 5. 2 Support capacity in RIB	25,327	83,240	82,892	145,067	336,526
Activity 5.5 management and coordination	13,067	47,499	49,078	9,250	118,895
TOTAL	57,901	255,334	297,095	311,557	921,887

Table 19: UNDP contributions to the JP. Source UNDP and the SPIU, numbers in US\$.

63. The review indicated slower use of funds and delays in implementation. There are no perfect metric to judge the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of the resources to achieve desired results for the activities but the experiences of similar work indicates the activities here were cost effective.

64. The coordination of the JP required considerable effort and even though coordination was not successful across the 20 activities, the implementation was efficient under the circumstances, if it was to remain a JP. The alternative of independent activities by the partners was a feature of the actual implementation and hence the efforts made for coordination were not efficient or effective. There are there no additional management challenges affecting the efficient implementation of the JP for the remaining months. On the other hand, for greater effectiveness if there are resources within the JP, and a degree of interest to examine any linkages between activities that have been successfully undertaken, that could be useful.

Sustainability:

65. The evaluation considers the benefits of the JP activities that have successfully been carried out are likely to continue even after JP funding has been completed and the project closed at the end of 2018. The JP was in fact focused on issues of environment sustainability and it also aimed to promote environmental sustainability mainstreaming. The evaluation concludes that the benefits of each of the successful JP to continue after 2018 as they all belong to UN and GoR national development priorities and so will attract national and additional donor funding. The JP had no clear exit strategy defined in the ProDoc nor is any strategy beyond closure at the end of the extended project period in December 2018 planned.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ The current plans of completing the ongoing activities and then closing down the JP in December 2018 would be appropriate.

Outcomes and Impacts:

66. The JP activities consisted of two types of intervention – some that increased capacity and built institutions to assist in the future planning and implementation of GE measures in Rwanda and others that provided direct benefits to a small numbers of poor women and men. They are considered successful for the current time. The true measures of their future positive impacts will only be known going forward with continued monitoring of results. In the activities completed, the JP certainly contributed to the achievement of UNDP outcomes and outputs. Given the recent time when many outputs have been concluded it is too early to assess the impacts of the JP and second, the smaller size of the JP inputs would imply a smaller set of measurable direct benefits.

67. No negative changes were seen to have been produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Cross Cutting Issues

68. **GENDER and HRBA:** All government and UN documents seen have emphasized the crosscutting themes of gender and human rights, including the HRBA, and given their overwhelming emphasis in reports that the evidence supports knowledge and adherence to the principles. It has been reported that around half of the people that attended the awareness training workshop conducted by the CoEB were women. As environmental issues have been the main focus in the JP, they are not addressed here under cross cutting issues. The evidence seen confirms that the design and implementation of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach. The activities seen do not raise any recommendations to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming, as they appear appropriate to the activities.

69. **SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION:** The activity supported by UNEP involved five countries in the region and had South-South knowledge and experience exchange built in to the design and its execution. In activity 5.2, involving Rwanda Investigation Bureau (RIB) in mapping environmental crimes and building capacity to reduce them, it was stated in interviews that the project partners availed of opportunities to discuss rules, regulations and operating procedures with neighbouring countries as the ecosystem issues often have cross boundary implications.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There has been very high GoR involvement and commitment at the highest levels of government of the activities within the JP, which have often taken place outside the boundaries of the JP. The JP arrangement has provided a very useful forum for the various national actors involved to recognize the importance and value of a green economy which is a constituent part of the GoR national development agenda.
2. The JP as a project has catalysed interactions to some other development initiatives with the engagement of the diverse national stakeholders. The meetings of the PSC provided very useful opportunities for stakeholder interactions and dialogue but its full potential was not utilised. The learning and adaptation opportunities could have been enhanced with annual project Reviews to assess whether or not all of the activities were making progress, and the results of activities did not contribute to project outcomes, and as in this case, new information was available on changes in resources, priorities or the context, in ways that affected the JP, the individual activities and overall purpose should have been adapted to reflect that. The information available at the design can never be perfect for the future. The project guidance should clearly establish circumstances, when project documents must be formally amended versus when an informal update can be adequate.
3. The idea that the JP can potentially provide a mechanism to focus the work of dozens of UN agencies that underpins one of its motivations was not proven to be valid. The project, at the level of expectations of the JP, that would allow for greater synergies and focus a set of sub projects and multiple agencies to work together, where working together is key, did not work. The One UN fund was smaller than anticipated and agencies that had begun the engagement with enthusiasm and high expectations were not able to maintain their initial plans as smaller resources became a reality. In some cases, most likely in Output Four, SE4ALL, additional resources outside the JP framework led to a complete reorganization of the partnerships expected between the UN agencies and national counterpart.
4. The JP has performed well in implementing activities where both resources and commitment existed from both the concerned UN agencies and the IPs. However, even in instances where the evaluation has noted weak coordination, there is still an opportunity to better integrate the different projects under this JP, especially where there is common ground and opportunities for cross-cutting activities for collaboration.
5. The JP process has proved inefficient and burdensome and the results achieved could also have been largely achieved by standalone projects. It proved very difficult to establish the financial and narrative status for most of the activities. The JP Steering Committee served well to bring together the different actors in a knowledge sharing mode, but it did not exercise management and control authority to the expected extent. Clearer annual statements of work done and planned were required for adaptive planning and management under the changes that it faced.
6. Two agencies, namely UNESCO and UNEP, have performed well in their activities, albeit in different ways. UNEP has undertaken the work it committed to and the evidence provided suggests successful outputs and outcomes (this will need to be confirmed by independent

planned UNEP evaluation) appropriate to the JP through the planning of the toolkit and its deployment. However, UNEP contributions to the SE4ALL (output 4) was highly limited. Also, UNEP remained outside the JP management and coordination. The UNDP has done a difficult task of attempting to coordinate the JP and integrate the activities into a larger whole; managing activity and financial reports, meetings and supporting two activities on its own, while challenged by resource and staff shortages and frequent turnover within UNDP and the SPIU. The challenges faced by both UNDP and the SPIU have led to inefficiencies and a loss in effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Both the MoE and UNDP should improve their reporting and monitoring format and framework. UNDP in Rwanda has been working on a template for annual reporting of all activities it is involved in. The template was discussed with the evaluator and it is recommended that such a template be reviewed within the agency and applied to all multi-years projects undertaken.
2. The UN, UNDP and the GoR, should undertake a review across all the JPs supported during the same 2014-2018 period to examine whether similar or different experiences and lessons emerge from them.
3. Rwanda has ambitious plans for environmental protection and climate change actions. This includes the Green Growth and Climate Change Strategy. Successful implementation of such cross cutting plans will require stronger a SPIU than seen here, with more resources and the ability to work across government departments and external agencies. The MoE and UNDP must ensure in future work that the SPIU is provided with adequate resources to efficiently perform their tasks.
4. UNDP and MoE should plan their future co-operation for the joint priorities of promoting the green economy approach to economic transformations, which support pro-poor growth, with inclusive economic development and poverty reduction with activities that are within their core competencies and where adequate resources are available. In these plans some of the work done under the JP should be consolidated, scaled up and made more effective towards longer term goals.

LESSONS LEARNED

The successes (and the lack of it) in each specific activity of the JP provides some individual and systemic lessons:

1. Each activity that was found to have delivered is scalable, and it has significant potential to be undertaken in wider scope and covering additional parts of the country.

2. In any common endeavour, emphasis must be placed on the rules and sets of incentives and penalties for participants for high performance. The JP provided only one incentive - that by participating, the UN and national agencies would have access to additional resources. The incentive of resources was lost when they did not materialize. When the incentive failed to materialize, the partnerships dissolved with it.
3. UN agencies work best when there have been assured resources and the resources are well targeted towards work involving the agencies' core competencies. The fact that so many actors (UN Agencies and IPs) were seemingly involved in the JP caused coordination challenges and eventual weathering away of commitment by some actors.
4. All future progress towards achieving the goals of the Green Economy for Rwanda requires improvements in the current practice of administration. There is the classic model that agencies are more familiar with – the design of a programme that in the case of the JP was established by the PRODOC. This set out the resources and tasks, and the responsibilities for those tasks, by the key agents. This model proved inadequate to two facets of reality – first, short fall in the resources available, and second, the degrees of commitment to the common programme was not uniform among the agents. A solution of the first issue and minimisation of the effects of the second, require planning that is more attuned to risks and to changed circumstances over time. This requires a degree of **adaptive planning** that could have improved the performance of the JP. Adaptive processes require some level of scenario development, into design strategies – what if statements and possible actions that address the relevant changes that can occur in the course of implementation. This also requires regular portfolio reviews to check assumptions and re-engage stakeholders, to adapt to the new information. Triggers for adjusting the JP could have been developed through an annual review of the JP elements, followed by a revised plan going forward.
5. The One UN Fund allocations to Rwanda can play a catalytic role when it is able to incentivize all partner agencies to put more emphasis on synergies with other actors but that requires adequate support by the donors and greater awareness by the government and all partners on the potential catalytic role of the One UN. This is only possible when it is sufficiently resourced.

ANNEXES TO THE REPORT

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Background and Context

The adverse effects of climate change as well as early lessons learnt during the implementation of EDPRS I led to the development of Rwanda's national strategy for Green Growth and Climate Resilience (GGCRS). The Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy has significantly influenced the inclusion of the "Green Economy Approach" as a priority of EDPRS II (2013-2018) under the Economic Transformation thematic area. The main objective of the Economic Transformation thematic area is to propose an ambitious, prioritized and coherent cross-sectorial strategy to sustain rapid growth and facilitate Rwanda's process of economic transformation to meet revised targets in the context of Vision 2020. The Government of Rwanda identified the need to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation by reducing economic costs through going 'green' and exploiting new 'green' economic opportunities.

Through a Joint Programme under its new support framework: the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) 2013-2018, the UN Country Team is supporting the implementation of this priority area. In addition to alignment to EDPRS II, the UNDAP takes serious consideration of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1 that elaborates sustainable development pathways that can eradicate extreme poverty and reduce social and economic inequality and exclusion. Area of Work 1 includes the development of sustainable and inclusive productive capacities, including Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency and is in alignment with the EDPRS II priorities that is supported by the Joint Programme.

The Joint Programme titled: "Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Economy Approach to Rwanda's Economic Transformation" will support Rwanda to have in place improved systems for sustainable management of the environment, natural resources and renewable energy resources and energy access, to achieve greater environmental and climate change resilience by:

- Supporting sustainable urbanisation with a clear focus on resiliency and green growth;
- Supporting the scaling up of renewable energy, energy efficiency and energy access;
- Supporting the Government in facilitating an increased level of public and private investment in sustainable environment and natural resource management and climate change;
- Strengthening sectoral capacity to develop and/or acquire appropriate technologies and skills for resource efficiency and cleaner production; and
- Strengthening the capacity of national and local institutions to reduce carbon foot print in human settlements through the planning and implementation of green cities and villages;

- The establishment of Centres of Excellence.

The Ministry of Environment (MoE) and its affiliate institutions, the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) and the National Fund for Environment and Climate Change (FONERWA) have been mandated to lead the implementation of Priority 5 of the Economic Transformation thematic area of EDPRS II. MINECOFIN, as the Ministry responsible for national economic planning and therefore green economic transformation, will continue to provide guidance and advice. In this regard, therefore, the Joint Programme is being led by MoE on behalf of the Government of Rwanda. The Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) is implementing a significant proportion of the planned joint programme activities. Other Implementing Partners (IPs) include University of Rwanda under MINEDUC, the Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with REMA, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM).

UN support for the Joint Programme as articulated in the UNDP is led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the One UN Fund. Other supporting UN agencies include the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The Green Economy Joint Programme will contribute to achievement of the UNDP Result 1 of Inclusive Economic Transformation through its Outcome 1: “Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction”. Outcome 1 will be realised by supporting activities aimed at improving systems to pursue a green economy approach to economic transformation through, among others, the development of green cities and villages, green industries and services, codes and standards for energy efficiency, framework and assessment tools for renewable energy development to expand energy access as well as the establishment of Centres of Excellence on environment and climate change. UNDP’s Outcome 1 is also directly aligned to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-17 Area of Work 1 that includes Green Economy policies, sustainable energy access and improved energy efficiency through following outputs:

Output 1: Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established and linked to relevant institutions

Output 2: Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation approaches to Economic Transformation increased

Output 3: Planning and implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages) especially for vulnerable women and men strengthened.

Output 4: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Goals in the Energy Sector of Rwanda Advanced

Output 5: Indicatives in support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy Effectively Coordinated

The Joint Programme (JP) is funded through multiple sources of funds including the One UN Fund, which is a pooled fund mechanism, in addition to core and vertical resources from different UN agencies including UNDP. UNDP is the Administrative Agent of the One UN Fund.

In addition to UNDP corporate requirements, the guidelines on monitoring framework and evaluation under the joint programme document stipulate that the JP is subject to an external programme review linked to the EDPRS II midterm review with respect to timing. Against this background, One UN Rwanda is looking for an individual national consultant to undertake the final evaluation of the abovementioned joint programme.

2. Purpose and objective of the Final Evaluation

The Final Evaluation is backward looking and will effectively capture lessons learnt and provide information on the nature, to the extent possible, the potential impact and sustainability of the joint programme as well as inform the design of the next phase of the programme.

The evaluation will assess the design, scope, implementation and sustainability of the JP and the capacity to achieve the expected outcomes. This will collate and analyze lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation period which will inform the next phase of the programme which will be designed during the spring of 2018. The main objectives of the final evaluation are the following:

- Assess the achievements of the programme against its stated outputs and its contribution to the achievement of UNDAF and EDPRS outcomes;
- 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 JP's activities;
- Identify the underlying causes and issues of non-achievement of some targets;
- Document lessons learnt;
- Assess the programme exit strategy;
- Inform the design of the next programme phase.

The emphasis on lessons learnt will speak to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future programme. The evaluation will assess the performance of the JP against planned results. This will also assess the preliminary indications of potential impact

and sustainability of results including the contribution to capacity development and achievement of the country's development agenda stipulated in EDPRS II and Vision 2020 and potentially to sustainable development goals. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation who are the Government of Rwanda – through the Ministry of Environment (MoE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA), Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), Rwanda Housing Authority (RHA), University of Rwanda (UR) under Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Rwanda National Police (RNP) in collaboration with REMA, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF) as a partner of the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM) – UNDP and other One UN agencies, especially those partaking in the joint programme.

3. Scope and Objective of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the level of achievement of the Joint Programme during February 2015- June 2018, since the initiation of its implementation. 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 JP. This refers to:

- Planned outputs of the JP compared to actual outputs and the actual results as a contribution to attaining the JP objectives;
- Problems and necessary corrections and adjustments for future programmes;
- Efficiency of JP management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.
- Likely outcomes and impact of the JP in relation to the specified goals and objectives of the JP.

The evaluation comprises the following elements:

- (i) Assess whether the JP design is clear, logical and commensurate with the time and resources available;
- (ii) An evaluation of the JP's progress towards achievement of its overall objectives;
- (iii) An evaluation of JP performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the logical framework matrix and the Joint Programme Document; An assessment of the scope, quality and significance of the JP outputs produced during the implementation period in relation to expected results; Identification of any programmatic and financial variance and/or adjustments made during the implementation of the JP and an assessment of their conformity with decisions of the PSC and their appropriateness in terms of the overall objectives of the JP;
- (iv) An evaluation of the JP'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 Joint Programme Document;

(vi) An evaluation of JP coordination, management and administration. This includes specific reference to:

a. Organizational/institutional arrangements for collaboration among the different stakeholders involved in JP arrangements and execution;

b. The effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework/mechanisms in monitoring on a day to day basis, progress in JP implementation;

c. Administrative, operational and/or technical challenges and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the JP;

d. An assessment of the functionality of the institutional structure established and the role of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC);

e. Financial management of the JP, 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 JP are likely to be met;

(viii) Progress towards sustainability and replication of JP activities;

(ix) Assess the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach

(x) Assess of the extent to which the design, implementation and results of the programme have incorporated the environmental sustainability concerns and make recommendation accordingly

(xi) Lessons learned during JP implementation;

(xii) Evaluate the programme's exit strategy in terms of quality and clarity.

4. Evaluation Questions

Evaluation criteria The JP will be evaluated on the basis of the DAC evaluation criteria: • Relevance: measures whether the JP addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid. • Effectiveness: measures whether the JP activities achieve its goal. 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>

• Efficiency: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results. • Sustainability: measures whether the benefits of the JP are likely to continue

after donor funding has been withdrawn. The JP needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable. • Impacts of intervention: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the JP, 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 JP being implemented? How was the JP site selected? What has been the main focus of the JP implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the JP aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS II, Vision 2020)?
- The extent to which the JP activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
- To what extent are the objectives of the JP still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

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 JP 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 and One UN support the achievement of JP 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 projects/ (joint) programmes? 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>.

Efficiency

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

Sustainability

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

Impact of interventions

- What are the stated goals of the JP? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the JP and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed? How did the JP contribute to the achievement of UNDP outcomes and outputs?
- What has happened as a result of the JP?
- What have been the main impacts of the JP on the Green Growth and Climate Change Resilience Strategy or its framework in Rwanda?
- How many people have been affected?
- Has the JP contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the JP?
- What difference has the JP made to beneficiaries?

5. Methodology

General guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, the UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, and UNDP Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results). UNDP's Evaluation Policy provides information about the role and use of evaluation within the M&E architecture of the organization.

The final decision on the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from consultation among programme staff, the evaluator and key stakeholders, based on the inception report prepared by the evaluator, about what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answer the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data.

The evaluation should use a mixed methods approach, drawing on primary and secondary, quantitative and qualitative data to come up with an overall assessment backed by clear evidence. Data will be collected through surveys of all relevant stakeholders (national and local Government institutions, development partners, beneficiaries, etc.) and through focus group discussions. Further data on the JP indicators (RRF data) will be used by the evaluation to assess the JP progress and achievements.

The evaluation methodology will include the following:

- (i) Desk review of Joint Programme Document, monitoring reports (such as minutes of LPAC meeting, Minutes of Steering Committee meetings including other relevant meetings, Programme Annual Implementation Report, quarterly progress reports, and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports);
- (ii) Review of specific products produced so far, including data sets, management and action plans, publications and other material and reports;
- (iii) Interviews with the head of SPIU, Programme Coordinator, Technical Assistant, and Administrative Assistant in MoE
- (iv) Interviews with UNDP Country Director, Head of Poverty and Environment Unit in UNDP and UNDP Programme focal point
- (v) Interviews with central and local government officials and other JP beneficiaries
- (vi) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders involved, including Resident Coordinator's Office, Global Green Growth Institute Rwanda Office.
- (vii) Focus group discussions with all stakeholders

6. Final Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

This section presents the key evaluation products the evaluator will be accountable for producing. The deliverables are the following:

- Evaluation inception report: An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset. The inception report will be discussed and approved with UNDP and MoE. (Timeline: 1 week after signing the contract)
- Draft evaluation report: Submission of draft evaluation report to UNDP for comments and inputs. The programme unit and key stakeholders in the evaluation will then review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation covers the scope and meets the required quality criteria.
- Presentation of Draft evaluation report (PPT presentation) to the Joint Programme Steering Committee for inputs and comments.
- Final evaluation report: The final report should be completed 1 week after receipt of consolidated comments from stakeholders.

ANNEX 2: INFORMATION SOURCES

List of supporting documents reviewed

Annual Progress Report, Green Growth and Economy Approach JP. 1st January 2017 – 30th December 2017

Annual Progress Report, Green Growth and Economy Approach JP. 1st July 2017 – 30th June 2018

Annual Progress Report, Green Growth and Economy Approach JP. January – December 2016

Annual Work Plans and Budgets, Green Growth and Economy Approach JP.

Arjun S. Bedia, Lorenzo Pellegrinia and Luca Tasciottia, 2013. Impact Evaluation of Rwanda's National Domestic Biogas Programme, April 2013, at <https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23450/1/396-impact-evaluation-of-rwandas-national-domestic-biogas-programme.pdf>

Cliff Bernard Nuwakora, 2018. Final evaluation report, Outcome Evaluation of UNDAF Outcome 1.1: "Pro-poor growth and economic transformation enhanced for inclusive economic development and poverty reduction", May, 2018.

ENEA, 2016. Domestic biogas diffusion in Rwanda – Key Learnings for Scale Up, March 2016. Available at <http://www.enea-consulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ENEA-Consulting-Domestic-biogas-diffusion-in-Rwanda-Open-Ideas1.pdf>.

GREEN ECONOMY- Consolidated AWPB Jan-June 2015

GREEN ECONOMY- Consolidated AWPB Jul 2017 June 2018

Green Economy Guidebook UN 2012

Green economy methodology UN 2017

GREEN ECONOMY-Consolidated AWPB Jul 2015-June 2016

GREEN ECONOMY-Consolidated AWPB Jul 2016 June 2017

Ibrahim C. Musobo, 2018. Mid-Term Evaluation of the Joint Program on "Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda's Economic Transformation" Final Report, Kigali, February 2018.

Joint Programme Outcomes: UNDAF Result 1: Inclusive Economic Transformation GREEN ECONOMY.

Matthew Landi Benjamin, Sovacool Benjamin and Sovacool and Jay Eidsness, 2013. Cooking with gas: Policy lessons from Rwanda's National Domestic Biogas Program (NDBP) Energy for Sustainable Development 17(4):347–356, DOI: 10.1016/j.esd. 2013.03.007, August 2013.

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

Mujyanama Pio, 2017.

INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT

Kigali December, 2017

OECD, 2002, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

ONE UN Rwanda Annual Report 2013.

ONE UN Rwanda Annual Report 2014.

ONE UN Rwanda Annual Report 2016-2017

PRODOC, 2015, Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda's Economic Transformation.

Quarterly Implementation Reports: 01 April to 30 June 2017

Reports if available in MoE will be checked and also the former project manager if he has information. Both sources will be followed up.

Rwanda UNDAP 2013 2018

Rwanda UNDAP Review Sida

Rwanda-UN-Business-Operations-Strategy-2013-2017

Scoping Study on Integrating Poverty Reduction, Environmental and Economic Concerns into National Development Planning Rwanda Report

Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

UN Environment website, green economy toolkit at <http://www.switchafricagreen.org/opgetoolkit/>

UN Presentation - Joint Planning UNDAP

UNCT, 2007, One UN Delivering as one in Rwanda: Concept paper, One UN' in Rwanda, 5 April 2007.

UNDAP 2018-2023 Analysis and Results Framework

UNDAP 2018-2023 Analysis and Results Framework_

UNDAP Annual Report 2016-2017.

UNDAP Annual Report 2017.

UNDG, 2008, Guidelines on Joint Programme.

UNDG, 2014. Standard operating procedures for countries adopting the “Delivering as ONE” Approach, August 2014.

UNDP Rwanda Governance Outcome Evaluation, 2017.

UNEG’s Guidance in Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation at <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

UNEP, 2018. Operationalising Green Economy Transition in Africa (2014-2018) Project Results: Rwanda.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Rwanda, 2008-2012.

United Nations Development Group (UNDG), 2008. Guidance Note on Joint Programmes.

List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted and sites visited

	Key persons	Function	Institution	Contact
1	Fatina MUKARUBIBI	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Environment	fmukarubibi@environment.gov.rw
2	Jacob Hodari	Director of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Ministry of Environment	jhodari@environment.gov.rw
3	Timothy Kayumba	Green Economy Joint Programme Specialist	Ministry of Environment	TKAYUMBA@environment.gov.rw
4	Innocent Musabyimana	SPIU Coordinator	Ministry of Environment	imusabyimana@environment.gov.rw
5	Charles Habuwera	Finance Specialist	Ministry of Environment	chabuwera@environment.gov.rw
6	David Bwimba	Director Environment Protection Unit	Rwanda National Police	dep@police.gov.rwbwimbadaid1@gmail.com
7	Alex Fata	Director SPIU	Rwanda National Police	dspiu@police.gov.rw
8	Jean Marie	Commissioner for CID	Rwanda National Police	
9	Eddy Kyazze	Director of Planning	MININFRA	eddyunited@yahoo.com
10	Robert Nyanvumba	Principal Senior Engineer Energy, Water and Sanitation	MININFRA (Energy)	rnyamvumba@edcl.reg.rw
11	Felix GAKUBA	Managing Director EDCL (focal person for SE4ALL)	MININFRA (Energy)	emmanuel.kamanzi@mininfra.gov.rw
12	Frank Kagame	M&E Officer and Green Economy Focal Point	Rwanda Housing Authority	kfranka04@yahoo.com
13	Augustin Kampayana	Human Settlement Planning and Development, Head of Department & Deputy Director General	Rwanda Housing Authority	Augustin.kampayana@rha.gov.rw
14	Dr. Marie Christine Gasingirwa	DG, Science, Technology and Research, Ministry of Education	MINEDUC/UR	cgasingirwa@mineduc.gov.rw
15	Remy Twiringiyimana	Director of Research and Development Directorate of Science, Technology and Research	MINEDUC/UR	rtwiringiyimana@mineduc.gov.rw
16	Prof. Beth Kaplin	Acting Director, Center of Excellence in Biodiversity & Natl Res Management (CoEB), Rwanda	MINEDUC/UR	bkaplin@antioch.edubkaplin@ur.ac.rw
17	Jeannette BATAMULIZA	Project Manager, CoEB Rwanda	MINEDUC/UR	jealiza90@gmail.com
18	Dorothy Uwera	PSF SPIU	MINICOM (Industry)	dorothyu@psf.org.rw
19	William Mugabo	Green Economy Joint Programme Specialist	Ministry of Environment	wmugabo@environment.gov.rw
20	Patrick MUGABO		Rwanda Environmental Management Authority	p.mugabo@rema.gov.rw
21	Diana Ngangure	Energy Policy Analyst	ESWAp/MININFRA	diana.ngangure@mininfra.gov.rw
	UN Agencies			
22	Stephen Rodriques	UNDP Country Director	UNDP	stephen.rodriques@undp.org
23	Bernardin Uzayisaba	Officer in Charge of Poverty and Environment Unit	UNDP	bernardinophie.uzayisabanyirabakwiye@undp.org
24	Jenny Kwon	Programme Analyst	UNDP	jaeun.kwon@undp.org
	Gabrielle Tillberg	M&E Officer	UNDP	gabrielle.tillberg@undp.org
25	Mr. Otto Vianney Muhinda	ARR/Programme	FAO	otto.muhinda@fao.org
26	Peter Wallet	Programme Coordinator	UNESCO	p.wallet@unesco.org
27	Bernardin RUTAZIBWA	Antenna Officer	UNESCO	B.rutazibwa@unesco.org
	Andre Habimana	UNIDO/ Programmes	UNIDO	A.habimana@unido.org
28	Steve Niyonzima	UNIDO / MINICOM	UNIDO	niyosteve12@gmail.com
29	Monique Sevumba	UN-Habitat Programme Manager	UN-HABITAT	monique.sevumba@undp.org
30	Catherine Kalisa	National Technical Advisor	UN-HABITAT	Catherine.kalisa@unhabitat.org
31	Alice Mbarushimana		UN-HABITAT	alice.mbarushimana@undp.org
32	Jean-Philippe Rodde	Economic Affairs Officer, UNCTAD Technical Cooperation Service	UNCTAD	Jean-Philippe.Rodde@unctad.org
33	Kjartan Sørensen	Business Facilitation Program	UNCTAD	kjartan@businessfacilitation.org
34	Frank Grozel (Geneva based)	Coordinator, Business Facilitation Programme	UNCTAD	Frank.Grozel@unctad.org
35	Concorde Kananura (Kigali based)	Business Facilitation Programme, UNCTAD	UNCTAD	concorde@businessfacilitation.org
36	Yohannes Hailu	Economic Affairs Officer- Energy	UNECA	YohannesHailu@uneca.org
37	Jean-Jacob Sahou	Regional Development Coordination Officer	UNEP	jean-jacob.sahou@unep.org
38	Lowri Rees (Green Economy Toolkit, Nairobi based)	Programme Management Officer	UNEP	Lowri.Rees@unep.org
39	Meseret Zemedkun (Geothermal, Nairobi based)	Programme Manager, African Rift Geothermal Development Facility (AGReo)	UNEP	Meseret.Zemedkun@unep.org
40	Innocent Habimana	PHE/UNDAP Focal point	WHO	habimanai@who.inthabinoc@gmail.com

Questionnaire Used

Survey of Agency and activity Focal Points/Coordinators/Experts:

RE: Final Evaluation of the Joint Programme “Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda’s Economic Transformation”

Introduction: The UNDP and the Government of Rwanda (GoR) have commenced the Final Evaluation of the Joint Programme “Support to the Development and Implementation of a Green Growth and Economy Approach to Rwanda’s Economic Transformation.” The evaluation terms have specified two purposes. First, for providing accountability for the resources and the results achieved; and second, to promote opportunities for learning and operational improvements and provide inputs, which will inform the next phase of the programme to be designed during the final quarter of 2018.

It is very important to have the feedback from individuals like you for this evaluation. It is also difficult to find time in the busy schedules of key stakeholders like yourself, and so we have devised a short questionnaire to solicit your views. This is being sent to all representatives of Partner Agencies and the GoR counterparts whose names have been provided by UNDP and the MoE.

We seek your response within one week if possible. Your views provide an important and critical dimension to this evaluation. I already have been able to meet many of you and even in those cases, I will be pleased if you can address the questions below. Please advise if you face any challenges. The personal data that is asked of you will be used only to monitor the responses. The evaluation undertakes to fully protect the anonymity of all respondents. No names or identifications will be shared with anyone else, unless you expressly provide for the release, for which an option is provided below. If you have any questions or need more information, please contact me at amitavrath@gmail.com and/or arath@policyresearch.ca and/or +250 local phone to 13 September 2018.

Thank you for your participation. Amitav Rath, Evaluator.

Name First, Last:		
Agency and work title:		
Email:		
Phone:		
Gender	Female	Male

I do NOT wish my name to be disclosed in the report	
I do NOT have any objection if my name is disclosed in the report	

1. Please indicate the period during which you have been an active member supporting the activities and outputs of the Joint Programme (It started in 2015 and is to conclude in 2018)

Date From:

There were 20 defined activities and 5 Outputs. Please complete the table below indicating where you were involved or if you had another role such as observer, administrator and any other:

Your Role: Activity and Output	Key Actions Undertaken	USD spent

2.

Please provide any additional information if you have - progress made and not recorded; any numerical indicators on outputs and outcomes, any considerations to You may also provide documents as attachments.	
---	--

2.1 Were the activities completed in time?	
--	--

2.2 Were any additional resources leveraged for or by your efforts and if yes, explain?	
---	--

2.3 Please explain the reasons for changes, if any, from the original plans in the Prodoc:	
--	--

3. Based on your involvement with the	
---------------------------------------	--

programme activities what are the most outstanding achievements? Please list or describe as many as you choose.	
---	--

4. In your view, and experience, what are some of the key challenges you and your areas of work faced, those that you were able to overcome, and perhaps others which could not?	
--	--

5. Did you, find the key partners most appropriate to the work planned? Please explain your views.	
Yes	
No	
Largely yes, but some adjustments could have been useful	

6. Did you find that your area within the Joint Programme project was well linked and coordinated with the other national initiatives which it was meant to complement and support as with the UNDAP 2014-2018, EDPRS II and others? Did it contribute to the achievements of outputs of the larger programmes – UNDAP and EDPRS II? Did it have any impact on the Green Growth and Climate Change Resilience Strategy in Rwanda? Please explain, using as many specific details as possible.

--

7. How satisfied were you with the reports and information provided to you on the activities, outputs, achievements and challenges for the performance of your role(s) on the JPSC and in your own agency? Explain in area below.

Not satisfied	
Somewhat satisfied	
Fully satisfied	

8. Please rate the achievements by the Joint Programme by activities and outputs, based on your knowledge: (Please check one box for each item)

No.	Key Output and Related Actions:	Do not Know	Not at all 1	Low 2	Medium 3	High 4	Fully 5
1	Innovation Centres of Excellence for environment and climate change established						
1.1	Support establish operationalize an innovation center of excellence - environment, climate resilience, green urbanization and green technologies.						
1.2	Support operationalize Center of Excellence on Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management.						
1.3	Support institutional linkages in pursuing GE growth (Innovation Center of Excellence)						
2	Public and private investment in Green Urbanisation Increased						
2.1	Support establish operationalize private sector-led structure for construction of a model green city						
2.2	Support private sector-led resource mobilization and construction of model green city						
2.3	Support private investment in green technology goods for large scale national/export markets.						

3	Planning & implementation of integrated rural settlements (Smart Green Villages), especially vulnerable women and men						
3.1	Support establish a gender-balanced private sector-led structure for up-scaling villages in vulnerable women and men						
3.2	Support investment for integrating Climate-Smart practices in construction of green villages						
3.3	Support private sector-led resource mobilization for upscaling green villages						
4	Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) advanced						
No.	Key Output and Related Actions:	Do not Know	Not at all 1	Low 2	Medium 3	High 4	Fully 5
4.1	Support strengthening of national energy planning renewable energy resource assessment and decisions tools development						
4.2	Support development execution of technical and economic assessments of renewable energy at one of the sites						
4.3	Support development of national energy efficiency standards and codes						
4.4	Support mainstreaming - Energy Technology Deployment; Energy Security framework; SE4ALL multi-stakeholders' framework and coordination; Off grid solutions, policy dialogue, consultation and technical support; and Strengthen the Decentralized energy segment of the Rwanda SE4ALL AA and develop program framework for						

	decentralized energy solutions
4.5	Support the drafting/adoption of the SE4ALL Investment Prospectus
4.6	Support nationally adopted indicators SE4ALL progress & tracking system
5	Support of policy, advocacy, and capacity development for Green Economy Effectively Coordinated
5.1	Support the development and operationalization of a toolbox for operationalizing GE in Rwanda
5.2	Provide capacity-strengthening support for the Environment Unit of the RNP for implementing green growth standards
5.3	Support costing of the Green Growth and Climate Resilience Strategy
5.4	Support urbanization and environmental health risk reduction policy development and implementation pilot projects
5.5	Support technical and capacity development and provision of advisory services for Green Growth and Green Economy

9. What further steps would promote the longer-term sustainability of the project outputs in which you were responsible for in the future (over the next five years)?

10. Considering the fact that many of the activities of the Joint Programme is expected to continue, what do you think are the most critical issues that must be faced during future programming from your experience?

11. Are there any other comments that you wish to make pertaining to the Joint Programme objectives and execution that we may not have asked you about?

If you wish to contact me for any reason, please feel to do so.

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX

NO	Evaluation Criteria: Key Questions & Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Means of verification
I	Relevance measures whether the JP addresses an important development goal and whether its objectives are still valid			
1	Where is this JP being implemented? How was the JP site selected? What has been the main focus of the JP implementation so far? Who are the main beneficiaries? How were they selected? How was the JP aligned to the national development strategy (EDPRS II, Vision 2020)?	Congruence of project objectives and national context as in EDPRS II and UNDAP	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders
2	The extent to which the JP activities are suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.	Congruence of project objectives and national context as in EDPRS II and UNDAP	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
3	To what extent are the objectives of the JP still valid?	Congruence of project objectives and national context as in EDPRS II and UNDAP	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
4	Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?	Congruence of project activities and outputs with LFA	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
5	Are the activities and outputs of the JP consistent with the intended impacts and effects?	Congruence of project activities and outputs with LFA	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
II	Effectiveness: measures whether the JP activities achieve its goal			
6	To what extent were the objectives achieved?	JP Goal and objective statement.	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group

NO	Evaluation Criteria: Key Questions & Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Means of verification
7	What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	Perceptions of project teams and national stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
8	Did the activities contribute to the achievement of the planned outputs?	Comparison between planned versus actual results Perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group Time series data collected
9	Have the different outputs been achieved?	Comparison between planned versus actual results Perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
10	What progress toward the outcomes has been made?	Comparison between planned versus actual results Perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
11	To what extent the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach? What should be done to improve gender and human rights mainstreaming?	Degree of congruence and integration of gender and HRBA dimension in project design, implementation and monitoring	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
12	What has been the result of the capacity building/trainings interventions? Were qualified trainers available to conduct training?	Perceptions of key stakeholders and beneficiaries	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
13	How did UNDP and One UN support the achievement of JP outcome and outputs?	Comparison between planned versus actual and perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey Field visit.	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
14	How was the partnership strategy conducted by UNDP? Has UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?	Comparison between planned	Document review Interviews	Discourse and content analysis

NO	Evaluation Criteria: Key Questions & Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Means of verification
	What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness? What were the synergies with other projects/ (joint) programmes	versus actual and perceptions of key stakeholders	Survey Field visit.	Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
III	Efficiency: measures the cost effectiveness, i.e. the economic use of resources to achieve desired results			
15	Were activities cost-efficient?	Comparison of actual project costs by activities to budget (variances) Evidence of leveraged resources Evidence of disbursement issues Evidence of co-financing Evidence of measures to correct irregularities	Document review Interviews Survey	Review financial reports Reports and content analysis Review of work plan, process and M&E tasks
16	Were objectives achieved on time?	Above	Above	Above
17	Was the JP implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?	Above	Above	Above
18	What was the original budget for the JP? How have the JP funds been spent? Were the funds spent as originally budgeted?	Above	Above	Above
19	Are there any management challenges affecting efficient implementation of the JP? What are they and how are they being addressed	Adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes Quality of backstopping; M&E plan; logical framework; engagement of the stakeholders yearly progress and financial reports; M&E information used	Above	Above
IV	Sustainability: measures whether the benefits of the JP are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. The JP needs to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable			
20	To what extent the design, implementation and results of the JP have incorporated environment sustainability? What should be	Define sustainability for results and comparisons. Likely	Document review Interviews	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key

NO	Evaluation Criteria: Key Questions & Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Means of verification
	done to improve environmental sustainability mainstreaming?	indicators - country ownership and driven-ness, national participation, partnership arrangements; cooperation received and stimulate ownership of outcomes	Survey	stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
21	To what extent will the benefits of the JP continue after donor funding stops?	Degree and effectiveness of involvement of government and relevant sector agencies; perceptions of project team, stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
22	What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the JP?	Above	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
23	Does the JP have a clear exit strategy?	Qualitative	Document review Interviews	Perceptions of key stakeholders
V: Impacts of intervention: measure the positive and negative changes produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended				
24	What are the stated goals of the JP? To what extent are these goals shared by stakeholders? What are the primary activities of the JP and expected outputs? To what extent have the activities progressed?	Project document; and progress reports	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
25	How did the JP contribute to the achievement of UNDAP outcomes and outputs?	Comparison of JP and UNDAP outputs and outcomes	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
26	What has happened as a result of the JP?	Perceptions of project team, stakeholders and beneficiaries	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and

NO	Evaluation Criteria: Key Questions & Sub-questions	Indicators	Data collection instruments	Means of verification
				beneficiary group
27	What have been the main impacts of the JP on Green Growth and Climate Change Resilience Strategy or its framework in Rwanda?	Analysis of outcomes	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
28	How many people have been affected?	Numbers in output and outcome reports	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
29	Has the JP contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions related to the JP	Analysis of outcomes with perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group
30	What difference has the JP made to beneficiaries?	Perceptions of key stakeholders	Document review Interviews Survey	Discourse and content analysis Perceptions of key stakeholders, target and beneficiary group

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Activity Phase	Tasks and deliverables	Time-Line
Contract signed	Commenced.	28 June 2018
Desk Review and Inception report phase	Desk review conducted of documents provided and listed in Annex. Discussions held with UNDP focal point/project leader. An inception report is submitted for review.	22 July 2018
	Validation meeting is held to discuss the Inception Report. Recommended further actions recorded in meeting notes, including preparation of more detailed schedule, ASAP. Maintain target to complete evaluation by end September.	6 August 2018
Milestone 1	Inception Report approved, with the additions of suggestions provided in this meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Questionnaire component mentioned in methodology of Inception Report 2. Add table of contents 3. Add short narrative to paragraph on LFA 4. Send timetable of work to secure meetings before time travel (make dates concrete) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tentative travel to Kigali week of 20-24 September b. Tentative presentation to stakeholder on 7-10 September 	7-13 August 2018
Continue planning and reviews	Request expenditure by activity by year (for UNDP funds and any information provided to UNDP by partners in format to be provided. Provide list of all the individuals, their organizations, and email address – for stakeholders, and partners and possible beneficiaries. Provide any missing documents. Prepare, review, consult on questionnaire with stakeholders: Send list of questions for questionnaire / Send the draft questionnaire/Finalize questionnaire. Send out questionnaire. Emphasis is placed on consultations, feedback and finalization of details of field visit. Continue planning field visit dates and logistics; any electronic interviews; draft survey(s), discuss with Management Team (MT) and readiness for efficient field work.	7-20 August 2018
Field visit to Rwanda ⁴⁵ :	Additional data; stakeholder consultations and Interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits, as feasible, in order to collect the required data.	August 26 to September 12, 2018
Analysis of data and drafting report	The data collection is ended; analysis and draft of the evaluation report is made; and, a PowerPoint presentation to stakeholders is prepared. .	Above.
Milestone 2: Presentation of draft	Presentations and feedback at stakeholders meeting for review and revisions. The feedback will be incorporated into the draft report for the	7 or 10 September,

⁴⁵ The field visit was originally proposed for August 22 to September 7, 2018 following the validation meeting on 6 August. This was adjusted in consultation with the Evaluation Management Team (MT). The dates for milestones 2 and 3 were changed accordingly, while the date for milestone 4 has been kept intact for now.

evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting	final evaluation report.	2018
Milestone 3: Draft Final Report submitted	The evaluator will revise the draft report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP.	20 September, 2018
END-Milestone 4: Review and Finalize	The evaluator will revise the final evaluation report based on any additional comments and inputs provided by stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP. The date was extended at the request of the MoE to end of October 2018.	30 September 2018

Work Plan	Date: Start/end	July	July	July	Aug	Aug	Aug	Aug	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	October
		16-20	23-27	30-3	6-10	13-17	20-24	27-31	3-7	10-14	17-21	24-28	1-5
Inception report phase	Initial desk review conducted of documents provided.	16-Jul-18											
	Discussions held with UNDP focal point/project leader.												
	Draft inception report is submitted for review.	23-Jul-18											
	Validation meeting is held to discuss the Inception Report.	06-Aug-18											
	Revisions made to Inception Report.												
	Revised Inception Report Submitted	13-Aug-18											
Milestone 1	Inception Report approved, with the additions of suggestions provided in this meeting:	14-Aug-18											
Data Collection, organization of tools, further analysis and logistics	Questionnaire design and review with stakeholders; secure agreements and meetings during travel; collect additional information, readiness for efficient field work.	13-25 August											
Field visit to Rwanda	Tentative travel to Kigali week of 26 August												
	Face to face consultations, any electronic interviews; draft survey, discuss with Management Team (MT) and	August 26 to September 12, 2018											
	Additional data; stakeholder consultations and interviews, focus group discussions, and field visits, as feasible, in order to collect the required data.												
Milestone 2: Presentation of draft evaluation report to Stakeholder meeting	Presentations and feedback at stakeholders meeting for review and revisions. The feedback will be incorporated into the draft report for the final evaluation report.	7 or 10 September, 2018											
Milestone 3: Draft Final Report submitted	Revise draft report based on the comments and inputs provided by all stakeholders and submit the final report to UNDP.	20-Sep-18											
END-Milestone 4: Review and Finalize	Revise the final draft report based on any additional comments and inputs, submit the final report to UNDP.	30-Sep-18											

GANTT chart of Work plan

ANNEX 5: THE EVALUATOR

Dr. Amitav Rath is the Director of Policy Research International, a consulting practice based in Ottawa. He is also associated with research institutions in Canada, India, South Africa and Tanzania. His education incorporates interdisciplinary training, combining science and engineering with studies in economics, finance, statistics and natural resources systems. He obtained his B. Tech. (Hons) from the prestigious Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, and his M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. He has a diverse experience of over 30 years working on many intersecting issues of development, policy and programmes, in the public and private sectors, and in monitoring and evaluations, in over fifty countries. His core areas of interest include energy and climate change policies.

His areas of work include policy design, analysis and Monitoring & Evaluation related to energy, technology, capacity building and innovation, as applied to challenges of poverty, growth, renewables and efficiency, natural resources, climate change and other facets of sustainable development. He has worked with many programmes, agencies and governments. He has continued to be involved in teaching and research, beginning at Berkeley, then as a professor and a director of research and consulting on Indian industry and economics, at the Management Development Institute, New Delhi, training senior managers and public officials. Subsequently, he has been involved in different capacities with over a dozen research and teaching institutions in several countries. Most recently he was a visiting professor at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bhubaneswar. He has contributed as the author or co-author to over sixty research articles, reports and books on key development challenges, was a professor at Tshwane University and is an adviser to a Tanzanian think tank.

He worked at the International Development Research Centre in Ottawa for over a decade, managing several global programmes. His primary focus at IDRC was in the programmes on Science, Technology and Innovation, and on Energy and Environment. He also contributed to programming on economic policy, environment and natural resources, enterprise development, education and institutional capacity building.

Notable assignments undertaken by him include work for the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Ottawa and many agencies of the Government of Canada; the regional development banks; the World Bank; the African Union; many UN agencies such as the UNEP; UNESCO; UNU; UNDP; UNIDO; the UN Fund for the Montreal Protocol; the Commonwealth Secretariat; DfID; GIZ; Sida; the International Energy Agency; several NGOs and Community organizations, research institutes and national governments of developing countries. He has been involved in a major expenditure review of energy and infrastructure in Rwanda, supporting a shift to sector wide approaches. He often works in multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder networks and teams, both as a team leader and as a team member. He has been involved in over fifty complex evaluations in 20 years, on economic development, research, innovation, energy, environment, natural resources, small enterprise development, education and capacity building in Africa, Asia and Latin America, allowing for cross-country learning and institutional sharing.

ANNEX 6: EVALUATOR CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT

Evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. Should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. The evaluator must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. The evaluator is not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluator should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the evaluator must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. Should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, the evaluator should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for their performance and their product(s), and responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Amitav Rath

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Ottawa, on 15 July 2018

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alain". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized, with a large loop at the top of the first letter.

ANNEX 7: THE SIX-POINT PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

The ToR specified the use of the Six-Point Performance Rating Scale shown below.

6. Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The object rated has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
5 Satisfactory (S)	The object rated has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
4 Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	The object rated has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
3 Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	The object rated has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
2 Unsatisfactory (U)	The object rated has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
1 Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):	The object rated has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency
N. A.	Not Applicable (or not relevant).